United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2015 No. 120

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 28, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID G. VALADAO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, The New York Times published an article titled ''Afghan Security Forces Struggle Just to Maintain Stalemate,'' by Joseph Goldstein.

Mr. Goldstein writes that, because of extremely high casualty rates in the Afghan security forces, there is also a high desertion rate. As a result, the Afghans are struggling to maintain adequate numbers in their security forces, meaning, it is becoming extremely difficult for them to keep the Taliban at bay.

The article is of great concern for those of us who have watched the fight against the Taliban since 2001. We have lost over 2,355 men and women in Afghanistan, with 20,000 wounded, and spent over $685 billion.

The history of Afghanistan has shown that no outside military force has ever changed it, from Alexander the Great, to the British, to the Russians. Yet, last year the Obama administration signed a 9-year agreement, committing American money and manpower in Afghanistan that was not voted on by the Congress.

That is so ironic. We are talking about voting on this agreement with Iran, but we did not vote to commit our troops and our money to Afghanistan for 9 more years.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am concerned by Mr. Goldstein's report. Let me give two quotes from his article about the ability of the Afghan security forces to keep the Taliban at bay that I found very, very concerning.

First: ''A spokesman for the Afghan Defense Ministry . . . insisted that desertions remained rare and that there had been no effort to ban leaves or to stop rotations away from the front to cut down on the number of people going absent without leave.''

The second quote: ''But interviews with soldiers and police officers repeatedly countered the government's claims. One Army major said . . . 'Once the soldiers are taken for their breaks, they are unwilling to come back and join their duty.' ''

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Afghan Government is untruthful and corrupt. Yet, we continue to spend billions of dollars at this losing cause.

It is not fair to the taxpayers of eastern North Carolina, the taxpayers of America, or anybody in this country that pays taxes that we will continue to send money there to build their infrastructure and rebuild their roads and then to have the Taliban blow them up. It makes no sense.

I can assure President Ghani, the President of Afghanistan, that the United States House continues to spend billions of dollars on Afghan reconstruction so the Taliban can continue to destroy what we send over there with the taxpayers' money to be built.

We in Congress should stop funding this rathole of a policy in Afghanistan, which has basically given the Afghan Government a blank check every year and will for the next 9 years.

History has proven that we will never change this tribal nation, and we should stop trying. Instead, let's focus on fixing our economy here in America.

God bless our troops, and God bless America.

RAISE THE GAS TAX ALREADY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 years, I have been coming to the floor, arguing against the folly of our attempting to pay for 2015 infrastructure with 1993 dollars.

We haven't adjusted the gas tax since 1993, and that is why we haven't given the American people a 6-year, robust reauthorization of the surface transportation system since 1998.

I find myself today in complete agreement with a column by James Surowiecki in the current issue of The New Yorker. It is entitled ''Raise the Gas Tax Already.''

He talks about how what is going on in the other body might be perceived as progress, might be a good thing, '' 'real progress,' except for one thing: their complicated, jury-rigged plan is only

Printed on recycled paper.

necessary because of the continued refusal by Congress to embrace the obvious, economically sensible solution to highway funding, namely raising the gas tax. The federal gas tax is, as it should be, a key source of funding for highway spending.'' Locked currently at 18.4 cents:

''The problem is that the funding mechanisms the plan relies on are as gimmicky and haphazard as ever. The bill would raise money by, among other things, lowering the dividend rate paid to banks in the Federal Reserve system, raising certain customs fees, increasing collection rates on unpaid taxes, and selling off a hundred and one million barrels of oil from the country's Strategic Petroleum Reserve.''

''If you're going to have a Strategic Petroleum Reserve, you should probably only sell oil from it for strategic reasons, not just because you want to raise some cash.''

''And, from an economic perspective, paying for operating expenses by selling off assets is not a good way to manage your money.''

''What's especially infuriating about the bill is that we already have, in the gas tax, an ideal tool for raising money to pay for highway repairs. It's a user tax: if you don't drive, you don't pay it, and if you drive less it costs you less.''

''That's why even conservative economists, like Gregory Mankiw . . . have been ardent advocates of gasoline taxes.''

''Indeed, the refusal of Congress to raise the gas tax is the ultimate expression of how reflexive and irrational the resistance to taxes has become. Opposition to higher income taxes has some theoretical justification: higher marginal rates discourage people from working more and investing. Seen in one light, they're a penalty for success. But no such argument exists against the gas tax: all it does, in essence, is ask drivers to pay for the roads they use. It's not even fair to say that keeping this tax at its current level is a check on big government, since most federal highway spending now goes toward rebuilding and repairing roads—maintenance that even conservatives recognize we must do.

''Highway revenue has to be raised somehow. Congress should show some political spine, discard the Rube Goldberg funding schemes, and stop treating all taxes as bad ones.''

I couldn't agree more with that sentiment. Indeed, we have seen six Republican States already this year show some political spine. They have raised the gas tax in Idaho, Utah, Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Georgia.

It is time for us to assume our responsibilities, to rebuild and renew America, that used to have the finest infrastructure in the world, but now is locked into a downward spiral.

Renewing and rebuilding America, giving a 6-year, robust reauthorization bill will put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work in a matter of months all across the country, and it will make all our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

DRUG FREE AMERICA FOUNDATION CHAIR BETTY SEMBLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone who has been described as a pioneer in national substance abuse policy and prevention and a woman whose dedication, drive, and compassion have made the world simply a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Betty Sembler of St. Petersburg, Florida, as she retires as chair of the Drug Free America Foundation after nearly 15 years of dedicated leadership.

Mrs. Sembler has actually dedicated the past three decades of her life to fighting the war on drugs. In 1976, she was 1 of 10 founding members of Straight, Inc., a nonprofit drug treatment program that successfully treated more than 12,000 young people with drug addiction in eight cities nationally, from Dallas to Boston.

Mrs. Sembler then turned her sights to establishing a national drug policy to reinforce the four critical fronts to combat drug abuse: education, treatment, interdiction, and law enforcement.

Mrs. Sembler helped form public policy in the United States' campaign against drugs through her participation in the White House Conference for a Drug Free America, as a member of the Florida Governor's Drug Policy Task Force, and as a board member of DARE Florida, a national organization that provides drug resistance education for elementary and middle school students.

Mrs. Sembler has continued her campaign against weakening drug policies and against legalization of drugs on an international basis. She serves on the board of DARE International as vice chairperson.

She accompanied her husband, Mel Sembler, on both of his missions as United States ambassador, first to Australia and then to Italy.

Mrs. Sembler is the founder and board chair of Save Our Society from Drugs and the Drug Free America Foundation.

Both organizations work to educate people about the effects on individuals, families, and communities, from legalizing and loosening restrictions on drugs while also fighting to reduce drug use, drug addiction, and drug-related illnesses and death.

Mrs. Sembler serves on the boards of the Republican Jewish Coalition, Operation PAR in Pinellas County, the Florida Holocaust Museum, the Florida Governor's Mansion Foundation, the Florida National Guard Multijurisdictional Counterdrug Training Advisory Board, the Jewish Policy Center, and St. Petersburg's Menorah Manor.

Mr. Speaker, in 2008, the DEA Museum Foundation presented its Lifetime Achievement Award to Mrs. Sembler for her 30 years of leadership and commitment to fighting drugs.

The Lifetime Achievement Award is the highest honor bestowed by the foundation and recognizes long and sustained commitments to supporting law enforcement, drug abuse treatment, and drug abuse education.

Mrs. Sembler was awarded honorary agent status by the DEA, only the second such designation to ever be given.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is Mrs. Betty Sembler and her work with the Drug Free America Foundation has positively impacted lives and families around the world and has, no doubt, saved lives around the world.

Mrs. Sembler, with her grace, friendship, and charm, has impacted each and every individual that she has touched throughout her life, including this Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Mrs. Betty Sembler for her selfless years of service and for her work leading the charge, pushing back against dangerous drug policies, and promoting public health and public safety.

PUERTO RICO'S DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an introduction. This is the beautiful island of Puerto Rico. We own it. It is ours. We are responsible for it.

The Congress of the United States governs this island. It is our colony, and we rule over it. It is $73 billion in debt.

The Supreme Court said: Puerto Rico is a territory . . . belonging to the United States, but not a part of the United States.

And, apparently, the responsibility to govern Puerto Rico falls to the Congress and not to the executive branch, because, for the last 6 months or more, I have talked with Obama administration officials at every level about Puerto Rico, and their response has been that they cannot or will not do anything. The message I received loud and clear was anything to help Puerto Rico had better happen in Congress.

But there is no sense of urgency in Congress or anywhere else in Washington for real solutions. Puerto Rico's problems are complicated.

I am here to say that the Puerto Rican people must begin putting direct pressure on this Congress for action because Puerto Rico's problems are mostly the creation of—you guessed it—Congress.

The Jones Act of 1917 made all Puerto Ricans citizens of the United States, just in time for World War I, when 18,000 new draftees were needed.

The Jones Act also says that Puerto Rico, unlike any State, can issue triple-exempt bonds, bonds that are free

of Federal, State, and local taxes. Illinois can't do that. Neither can your State.

□ 1015

But Puerto Rico was specifically written out of U.S. bankruptcy laws by Congress. They cannot declare Chapter 9 or anything else because a special exemption was made. So Congress creates a tax-free bond haven and Wall Street jumps in to buy Puerto Rican debt decade after decade.

Puerto Rico has more than 15 times the median bond debt of all 50 States, and bankruptcy is not an option without an act of Congress. And get this: the Puerto Rican Constitution says bondholders must be paid before anything else.

Right now, Wall Street is circling the wounded animal like vultures waiting to get their piece; and they are fighting against a bill that would allow Puerto Rico, like any other jurisdiction, to declare bankruptcy because that could move decisions about who gets paid and in what order they get paid into a U.S. Federal court of law.

You see, the current situation favors the billionaires and hedge funds because they will get paid before the cops on the beat, the doctors in the hospitals, and the teachers in the schools. Oh, we can't investigate that crime or take down that drug dealer because we have to pay the bondholders on Wall Street first.

Now, the same people who cash in on debt in places like Greece and Argentina are lining up to cash in in the Caribbean by stepping up their demands for austerity measures, privatization of utilities, and restructuring on their terms that will make them very, very rich at the expense of the Puerto Rican people.

Tomorrow, I will discuss how the Puerto Rican people are being distracted by the promises of statehood by every politician who travels to San Juan or needs the votes of Puerto Ricans in Orlando, Florida.

But today, I want to make clear that the sooner the people here realize that the people in this Chamber are the ones who need to take action, the sooner we can make real progress and not get distracted by politics and the pipe dreams of statehood.

So for my remaining minute, I want to address the people of Puerto Rico directly in the language they speak at home around the dinner table.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

It is time for everyone to put political divisions aside.

I have talked to the Obama Administration and they will do nothing to help Puerto Rico.

The bond-holders are lining up to get paid even if the rest of Puerto Rico collapses.

Wall Street is buying up Puerto Rican debt so that they can demand austerity measures, tax-breaks, and privatization of industries that will fill their pockets with even more money.

Whatever plan is invented in Washington or on Wall Street will not put the needs of the Puerto Rican people first—we all know that.

So what is a unified Puerto Rico's plan to move forward?

Boricuas must step up right now so that Puerto Rico has a plan for the economy that will create jobs and not just drive young people off of the island to the U.S. on Jet Blue.

The only place we can seek help is right here in Congress; we need to make this Congress act.

I will talk more about this and the Island's the distraction of the status question tomorrow.

But right now I want Puerto Ricans to put their ideas together.

Go to my Facebook page—''Rep. Gutierrez on Facebook''—and let's begin working on a plan to get Congress to act.

Ya es hora de que todos pongan a un lado divisiones políticas.

He hablado con la Administración de Obama y ellos no van a ayudar a Puerto Rico.

Los dueños de bonos están haciendo fila para recibir sus pagos aun cuando el resto de Puerto Rico se derrumba.

Wall Street está comprando la deuda de Puerto Rico para poder exigir medidas de austeridad, rebajes de impuestos, y la privatización de las industrias que llenarán sus bolsillos con más dinero.

Cualquiera que sea el plan de Washington o de Wall Street no pondrá las necesidades de la gente de Puerto Rico primero—todos sabemos eso.

Entonces, ¿Cuál es el plan de Puerto Rico unido para seguir adelante?

Los Boricuas deben involucrarse en este momento para que Puerto Rico tenga un plan de economía que pueda crear empleos y no seguir empujando a los jóvenes fuera de la isla para los Estados Unidos en Jet Blue.

El único lugar donde podemos buscar ayuda es aquí en el Congreso, tenemos que hacer que este Congreso cumpla.

Voy a hablar más sobre esto y de la distracción de la cuestión del estatus de la Isla mañana.

Pero por ahora quiero que los puertorriqueños pongan sus ideas en conjunto.

Vayan a mi página de Facebook—''Rep. Gutiérrez en Facebook''—y empecemos a organizar un plan para hacer que este Congreso cumpla.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will provide a translation for the RECORD.

CONGRESS-BUNDESTAG YOUTH EXCHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since 1983, tens of thousands of students have participated in the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange, or CBYX, program with Germany. This program allows young professionals from both the United States and Germany to spend a year abroad to intern and study a different culture while living with a host family.

During their experience, students from both countries develop a better understanding of foreign cultures and expand their knowledge and leadership potential exponentially. This fellowship provides extensive language training, strong courses of study at foreign universities, and the opportunity to be fully immersed in another culture, thereby culminating in a very unique experience.

Members of the German-Bundestag hold this program in especially high esteem as they hand select their nominees and build very strong personal relationships with them. While Members of the United States Congress are not as involved in the selection process of American participants, the American equivalent would include the prestige that congressional nominations for military academies carry.

Over the years, this program has shown tremendous success in fostering a stronger relationship between the United States and Germany, which is why I was particularly disappointed to see the Department of State cut its funding by half in 2015. These reductions of CBYX came despite Congress' continued bipartisan support over this program for decades.

To prevent the collapse of this program altogether, Germany graciously closed the gap in 2015 by authorizing additional funds to negate the funding cuts that the U.S. had implemented. However, they maintained this was not something that they would be able to continue, and without the U.S. restoring funding, the continuation of this program was in jeopardy.

To further emphasize the significance of CBYX, German Chancellor Angela Merkel highlighted her disappointment in the funding cuts to President Obama during her visit to the United States in 2015. During those deliberations, she said:

> We were not pleased . . . because we very much value this partnership program. And I believe that all of those who participated as young people have also had unforgettable experiences. Especially now, 25 years after German unification, we want to continue this program. Given the fact that there are no longer as many American soldiers experiencing Germany as in the past, it is even more important that young people learn as much as possible from one another.

In fact, the State Department's own U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy countered the cutbacks during its 2014 annual report. In it, the Commission is quoted as saying:

> We believe that it is against our interest to invest less in our relations with the German public at a critical time when facing dual threats from Russia and countering violent extremism in Europe, while also trying to secure the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership agreement with the European Union . . . the cutback of U.S. investment in the Congress-Bundestag exchange also sends a strong message to the German public and

government that the U.S. does not value the relationship with a critical ally whose public is increasingly skeptical of the United States.

In response, the House German-American Caucus and those concerned about the prospect of the CBYX program being placed at a disadvantage, voiced our frustrations with both Secretary Kerry and our House colleagues to raise awareness and demand the restoration of full funding for CBYX. I was pleased that this effort amassed bipartisan support throughout the House.

Further, the House Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies conveyed their concern in June 2015 by adding the following language:

This program is integral for the continuation of a strong relationship between the United States and Germany . . . the committee does not support the proposed program reduction.

Ultimately, the committee included language to restore funding for fiscal year 2016. While this was good news, the root of the problem still fell within the State Department's lack of support.

On July 17, 2015, the U.S. Ambassador to Germany, John Emerson, contacted the German Bundestag to emphasize the vital importance of this program and relayed the State Department's reversal on this issue and their decision to restore full funding for CBYX.

As co-chairman of the Congressional German-American Caucus, I was ecstatic to hear this news, and I am pleased that the United States is holding up our end in strengthening ties with our great European ally. Many thanks to the nonprofit exchange organizations here in the U.S. who administer CBYX, such as Cultural Vistas, AFS, Youth for Understanding, CIEE, ASSE, FLAG, and Nacel Open Door. They are important partners in the success of the CBYX program.

I would also like to thank my co-chair from across the aisle, Congressman KEATING, for the great efforts he showed throughout this process as well. This is a great step forward towards continuing our participation in this program and educating our future leaders through such an important fellowship.

SUMMER FOOD ROCKS TOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, I hosted my second annual Summer Food Rocks Tour in my district to bring attention to the importance of summer meals and USDA's Summer Food Service Program, which ensures that low-income children continue to receive nutritious meals when school is not in session.

I was honored to be joined on the tour by USDA Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services Kevin Concannon, as well as many local, State, Federal, and nonprofit partners.

Mr. Speaker, for millions of low-income students, summer break isn't as carefree as it should be. For these children, summer is a time of great uncertainty. During the school year, they have access to reliable, healthy school breakfasts and school lunches, but when school is out, these children and their families are often left scrambling to find enough to eat.

According to Share Our Strength, a leading national partner on summer meals, 43 percent of low-income families say it is harder to make ends meet during the summer, and they must budget an extra $300 a month for groceries when kids are home from school in the summer. For families already struggling to put food on the table, these can be daunting challenges.

Summer should not be a time of increased hunger among our children. That is where USDA's Summer Food Service Program comes in. It is a federally funded, State-administered program that reimburses providers who serve healthy meals to children and teens in low-income areas at no charge during the summer. Local sponsors serve meals at community sites on set days and times. Sites may be located in a variety of settings, such as schools, recreation centers, parks, community centers, day camps, housing projects, and Indian reservations.

My Summer Food Rocks Tour began at Koziol Elementary School in Ware, Massachusetts. We had the opportunity to serve breakfast and speak with kids and their families about the importance of summer meals, and Share Our Strength was there to distribute sunglasses to the children, which they all loved.

Our next stop was Fisher Hill Elementary School in Orange, Massachusetts. There, we met with children attending day camp at a school who receive breakfast through the summer meals program. We got a chance to play basketball with the kids. The kids were definitely better than us.

Then we were off to the Spanish American Center in Leominster, Massachusetts, where we were hosted by the center's executive director, Neddy Latimer. We participated in a roundtable discussion on the successes and challenges of the summer meals program. We then had the opportunity to tour the center's newly constructed kitchen and serve lunch to an enthusiastic group of children.

Our day ended at the Goddard School in my hometown of Worcester. Under Secretary Concannon led a roundtable discussion on national standards for the school lunch program. During the discussion, we were treated to a delicious lunch prepared by the Worcester Public Schools Nutrition Department.

We wrapped up our visit by touring two Worcester Public Schools food trucks and learning more about this innovative mobile meals program that runs throughout the city.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank everyone who joined me and my Summer Food Rocks Tour, especially Under Secretary Concannon, the site sponsors and volunteers, and the children and families who reminded me of why summer meals are so really important.

A child's need for healthy, nutritious food doesn't just end when the school year does. We know that providing children access to healthy meals in the summer months has clear health, education, and economic benefits; and since summer meals must be served in a community setting, children have another incentive to participate in summer enrichment and recreation programs that, in turn, help them return to school ready to learn in the fall.

This summer, USDA plans to serve more than 200 million free meals to children 18 years and under at approved summer meals sites. I have no doubt that they will achieve this ambitious goal.

But there is still a lot of work to be done. USDA estimates that only one out of six students that gets a free or reduced price school meal during the school year receives a summer meal. As we consider the next Child Nutrition Reauthorization bill, we need to make sure that all students who are eligible for school meals have access to free summer meals and that States and local communities have the funding and resources they need to reach all eligible children.

An easy way to find a summer meals site near you is to text FOOD to 877–877, or visit USDA's Summer Food Rocks page online.

Over August recess, I encourage all of my colleagues to visit a summer meals site in your district. I know that you will be just as impressed as I was at the incredible work being done right in your own community to ensure that no child goes hungry in the summer.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we should do more to end hunger now.

□ 1030

OUT-OF-CONTROL SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about one of the biggest problems facing our Nation, out-of-control spending.

At this very moment, the national debt sits at over $18 trillion. We have not arrived at this point because of the actions of one party or of one administration. Over the years, both parties have enacted programs that have increased our debt.

That said, we have reached a point at which we must get serious about reining in our out-of-control spending, or we may fall victim to a similar fate that many nations throughout history have experienced.

Here in the U.S., our spending problems are reaching a crisis level, and we are effectively leaving behind a catastrophe for the next generation. The basis of the American Dream is that, if you work hard, you can leave behind a better future for your children and grandchildren. That fundamentally American vision is in jeopardy due, in part, to our irresponsible spending.

I am a new and very proud grandfather. My grandson, MacGuire, is about to turn 1, and already, his share of the national debt before his first birthday is over $40,000. We cannot turn a blind eye to this problem and pretend that it will just get better. Let me explain why.

There are two basic forms of Federal spending, mandatory spending and discretionary spending.

Mr. Speaker, when most people think of the Federal Government, they are probably thinking about discretionary programs, which is money that goes to things like our military, highways, national parks, agriculture, and medical research.

The good thing about discretionary spending is that, each year, Congress has the ability to control these spending levels through the appropriations process. Since Republicans took control of the House in 2010, we have had some success in cutting funding to various Federal agencies. For example, agencies like the IRS and the EPA have seen their budgets cut in response to egregious executive overreach.

While it may seem like it covers the majority of government operations, discretionary spending actually only makes up about one-third of all Federal spending.

The other portion of spending is what we call mandatory spending. This, along with the interest on the national debt, makes up almost two-thirds of all Federal spending.

Now, here is the really bad part about mandatory spending: it is on autopilot. Unlike discretionary spending, mandatory spending does not require annual appropriations from Congress. Instead, as long as someone meets the requirements, these programs dole out money without any action from Congress. Within these mandatory spending programs are what we call ''means-based entitlement programs,'' including things like Medicaid, ObamaCare, food stamps, welfare, and the like.

For example, in fiscal year 2012, the Federal Government spent almost $800 billion on over 92 programs that were aimed at lifting Americans out of poverty. Despite that record spending, too many Americans simply stopped looking for work. The system is failing the very people it was designed to help.

While many of these means-based entitlement programs have good intentions, they aren't supposed to be permanent. These programs were created to help lift people out of poverty, not to keep them there. That is why it shouldn't be a surprise that, during the recent economic downturn, spending on these means-based entitlement programs ballooned.

What is surprising, however, is that, as the economy has improved, the spending on these programs has not gone down. In fact, the spending on some of these programs remains at all-time highs.

Now, Republicans and Democrats both agree that Americans shouldn't be stuck in poverty, and that is why we should put party politics aside and come together to address this dangerous cycle of government dependence.

We need to reform these means-based programs to put a real focus on workforce training to help connect Americans with the skills they need to get good-paying jobs that meet workforce demands.

We could block grant, through the appropriations process, money to State governments and allow them to craft poverty fighting programs based on each State's specific societal programs and economic needs.

I know that reforming these mandatory spending programs won't be easy, but I didn't run for Congress to come here and make easy decisions. I doubt my colleagues did either.

Before I leave this body, I want to be able to look at my grandson, MacGuire, and know that I have been part of a real effort to rein in spending and put our Nation on a fiscally stable path for the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join me in addressing our Nation's spending crisis. Let's come together and make the tough choices. Let's get our spending under control, and let's leave behind a better America for the next generation.

POSTPARTUM DEPRESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a common medical condition that is too often masked by silence and stigma. It affects more women than diabetes or stroke or breast cancer. It is postpartum depression.

Here are some words from women who have suffered from postpartum depression.

From Maria: I was experiencing anger and rage, and I had suicidal thoughts. ''I don't know what's wrong, but I can't take care of the baby, and I'm miserable all of the time.''

From Jodi: My son was sick again, and I was crying so hard I could barely text my mom to have her come over immediately. I waited anxiously at the door, with a screaming, ill child, and greeted her by handing over my son, saying, ''I can't do this anymore.''

From Heather: Soon after the birth of my son, I knew something was wrong with me. I couldn't fall asleep, or if I did, I couldn't sleep for long. I also couldn't eat. I forced down every bite of food, and I spent most of my time crying.

These women are not alone. In 2013, there were more than 3.9 million live births in the United States, and of these births, one out of every seven mothers was affected by postpartum depression.

Women suffering from maternal depression often report overwhelming and isolating feelings of sadness, anxiety, fear, and guilt. This can include strong feelings of anger, thoughts of death or suicide, and even negative feelings towards their babies.

The children of mothers with postpartum depression can become withdrawn, have behavioral problems, and have a higher risk of anxiety disorders, depression, and toxic stress.

Even though this condition affects hundreds of thousands a year, many do not seek medical help. Many moms report that they are too embarrassed to admit their feelings or are worried they might be seen as failing or as being bad moms. It doesn't have to be this way. The good news is that treatment works. Ninety percent of women who are going through postpartum depression can be treated effectively.

That is why I am introducing a bill with Representative COSTELLO to make sure new moms are not on their own when it comes to dealing with postpartum depression. The Bringing Postpartum Depression Out of the Shadows Act will offer grants to States to screen and treat new and expecting moms for maternal depression.

States and professional groups have made great progress, and we need to support them as they move to increase awareness and consolidate resources. We need to help doctors recognize the signs of postpartum depression and provide access to appropriate treatment.

This is commonsense legislation to help the over 400,000 women annually who suffer from maternal depression. We need to stand up and tell moms they are not alone. Needing help does not make them bad mothers, and help is out there, but we need to make sure those who need it can get it.

I ask my colleagues to cosponsor our legislation and take this concrete step towards supporting healthy moms and healthy babies.

FAILING VA MEDICAL CENTER RECOVERY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost a year since the director of the Central Alabama Veterans Health Care System was fired after numerous reports of mismanagement and malfeasance surfaced—the missing patient x rays, the falsified records, the employee who took a veteran to a crackhouse, and the utter lack of discipline and order.

The removal was possible under new authority granted under the VA reform law that we passed last year, and I was hopeful that this action was indicative of a new VA leadership that finally got it, that was willing to cut through the bureaucracy and make the decisions necessary to turn around failing medical centers.

I did hear a lot of nice promises—commitments to work through the system to make sure that the problems were fixed—but, Mr. Speaker, the problems were not fixed.

Communication and coordination between various levels of management are still badly out of sync at a time when we can least afford it. It seems like, every time I think we are in a position to make real progress in central Alabama, something falls through the cracks, the ball gets dropped, an opportunity is missed. Every time, the VA leadership can point to the various layers of bureaucracy for why these problems exist—promises, excuses—but not action.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the problem is that we have been depending on a broken bureaucracy to fix itself. I believe the problem is that we have been asking the VA leaders to intervene in this troubled system rather than requiring them to. I believe it is time to change that by breaking through the bureaucracy to get results on behalf of our precious veterans.

What happens when a public school continues to fail to meet basic standards? The State Department of Education steps in to take over, and it takes charge of turning the place around.

It is a process that isn't pleasant, but everyone from principals and teachers to students and parents understand the consequences of the failure to improve. I believe we need a similar mechanism at the VA when medical centers continuously fail our veterans.

Today, I am filing legislation to compel the Department of Veterans Affairs officials to intervene and take over failing VA medical centers. It is called the Failing VA Medical Center Recovery Act.

It offers the VA new tools to turn around the worst of our healthcare centers, and it puts the responsibility for doing so squarely on the Secretary of the VA. The VA needs a team of leaders who is equipped with the expertise to identify solutions and the authority to execute them.

Under my bill, the VA will recruit teams of the best managers and medical professionals who can rapidly deploy to failing medical centers to take over and take charge. These takeover teams would be managed through the newly authorized office of failing medical centers and would have the new legal tools needed to make a difference at each location.

This is an antibureaucracy bill. This is the team that no complacent VA employees want to see coming because they know that the status quo is about to get shaken up.

Just like a failing school, this can serve as a motivation to keep performance from dropping off. Also very important is that the determination of a failing medical center will be based on data, not on the Secretary's whim or what media attention it is garnering. My bill sets up an automatic trigger that compels the VA to act under the law.

I am glad the Secretary used his authority to take control of the situation in Phoenix—but why not Montgomery? Why not Tuskegee? Why not come and take control of the worst and the second worst situations in our country, especially after we have repeatedly asked and have pleaded for him to do so? I am tired of asking, and that is why my bill requires the VA to step in and take charge.

Mr. Speaker, some might misperceive this as an attack on the VA, and it is not. It is actually a gift. Entrenched bureaucrats might hate this plan, but reform-minded leaders at the VA should welcome new tools and new resources to fix medical centers and help veterans access care.

I have spoken to many of my colleagues about this bill, and I am pleased as to how well it is being received. I look forward to working with Chairman MILLER and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to move this legislation forward.

Let's have a real conversation about getting results on behalf of our veterans.

TRIBUTE TO THE PASSING OF MAJOR GENERAL ANDREW COOLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I stand in recognition of the late Major General Andrew Cooley, a dear friend and a tremendous patriot who dedicated his life to serving our great Nation.

A true leader and a combat veteran, he faithfully served for 38 years, leading from the front and accomplishing much along the way. His career was marked by several tours of duty at home and abroad, including the command of an Army division, and he participated in combat operations in Korea, Vietnam, Lebanon, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Angola.

In 1951, General Cooley enlisted in the United States Army at the age of 17, and he went on to receive his commission after having successfully completed Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, Georgia, in 1955, as a second lieutenant.

Over the course of his career, he served in various staff and command positions, including as the principal representative of the Department of Defense to the Lebanese-Israeli negotiations and as commanding general of the 24th Infantry Division.

Upon retirement from the Army, General Cooley was instrumental in instituting a forward-focused, logistical infrastructure that remains instrumental to our Nation's defense.

□ 1045

Without a doubt, General Cooley's many accomplishments deserve to be honored. However, his accomplishments could only be realized with the support and commitment of his wife of 57 years, Joan, and their two children, Cathleen and Caroline.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today humbled by the many accomplishments of a true patriot. It is my great honor to recognize the late Major General Andrew Cooley for his friendship and his service to our great Nation.

UNRESTRICTED ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, just this past week a Federal district court in California found that facilities built to hold illegal immigrants while immigration officials determine whether their asylum claims are valid or not were not properly operated and ordered the release of thousands of illegal immigrants within 90 days.

The lawsuit alleged that, despite the fact that detention centers provide schooling for underage detainees, they still believe the facilities are insufficiently hospitable.

Despite brand-new facilities built to address the present surge in illegal immigration last year, advocates of illegal immigration will use any avenue to expand and promote policies that entice immigrants to make dangerous journeys and put themselves under the influence of smugglers and human traffickers.

The ruling gave the government until August 3 to submit a plan for releasing the illegal immigrants within 90 days.

Of course, the Department of Justice's own data tells us that what will happen when these illegal immigrants are released is fully 85 percent will never show up for their immigration court hearings.

The end result of this lawsuit will simply be the release of thousands of illegal immigrants who have not been vetted for criminal backgrounds, outstanding warrants, or any other characteristics that should prevent the release into our society.

The situation raises a number of questions: Why did illegal immigration advocates file a lawsuit in California rather than in Texas, where these detention facilities are located? We know why.

California is the lawsuit capital of the world and the home of courts like the Ninth Circuit, which most times is overturned, many times overturned at higher levels of court. They figure they could get a loose deal in California on immigration.

Why did these illegal immigration advocates file a lawsuit knowing full well that the administration intends to release any detainees who provide a credible asylum request?

Is even the most cursory review of illegal immigrants to determine whether they are dangerous to Americans too much for these attorneys?

Will this administration appeal or does this ruling simply support their goal of unrestricted immigration and policies which ensure that the vast majority of illegal immigrants who are detained are released into our country almost immediately?

Mr. Speaker, I believe we already know the answer to these questions. Both the Obama administration and the lawyers who file these frivolous suits have but one interest: continued unrestricted illegal immigration that places both Americans and immigrants in danger and makes a farce of our rule of law.

JUDY WATERS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I come often to this floor to talk about community and service and the notion that, if we work to put a little less emphasis on figuring out how to control people from Washington, D.C., and a little more emphasis on trying to serve one another back home in our communities, that America will be moved in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I come today to have that same discussion and to put a face on that conversation. For me, in north Georgia, Mr. Speaker, that face is Judy Waters.

Mr. Speaker, in 1979, Judy Waters was known as the best hairdresser in all of Snellville. By the end of 1979, she was known as the first female ever elected to the Snellville City Council, and her path of service continued from there.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade, as Snellville grew into the first suburban-from-rural community in Gwinnett County, Judy helped to navigate those challenges. Her fingerprints are on absolutely everything that you see in the foundation that has allowed Snellville to become what it is today.

Mr. Speaker, after serving the City of Snellville, seeing that our county was going through some of those same challenges, in 1992, Judy answered the call to serve Gwinnett County.

She ran for the District 3 county commissioner seat and was sworn in in 1993 to that post. Over the 8 years that she served, Gwinnett County's population almost doubled to 600,000 people and her hand helped to guide that development.

Mr. Speaker, our motto in Gwinnett County is ''Gwinnett is great,'' and Judy's emphasis on ensuring that that was true absolutely every single day earned her the love and devotion of an entire community.

But her service does not either begin or end with these kinds of public roles, Mr. Speaker.

In 1992, she ran for that post. But, in 2004, she answered the call to serve the Community Foundation for Northeast Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the motto of the Community Foundation of Northeast Georgia is ''Connecting people who care with causes that matter.''

Mr. Speaker, this foundation, under Judy's leadership, grew its assets by more than $20 million. It has plowed back into service projects in our community more than $52 million since 1985.

Thousands upon thousands of lives in Gwinnett County have been impacted in no small part due to the love, devotion, and commitment of Judy Waters.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that all of the individual deeds we see in our lives are woven together to make us more than who we are.

Judy set out early in her life to make sure that no one would be giving back more than she did, and she exemplifies exactly the kind of person that I am surrounded by in my community absolutely every single day.

People ask, Mr. Speaker: How can you give away Washington's power and influence and return that to the community? My answer is Judy Waters.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how well-intentioned the folks in this building are, they will never care more about my community than folks like Judy Waters do, and Judy lived that commitment every single day.

Mr. Speaker, Judy retires from her service at the Community Foundation. Her official retirement is August 22. I want to add my heartfelt thanks to her for her decade upon decade upon decade of service.

Judy, we are all better off and grateful for all that you have done for our community.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are all better off and grateful just for the opportunity to have known her.

Mr. Speaker, there is no measurement of how many Judy Waters there are out there across the country, but there is a measure of what Judy Waters has done for our community.

You see it in the faces of the elderly and you see it in young families and you see it in the children in our community systems.

Thank you to Judy Waters for all that she has done for Gwinnett County.

PRATT & WHITNEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, next week marks the 90th birthday of a great American business, Pratt & Whitney.

It all started with just 26 employees and 12 machines in an old car plant in Hartford, Connecticut. Nine decades later, Pratt & Whitney employs more than 9,000 people in Connecticut and ranks among my State's biggest employers.

Planes with Pratt & Whitney engines carried Charles Lindbergh across America, Amelia Earhart over the Atlantic, and Wiley Post around the world.

During World War II, the company powered half the U.S. aerial fleet. Later, Pratt & Whitney led the world in developing jet engines for iconic aircraft like the B–52, the Blackbird, and the Boeing 747. Its technology even helped power the Apollo 11 Moon lander.

This tradition of excellence continues today. Pratt & Whitney engines built in my district provide the beating heart of the F–35 Lightning II. The company remains a key player in an industry that helps to safeguard our national security.

It is my honor to congratulate Pratt & Whitney on 90 years of achievement. We thank you. To the men and women who work at Pratt & Whitney, we say again thank you for your service to our great country.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Lord our God, thank You for giving us another day.

Be with the Members of this people's House in all their undertakings today. You know them through and through. You know how they relate with one another and know them as the American people do, as the 114th Congress of the United States of America.

Lord, help them to know You. As ultimate truth, send Your spirit upon them, that You might find a dwelling place among them, so that all Your people will place trust in them as leaders, as well as their Representatives.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOMACK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

STOP FUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, a third Planned Parenthood video surfaced, with a small warning of graphic content, the content being video of a freshly aborted fetus being dissected on a dish while, once again, senior staff uses casual rhetoric to describe how they obtain and sell baby parts, stating:

> I think a per-item thing works a little better, just because we can see how much we can get out of it.

Americans are horrified by this and other videos, which already prompted House and Senate committees, as well as eight States, to launch investigations into Planned Parenthood.

Faithful protestors nationwide are speaking out against this absolutely disgusting practice, including a rally occurring today in Sacramento; yet in that State, we have an attorney general actually, instead, leading a review of the group who filmed the videos.

Using unborn babies as human capital? That is totally fine. Journalists exercising their First Amendment rights to expose illegal and gruesome activities? The government must intervene.

Under Federal law and California State law, the sale or purchase of human fetal tissue is a Federal felony that carries a fine of up to $500,000, a number still less than the annual salary of Planned Parenthood's president.

Mr. Speaker, these are unborn babies we are talking about. At the very least, we need to put a stop to this organization until we can investigate fully.

CONGRATULATING PRATT & WHITNEY

(Ms. PINGREE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize one of the great companies in my district, Pratt & Whitney, who this week is celebrating their 90th anniversary.

Pratt & Whitney has a plant in North Berwick, Maine, and nearly 1,000 of the most skilled and dedicated workers in the aerospace industry work there to build and develop high-quality jet engines.

Pratt & Whitney has been a critical part in the history of aviation in this country, and even today, Pratt & Whitney is still at the forefront of shaping advances in aviation.

Their continued work on new technologies, like the geared turbofan engine, is advancing commercial aviation by reducing noise, fuel burn, and emissions like never before. I am very proud of the great work that has been done by those at Pratt & Whitney in my district for so many years.

Please join me in congratulating this great company and its employees for 90 years of impressive accomplishments and to thank them for their significant efforts and contributions.

PROTECTING LIFE AND TAXPAYERS ACT

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week, I joined 64 of my House colleagues in cosponsoring legislation that would permanently cut off taxpayer funding for abortion providers.

H.R. 3197, the Protecting Life and Taxpayers Act, would prohibit Federal funding to any entity unless it certifies that it will not perform abortions during the period for which funding is provided, and it will not provide any funds to entities that do perform abortions.

There are currently restrictions that prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars to fund elective abortion directly, but we all understand that money is fungible. It is clear that Federal funds are supporting organizations' entire operations and that those operations include performing elective abortions.

This legislation reflects the will of the American people and would prevent taxpayers from being forced to finance thousands of elective abortions.

Few things demean the sanctity of human life more than elective abortion, and we, as a Nation and as a Congress, must continue to confront the systematic extermination of an entire generation of the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD a recent article by Charles Krauthammer: ''The Price of Fetal Parts.''

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, August 6 marks the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Voting Rights Act, which is a landmark piece of legislation that expanded civil rights and protected one of our most fundamental democratic rights, and that is the right of every person to have the right to vote.

Unfortunately, though, 2 years ago, the Supreme Court gutted many of the Voting Rights Act's most important protections. Since then, despite some commitments right at that moment, since then, Republican leadership has refused to allow a strengthened Voting Rights Act to come to the floor.

Instead of working to ensure that every American has the right to vote, we have seen more efforts to suppress votes, disenfranchising hard-working Americans; yet on the floor, we have had, at the same time, our entire appropriations process held up because of the fear of the Republicans that they may have to cast a vote on whether or not we should display the Confederate battle flag in the year 2015.

We can't get a Voting Rights Act bill to the floor, but our entire appropriations process is held up over the Confederate battle flag—seriously? It is 2015. Let's bring the Voting Rights Act to the floor now.

FFA NORTH MIAMI

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the North Miami Future Farmers of America members for their dedication to aiding their fellow classmate, Evan Exmeyer.

As a student at North Miami High School, Evan was born with cerebral palsy. He lives on a hog and grain farm and relies on a wheelchair accessible van to transport him around his family's land. Unfortunately, the van can't travel to every corner of the farm, making parts of his own land inaccessible.

These outstanding FFA students, with the help of our generous Hoosier community, raised $20,000 in donations to purchase and modify a UTV Gator. Thanks to their hard work, Evan has the freedom to explore all that his farm has to offer.

The commitment to bettering the lives of others demonstrated by the North Miami FFA members makes me so proud to represent Indiana's Second District. Their dedication to public service is something to be admired by Hoosiers everywhere.

Today, I thank the North Miami FFA members for serving as role models for our entire Hoosier community statewide.

MEDICARE-MEDICAID 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. GALLEGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid.

For half a century, these critical programs have provided irreplaceable

health and economic lifelines for countless Americans.

In my congressional district alone, over 250,000 Arizonans rely on Medicaid for access to quality, affordable health care, while nearly 60,000 seniors depend on Medicare to cover their healthcare costs. However, this anniversary isn't just a time for celebration; it is also an opportunity to recommit ourselves to strengthening America's social safety net.

Instead of dangerous cuts, we should be considering meaningful solutions to the serious problems that Americans of all ages are currently facing, from the rising costs of prescription drugs to the unmet needs of our caregivers.

Unfortunately, some prominent Republicans, including leading Presidential candidates, would have you believe that we need to phase out these important programs. That is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine telling Latinos who rely on Medicare—half of them have incomes below $14,000—that we need to phase out their health care.

I am extremely proud to have fought for the Medicaid expansion in my home State of Arizona, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues here in Congress to protect and improve Medicaid and Medicare for future generations.

PRATT & WHITNEY 90TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, like many of my colleagues, in celebration of the 90th birthday of Pratt & Whitney.

Since its humble beginnings in 1925 as an employer of 26, Pratt & Whitney has grown to employ more than 31,500 people worldwide, including some in my district, the Third District of Arkansas, at its PSD facility in Springdale.

Today, Pratt & Whitney is at the forefront of shaping aviation. They are not only developing breakthrough technologies, like the geared turbofan; but they are also producing critical technologies, like the F–35 engine, for our warfighters.

Mr. Speaker, aerospace is Arkansas' number one export. That industry employees over 10,000 Arkansans, and I can say, without hesitation, that the continued economic growth of our State depends on the work and innovation of companies like Pratt & Whitney.

Thank you, Pratt & Whitney, for the vitally important work you do in the Third District and worldwide; and happy 90th birthday.

TPP

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, this week, trade ministers from 12 TPP countries are gathering on Maui in my district in what is expected to be the final negotiations of a massive trade agreement impacting 40 percent of the world's economy.

Not only were the American people shut out of this trade deal when Congress passed fast-track authority legislation, these negotiations continue, as we speak, in a shroud of secrecy, with the American people reliant on sites like WikiLeaks as they seek information about how this agreement will impact us.

The people of Hawaii and all Americans are rightfully concerned about how this trade deal will impact our jobs, our families, our economy, our environment, and our Nation's sovereignty.

We, the American people, deserve to know what is in this deal and to have a say in what happens. How can a genuine public debate occur on a deal as monumental as this when no one knows what is in it? It is hard to imagine a deal more demanding of transparency.

People from Hawaii and around the world are gathering tomorrow on Maui to protest this secret deal. They are sick and tired of multinational corporations benefiting on the broken backs of working class Americans, and they will not stop until their voices are heard.

RECOGNIZING JULIA LAKE

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very valued member of my staff and the staff of my predecessor, Congressman Jim Gerlach, as she embarks on a new adventure in the private sector.

Since 2010, Julia Lake has served the constituents of Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District. By the time I was elected to serve in January, I knew well of her reputation as a tireless, impactful, and caring worker; and I was very grateful when she decided to continue her role in my office.

It is very common for me to meet constituents across my district and hear high praise for her work. Just recently, I received an email from Sandra in Glenmoore, who had this to say:

> Julia was very diligent in responding to me. I believe she went above and beyond normal responsibilities to resolve this issue for our family. Thanks to her and your office.

My predecessor, Congressman Gerlach, had this to say:

> Julia was an extremely hard-working staff member who worked diligently every day to solve constituents' difficult problems with the Federal bureaucracy. Her high level of skill, combined with her warm and cheerful personality, made her an indispensable part of our team.

Julz, while we are saddened in one respect by your departure, given your exemplary and effective constituent service, we deeply appreciate your service and are excited that an opportunity arose that will benefit you and your two children.

Best wishes to you.

□ 1215

NEVER-NEVER LAND

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an imaginary world that many of my Republicans, I believe, are living in.

Peter Pan's Neverland is a place many of us think of with fond thoughts of our childhoods. It is an imaginary place where anything is possible and innocence lasts forever.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, I think the House is operating under some sort of a never-never land that neither reflects our best nor our brightest. It is a Neverland in which House leaders think we can build and reconstruct bridges, roads, and highways without the funding to do so. How do you do that? It sounds like never-never land to me.

How else do you explain 32 or—I forget—34 patches—short-term extensions—since the Federal authorization ran out 7 years ago, thus continuing to kick the can down the road? How is it possible to keep hard working individuals employed or to maintain the safety of our roads and transit systems if we are not providing the long-term funding to do so to match both State and local funding? It is not possible. Once again, we are going to see another patch for 2 months—kicking this can down the road.

This is a never-never land that the American public is frustrated with. This is America's Congress. We can, we must, and we should do better.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN K. COUTANT

(Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor John K. Coutant, who passed away on June 19, 2015, at the young age of 69.

John was the quintessential community servant. Born in Kingston in 1945, he graduated from Kingston High School and Dutchess Community College. He worked in the automobile industry for several decades, including founding Kingston Auto Supply and being recognized twice for having the top sales in the country. Very active in the community, John also served in several organizations and on the town board.

It was as town supervisor that John left his greatest mark. His vision for a better town led to many accomplishments, including solar energy projects at the town hall and the landfill.

John's outstanding reputation and popularity was a direct result of always being there for any constituent in need and of his inclusive style of governance of giving every citizen a voice.

I am proud to have had the opportunity to know and work with John. He leaves behind an impressive legacy of service that has made his community a better place to live. May God bless John Coutant and his entire family.

CAMERON TORNADO

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the first responders and volunteers who worked tirelessly in a town called Cameron, Illinois—population, 600.

On July 16, a tornado devastated this small town that measures only six blocks by seven blocks. While the storm caused widespread property damage, good people from across the region rushed in to help Cameron recover.

I was able to thank many of them last week when I toured the damage. Their generosity, bravery, and willingness to help their neighbors gives me hope that this community will rebuild again and be stronger than ever. I spoke with one family whose home was damaged. There was a little child there whose bike had been swept away in the storm. A first responder, in seeing this small child crying, bought a bicycle to replace it for him.

My heart goes out to all of these families who were impacted by this terrible tornado; and I want to thank our brave and generous first responders and volunteers who have poured their time, energy, and love into this town called Cameron, Illinois.

DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, Planned Parenthood must be defunded. Taxpayers should no longer fund inhumane actions.

Between sips of red wine, a top official with the organization shares the dark nature of their work of altering abortion procedures to better harvest body parts. In another, after talking about the price for body parts, an official muses of buying a Lamborghini. In yet another, human dissection, geared toward harvesting body parts, is exposed.

Such callousness.

Planned Parenthood resists the use of ultrasound during pregnancy when a mother considers abortion, yet uses ultrasound to guide the harvesting of body parts.

Such disregard for life.

I am not only disgusted but am very saddened, and so are millions of Americans. Is nothing off limits? Is nothing sacred? This is why I have long cosponsored legislation to defund Planned Parenthood, but we must do more. This body is obligated to investigate wrongdoings.

VOTER EMPOWERMENT ACT

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is the bedrock principle of our democracy. It is something to be cherished and held sacred.

Although it did not come without struggle or without sacrifice, the Voting Rights Act moved us step by step beyond the disenfranchisement that held entire segments of our population voiceless for far too long. But today, as we approach its 50th anniversary, the strides we have made through that historic legislation are at risk.

Two years ago, when the Supreme Court overturned a critical safeguard enacted in the VRA, many of our most vulnerable citizens—some who were on the front lines of this fight for decades—were again pushed to the sidelines of our democracy.

With each passing day of inaction in this Congress by House Republican leadership, we are not just standing passively by as the voices of voters go unheard; we are actively walking backwards along the march towards civil rights—step by step, day by day.

It is time to pass the Voter Empowerment Act and make good on our promise, one that has made us a model for young democracies around the world—that every vote counts, that every voice matters, and that all of our citizens have a right to vote.

PROTECTING CONSUMERS FROM THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am outraged that government agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau have denied public participation to allow consumers and businessowners to comment on regulations that directly impact them.

In 2013, the CFPB implemented guidance that would prevent families and individuals from obtaining auto financing discounts. This guidance not only affects the American auto industry and the hundreds of hard working auto dealers in the Granite State, but it also affects Granite State families and individuals—for example, the young couple in Manchester who is struggling to afford a new minivan to accommodate a growing family or, for example, the startup logistics company in Conway that is wishing to add another truck to its fleet to grow its business.

Congress created the CFPB to protect consumers, not to hurt them. If the CFPB really cares about developing policies that are truly in the best interests of consumers, it should amend its guidance and be more transparent.

That is why I introduced H.R. 1737, a bipartisan bill to rein in the CFPB's overreach and to merely bring more transparency, accountability, and clarity to the formal rulemaking process. H.R. 1737 will reverse this misguided CFPB indirect auto financing guidance and will allow the public's voice to be heard.

THE EX-IM SAGA CONTINUES

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the charter for the U.S. Export-Import Bank has been expired now for almost a month because Congress did not act.

Because of that, thousands of American small businesses have been unilaterally disarmed in the battle for export financed business. Meanwhile, 85 foreign export credit agencies continue to help companies from their countries finance their exports. They are helping their small businesses while ours are disadvantaged.

This body has also failed to act to increase the lending limits for the Small Business Administration. Without an increase, the 7(a) Loan Program will be suspended until the beginning of the next fiscal year, October 1; and the highway trust fund is set to expire, bringing vital construction work and jobs to a halt.

Mr. Speaker, if this body doesn't get to work, then we are going to needlessly hurt hundreds of thousands of American jobs. It is time to stop the political bickering and to pass these important bills.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. ROGERS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to any nuclear deal with Iran.

Iran has proven time and again it is a state that cannot be trusted. The current deal rewards its bad behavior while compromising our national and global security.

As a result of this deal, Iran will receive billions of dollars in sanctions relief that will, undoubtedly, be used to wreak havoc on its region of the world. This economic boost will make it much more likely that Iran will actually try and carry out its often repeated threat to wipe Israel off the map.

As a staunch supporter of Israel, I cannot support any deal that threatens its security. Just last weekend, Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei gave a speech that Iranians responded to with chants of ''death to America'' and

''death to Israel.'' How could anyone believe that Iran could be trusted to play by any agreed upon rules?

I stand by Israel. I am completely opposed to this deal, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

RAECHEL AND JACQUELINE HOUCK SAFE RENTAL CAR ACT

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, in 2004, Raechel and Jacqueline Houck were tragically killed in California when their rented Chrysler PT Cruiser crashed and caught fire due to a safety defect that was under recall.

A glaring safety gap in current law allows recalled cars to be rented without being repaired, which is why I have introduced H.R. 2198, the Raechel and Jacqueline Houck Safe Rental Car Act, so as to close this gap and prohibit the renting of vehicles that are subject to safety recalls.

The bill is supported by all major car rental companies and consumer safety groups as well as by General Motors and Honda, yet Chrysler and Ford continue to oppose this bill for unclear reasons. Chrysler's opposition is particularly troubling considering this week's announcement that NHTSA is imposing a record $105 million fine and vehicle buyback requirement on Chrysler for its failure to adequately fix recalled vehicles or to notify vehicle owners in a timely manner.

While H.R. 2198 wouldn't solve all of Chrysler's recall problems, it would at least ensure that American families who rent Chryslers this summer will know they are safe. This is a commonsense idea. I hope Chrysler voices its support for the bill and helps me bring it to the House floor soon for a vote.

PASS THE REINS ACT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, when I talk to small businesses in Minnesota about what their biggest challenges are, one of the top concerns they mention is of the regulations coming from Washington. For these small employers, unnecessary regulations and bureaucratic red tape make it difficult to expand and create jobs.

That is why I support the REINS Act, which the House will be voting on this afternoon. The concept is simple: If a government agency proposes a regulation that will have a significant economic impact, Congress should have to sign off on it. With an average of 10 new regulations a day, small-business owners are spending more time on paperwork and less time on their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, with our sluggish economic recovery and anemic growth, there is no doubt that we have to get the engine of our economy going and small businesses moving again. That means passing the REINS Act today.

PRATT AND WHITNEY'S 90TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pratt & Whitney on its recent milestone of having been incorporated for over 90 years. This is truly a remarkable achievement.

I am proud to represent the employees of Pratt & Whitney's Dallas Airfoil Repair Operations facility in the city of Grand Prairie, and I am very proud to have those manufacturing jobs there. I am very proud that aviation has come a long way since Pratt & Whitney's development of the air-cooled Wasp engine in 1925. Its passion for excellence continues today as it produces the engine for the revolutionary F–35 Joint Strike Fighter.

The technological advancements in aviation that Pratt & Whitney have developed over the last 90 years have helped make our Nation stronger, and they have kept our men and women in uniform safer.

Congratulations on 90 years of service.

□ 1230

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today mourning Mayci Breaux and Jillian Johnson, buried yesterday by their families following the horrific killings in Louisiana. Yesterday we had a moment of silence to convey our respect and our prayers.

But, as a House, we must break the silence because once again we have failed the American people with our broken mental health system. How many more people have to die before we take action?

A person with severe mental illness is 15 times less likely to be violent when receiving proper treatment. Over the last 10 years, we have more suicides, more drug overdose deaths.

We have replaced the hospital bed with a jail cell, the homeless shelter, and the cemetery. We cannot be silent anymore.

The Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2646, provides treatment before tragedy through comprehensive reforms.

Let not our offer of comfort be mere silence, but let it move us to comprehensive action. Otherwise, our passivity makes us partners to these tragedies.

I urge our Nation to not be silent, but to speak up. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2646.

PRATT & WHITNEY

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I join my other colleagues from Arkansas, Maine, and Texas, who have stood here today in recognition of Pratt & Whitney aircraft.

I am proud to say, however, that the headquarters for Pratt & Whitney aircraft is in East Hartford, Connecticut, where we keep the eagle flying.

My father, my mother, during the Second World War, my brother, all worked at Pratt & Whitney aircraft. It continues to be not only the arsenal for democracy for this great Nation of ours, but a center of innovation and technology where we not only keep the eagle flying, but we also provide opportunities for jobs well beyond these 90 years.

Pratt & Whitney alone, as a corporation, provides an education for every single one of its employees and not only pays for that education, it buys them the books and provides the time off to study so they can continue to do what they have always done, build dependable engines and be an excellent model of corporate behavior and continue to keep the eagle flying both in this country and around the globe.

BOB BREWSAUGH

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of one of the best men I have ever known, Bob Brewsaugh, who passed away over the weekend at the age of 76.

The Good Book says, in 2 Corinthians 9:6: He who sows sparingly will also reap sparingly, but he who sows bountifully will also reap bountifully.

Bob Brewsaugh lived this Scripture. He was a lifelong farmer and a loving father and grandfather. Most importantly, Bob Brewsaugh was a man of God.

He worked hard. He treated everyone with kindness and respect, whether as a Sunday School teacher at Sandusky United Methodist Church or as a county councilman or in his daily work on the farm.

Bob tilled the land. He sowed bountifully. As a consequence, he reaped a blessed and bountiful life.

My thoughts and prayers are with Bob's wife, Carolyn; his two kids, Scott and Mandy; my brother, Richie; all Bob's grandkids; and the entire extended Brewsaugh family.

SPECIAL OLYMPIC WORLD GAMES IN LOS ANGELES

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the 2015 Special Olympic World Games and to pay tribute to all who are participating in this wonderful event happening right now in my hometown of Los Angeles.

The opening ceremonies were held Saturday in the Memorial Coliseum. I was honored to attend as a member of the Presidential Delegation, led by our First Lady Michelle Obama.

Over the next week, 6,500 athletes representing 165 countries will compete in 254 competitions, supported by 30,000 volunteers and an anticipated 500,000 spectators, making this the largest sports and humanitarian event anywhere in the world this year and the single biggest event in Los Angeles since we hosted the 1984 Olympic Games.

This is much more than a sporting event. For almost 50 years, the Special Olympics has showcased the skills and accomplishments of people with intellectual disability and helped foster the acceptance and inclusion of all people.

I congratulate and wish good luck to all of the participants in this 2015 World Games.

JACK CHALMERS

(Mr. JOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a man who was a veteran, a volunteer, a devoted Christian, and a man who was dedicated to helping others. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember John Milton Chalmers, or ''Jack'' Chalmers, of Pinellas County, Florida.

Mr. Chalmers passed away quietly in his sleep on July 20 at the C.W. Bill Young VA Medical Center at the age of 81.

Born in Scotland, Mr. Chalmers came to the United States when he was 15 years old. He later graduated college with a degree in engineering and served in the U.S. Army.

An avid sailor, cyclist, and animal lover, Mr. Chalmers' life was marked by helping others. As a member of Northside Baptist Church, Mr. Chalmers volunteered in the food pantry and worked as a veterinarian assistant after retiring.

He was an active volunteer in the Central Pinellas Republican Club and a member of the Pinellas County Republican Executive Committee. With a brilliant mind and as someone who was always striving to give back, Mr. Chalmers was a man who led by example.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in remembering and honoring Jack Chalmers, a very dear and gentle soul, a dear friend of mine, and a man who will be missed by so many. May God forever bless Jack, and may God bless those who loved him dearly.

VOTER EMPOWERMENT ACT AND THE VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, August 6 will mark the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act. It has stood for a half a century as the great guardian of America's right to vote.

However, 2 years ago the Supreme Court dismantled key protections within the act. Making matters worse since, Republicans in Congress have refused to restore the protections and bring up a renewed and strengthened Voting Rights Act.

Today the right to vote is under coordinated attack around the country. States and localities are passing laws that restrict the right to vote, making it harder for young people, disabled Americans, and people of color to participate in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Voter Empowerment Act and the Voting Rights Advancement Act. I call on my Republican colleagues to join Democrats and pass a renewed, strengthened VRA and ensure the ballot box belongs to every American.

GEORGIA MILITARY COLLEGE

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the outstanding accomplishments of Georgia Military College, an outstanding academic institution in Milledgeville, Georgia, that recently achieved a 100 percent graduation rate and exceeded the State and national averages for the SAT and ACT.

Today I commend them for their commitment to deliver a high-quality education and for their support of all students to reach their true academic potential. They have an unprecedented 97 percent graduating class enrolled in post-secondary institutions.

Georgia Military College has also distinguished itself by improving its students' individual well-being and putting character above all.

GMC's impact extends far beyond higher test scores and academic performance. Students are more equipped to enter the workforce and are better prepared to contribute to society.

They have also excelled athletically, winning two State championships in varsity softball and varsity girls track this past year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Georgia Military College students, their faculty, staff, and president, Lieutenant General William B. Caldwell, for their remarkable scholastic and athletic achievements.

By instilling the values of duty, honor, and country, they empower students to reach new heights. I am deeply honored to have Georgia Military College in Georgia's 10th District.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Chair would remind Members to refrain from trafficking the well while another Member is under recognition.

DEPLOY AN EARLY WARNING SYSTEM FOR EARTHQUAKES

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to fund the purchase, installation, and activation of an early warning system on the Cascadia subduction zone off the Pacific Northwest.

The Cascadia fault has the prospect of unleashing a quake at any point that actually could exceed that off of Japan. As we know, in Japan, 15,000 people died, $300 billion in damages. In Oregon, our State expects thousands of deaths, $32 billion in infrastructure.

If the United States of America would deploy, like Japan and other countries are doing, an early warning system, thousands of lives could be saved.

Inland we could evacuate schools that are going to collapse. Up in Portland they could suspend the MAX service and get people off the bridges that are going to collapse. Manufacturing operations that are critical could be suspended.

We have the potential to save thousands of lives, tens of millions, billions, of dollars in excess damages, and it would just require the United States of America to do what other countries are doing: deploy an early warning system off the Pacific coast.

The technology is known. We just lack the will to fund it. So I am directing the Federal Emergency Management Agency to deploy such a system in the near future.

PRATT & WHITNEY

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to congratulate Pratt & Whitney for their 90 years of excellence in aviation.

Because of those determined and innovative founders, Pratt & Whitney has become a leader in aviation innovation, such as their groundbreaking development of the air-cooled Wasp engine.

Their engines have produced the power for some of the most formidable

military aircraft in American history. Even today the power behind Lockheed Martin's F–35 Lightning II aircraft comes from a Pratt & Whitney engine.

I am proud that Pratt & Whitney's engine center calls Columbus, Georgia, home, but more proud of the investment they have made in the community. The Columbus plant employs 1,026 highly skilled employees to refurbish jet engines and brings in over $750 million a year.

I have no doubt that Pratt & Whitney's impressive accomplishments and milestones will continue on for another 90 years. Their commitment to producing high-quality and dependable engines help keep our servicemen and -women in the air safe.

We are fortunate to have their support for our local economy and look forward to many more years of their business in our great State.

THREE WORTHWHILE OBJECTIVES

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, we have an opportunity in the next 48 hours to do three good things:

One, keep the highway system going. It is irresponsible, but we have not already done so.

Two, make sure that the Veterans Administration has sufficient funds to keep our VA hospitals serving our veterans.

Three, make sure that we are competitive with the rest of the world by adopting the Fincher amendment and providing for Ex-Im Bank's ability to create jobs and to make us competitive worldwide.

We ought to do all three of those things.

Mr. Speaker, you have said that you wanted to allow this House to work its will. Sixty-five Members of the United States Senate voted to keep the Ex-Im Bank in business for America and for American jobs.

There are, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, at least 240 votes on this floor to pass the Fincher amendment, which is the Kirk-Heitkamp amendment in the Senate.

Let's do it. Let this House work its will. Let's keep America competitive with the rest of the world. Let's adopt the Export-Import Bank, send it to the Senate, have them send it to the President, and help save American jobs.

Who says it will save American jobs? Speaker BOEHNER, the Speaker of this House.

Let us do all three of those worthwhile objectives that the American people support.

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 427, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 30, 2015, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 7, 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 380 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 380

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from July 30, 2015, through September 7, 2015—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 6. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 30, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 7. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 30, 2015.

SEC. 8. For purposes of the joint meeting to receive Pope Francis on September 24, 2015, only the following persons shall be admitted to the Hall of the House or rooms leading thereto:

(a) Members of Congress and Members-elect.

(b) The Delegates and the Resident Commissioner.

(c) The President and Vice President of the United States.

(d) Justices of the Supreme Court.

(e) Elected officers of the House.

(f) The Parliamentarian.

(g) The Architect of the Capitol.

(h) The Librarian of Congress.

(i) The Secretary and Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate.

(j) Heads of departments.

(k) Other persons as designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 380, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Committee on Rules. This rule provides for a robust amendment debate on an issue of critical national importance. This rule provides for the consideration of H.R.

427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015.

The Committee on Rules met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from both the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law of the Committee on the Judiciary, in addition to receiving amendment testimony.

This rule brought forward by the committee is a structured rule. There were 18 amendments total submitted to the Committee on Rules. Of those submitted, I am pleased to say that the full House will debate and vote on 10 of those amendments.

This legislation also went through regular order in the committee. During the committee markup, eight amendments were debated and voted on, including one I offered and that the committee had actually agreed to.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I appreciate the hard work of the Committee on the Judiciary Chairman, BOB GOODLATTE, and his full committee and subcommittee staff in bringing forward H.R. 427.

I strongly support this rule and the underlying legislation because, when we reform our Nation's regulatory system, we will jump-start the engine of our economy; and when our economy gets up and going, our families flourish.

What does this administration produce more than 60 of every day? Here is a hint: It is not jobs. The answer lies in the heart of many woes facing small businesses and established industries.

What they produce every day is regulations. The goal of any regulation should be to achieve a benefit that would not be possible without it, designed in such a fashion that the achieved benefit far outweighs the cost, but our administration has lost sight of this goal, and America's economic engine is paying the price.

Our current Federal Government designs regulations that are often unnecessary and achieve little to no benefit, but at very high cost. The rules have become so skewed that this administration's regulators are at war with American businesses.

Industries such as manufacturing and technology are fighting to compete in a global market, but first, they must survive the regulatory beast that is strangling innovation and growth.

This administration is legislating through regulation yet decries the REINS Act and calls it an unprecedented requirement. When you circumvent Congress and exploit the rulemaking process in order to, one, make law and, two, make law in contradiction to the wishes and needs of the American people, you should expect unprecedented responses.

In just the first 7 days of 2015—just the first 7 days of 2015—the administration unveiled 300 new rules. Over the Memorial Day weekend, the administration quietly published the spring 2015 Unified Agenda of Federal Regulations. What it contained was so disheartening to the American people and so destructive to small business that it didn't go unnoticed.

The agenda showed that the Federal departments and agencies have 3,260 rules in the midst right now of the rulemaking process. Unfortunately, it is not just the sheer number of regulations that is astounding; it is also the oppressive cost.

One of these 3,260 rules I mentioned is predicted to be one of the costliest regulations ever put forward, the EPA's national ozone standard. A recent analysis found the cost of this one regulation to be upwards of $140 billion. It will cost my home State of Georgia over 11,000 jobs.

To add insult to injury, the first line of H.R. 427 Statement of Administration Policy states:

> The administration is committed to ensuring that regulations are smart and effective and tailored to further the statutory goals in the most cost-effective and efficient manner.

This is the statement from the administration on why they oppose H.R. 427.

I cannot believe that a single regulation promulgated by this administration with $140 billion of cost was put forward in the most cost-effective manner, and a regulation costing 11,000 jobs in Georgia alone is hardly smart. The Statement of Administration Policy also claims that the underlying legislation would create business uncertainty.

I encourage this administration to use the infamous pen and phone to actually ask businesses what creates uncertainty for them because, when small businesses across the country came to Congress last week as part of National Federation of Independent Business lobbying day, their top legislative priority was regulatory relief. These are small-business owners who sat with us and said: Here is what we are facing in trying to get people jobs.

The 3,000-plus regulations in the works by this administration create the uncertainty, not this body's effort to require agencies to submit the most costly regulations to Congress for approval. The underlying bill applies only to regulations with a $100 million impact or greater.

The American people do not elect this administration's regulators—or any administration's regulators for that matter. They elect us in this body to represent them. This bill allows us to do so properly.

The system is broken. The system has failed the American people. The REINS Act is the first step toward restoring proper order and even sanity toward our regulatory framework.

The administration states that Executive Order No. 13563 requires careful cost-benefit analysis, but they don't explain why only 7 rules out of the thousands had cost-benefit analysis in 2013 and only 14 rules had that in 2012.

This administration's regulators have stated publicly that they are not going to sit around and wait for Congress—so much for respecting the powers enshrined in our Constitution and, thus, the reason that we need this legislation and why this rule should be approved.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 2 legislative days—really a day-and-a-half now—remain before Congress recesses for 5 weeks. Here we are, yet again, considering a piece of partisan legislation designed to fill up floor time, which has little to no chance at all of becoming law.

It is unconscionable that the majority continues to waste legislators' and the American people's time with bills such as the Regulation from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act—they really do name things nice around here, the REINS Act—when critically important work is left to be done.

Just a few moments ago, the minority whip spoke to three issues; I include them in my commentary, but largely, one that all of us ought be interested in is the highway trust fund, which will become insolvent on August 1 if those of us sent here to Washington to govern do not come up with a solution.

Instead of focusing on priorities like eliminating corporate tax loopholes to ensure that we have the money to fund projects to repair our Nation's deteriorating roads and bridges, House Republicans passed yet another short-term patch that the Senate has refused to take up. The majority's dysfunction and inability to govern is having a real impact on hard-working Americans.

Today marks the 204th day of the Republican-led 114th Congress. In the nearly 6 months that have passed, the majority has compromised the financial security of American companies by failing to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank's charter; avoided passing a long-term transportation and infrastructure bill; passed pointless legislation designed to cut critical funding from local police departments and communities in lieu of taking up comprehensive immigration reform; refused, they did, to bring up the student loan refinancing bill; and perhaps most abhorrent to some of us, voted four times in support of the Confederate battle flag, a symbol of hate and intolerance that has no place on any of our public lands.

□ 1300

The days leading up to a month-long congressional recess should be spent debating and voting on the important issues that our constituents sent us here to address—as an example, restoring the Voting Rights Act, bolstering our economy through a long-term highway bill, and guaranteeing that jobs are created and sustained.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 427 is yet another partisan measure that Republican leadership has selected for consideration, despite its clear constitutional violations and with the knowledge that it stands an almost certain Presidential veto.

It is, therefore, unclear to me why we are spending precious time on this bill. We already have the power to disapprove proposed rules; we have the power to limit delegations of authorities to agencies; we have the power to control the appropriations; and we have the power to stay the effect of specific rules and hold oversight hearings. It seems to me that, in addition to these tools being quite powerful, they also comply with the doctrine of separation of powers and, therefore, have the added benefit of being constitutional.

The REINS Act would require both Houses of Congress to approve every major rule, many of which are highly technical ones authored by experts such as scientists, physicians, engineers, and economists.

There simply isn't enough time for Congress to hold the hearings and conduct the research necessary to weigh in on these complicated matters. The individuals tasked with making these difficult regulatory decisions are certainly more qualified than most, if not all of us here in this room, and it is for this precise reason that Congress wisely delegated this regulatory authority to such experts.

Politicizing this process will not only permit industry representatives with deep pockets to have an overwhelming influence on whether major rules go into effect, it will make it nearly impossible for agencies to implement rules regulating consumer health and product safety, environmental protections, workplace safety, and financial services industry misconduct. The enactment of this legislation would, in my opinion, do immeasurable disservice to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the good gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Florida asked a rhetorical question. He said: Why spend precious time on this? And here is the reply: Because our constituents' time is precious. Our constituents' time in trying to comply with regulations is precious.

Before I get there, let me just give you a little bit of a history, Mr. Speaker, about my understanding of the genesis of the REINS Act. It is interesting from a process point of view and a substance point of view.

From a process point of view, my understanding is that this came out of a townhall meeting that was hosted and sponsored by our former colleague, Congressman Geoff Davis from Kentucky. He gathered a group of people together and, as I understand the story, one of the constituents raised his hand and he posed this question. He said: Congressman, how is it possible that the Environmental Protection Agency is contemplating a rule that is so controversial it couldn't pass Congress? How is that even conceivable under our governance structure that unelected bureaucrats are able to accomplish something that the elected Representatives of the people have said ''no'' to?

Congressman Davis in a very thoughtful way began to take that in. Out of it, he began to work with other people and put together the REINS Act, Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny, that says this. It says that over the years, one of the weaknesses of Congress is that this institution has delegated too much responsibility to executive agencies. That is at the base of what we are talking about. This is an issue of delegated authority. And since it was Congress' mistake in terms of atrophying its authority over a period of time, the remedy then falls on Congress to reclaim that authority.

So the gentleman from Georgia is proposing that we support this rule around H.R. 427, and it says this: If there is a regulation that has more than a $100 million impact on the economy, then that regulation ought not be foisted on the economy without discussion and approval by elected Representatives in Congress.

Now, there is a straw man argument that is out there as it relates to this. I haven't heard it on the floor today, but I might hear it if we continue to listen to the debate, particularly during the amendment process and so forth.

Here is the straw man argument. The straw man argument is: If you are in favor of the REINS Act, then you don't want any regulations whatsoever. You want the Wild West, where only the strong survive. That is a straw man. That is ridiculous.

What the REINS Act says is, if you are going to have a regulation, it ought to be thoughtful, it ought to be well structured, it ought to be well debated, and it ought not be a bureaucrat sitting on the seventh floor of a gray building on Independence Avenue that is pursuing an agenda—and haven't we seen plenty of that, by the way—pursuing an agenda, an agenda that couldn't pass this place, an agenda that 218 Members of the House of Representatives and a majority of the Senate are not going to support, but an agenda that a bureaucrat with a political agenda and so forth is trying to move forward.

Now, these numbers are staggering. According to the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the annual cost of complying with government regulations is $1.8 trillion. Think about the downward pressure of that.

What the gentleman from Georgia is saying—and other supporters of this—is let's take President Obama's admonition to the Congress and his admonition to the public, and let's take those words at face value.

This is what the President said in an op-ed in The Wall Street Journal. He said that overregulation ''stifles innovation'' and has a ''chilling effect on growth and jobs.'' Absolutely, that is true. That statement is true.

President Obama said in his State of the Union address that same week that the op-ed was published in The Wall Street Journal, January 2011, ''To reduce barriers to growth and investment . . . when we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on business, we will fix them.''

Okay. Great news. We have got the remedy. We have got the way to fix that.

I will tell you, I represent a constituency, Mr. Speaker, in suburban Chicago, as you know, and so, with frequency, I am out talking to businesses, getting in there. I represent a lot of manufacturers. I represent a lot of financial services companies. I represent a lot of food production, transportation, insurance, and other things.

When you talk to folks and ask them what the nature of the challenge is, they will tell you. But what is interesting is the consistency of the feeling of pressure that they feel as it relates to a regulatory burden.

So the good news is we can do something about that, and the good news is we can vote ''aye'' on the rule and we can vote ''aye'' on H.R. 427, the REINS Act.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), a very good friend of mine and the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule on H.R. 427, and I thank my friend for yielding.

This bill is the very definition of political legislation and serves absolutely no purpose in ensuring better rules. This legislation accomplishes nothing, aside from slowing down the administrative rulemaking process and giving Congress the power to shoot down any action that this majority doesn't like.

By requiring a joint resolution of congressional approval prior to enactment, the only surefire achievement of this legislation is a longer rulemaking process, not a better one.

Let me humor my Republican colleagues and try to give them the benefit of the doubt. They claim that this bill is about requiring Federal agencies to be more transparent in their actions. They want reports on how rules impact the Federal budget. But why should transparency only be limited to the budget? If transparency is the gold standard, why aren't we demanding reports on how these rules impact our most vulnerable and at-risk citizens? If we are striving for transparency, let's be transparent about all things.

Yesterday, I submitted an amendment to address this point. But unsurprisingly, this rule does not allow my amendment to be considered. This proves yet again that this Republican majority cares more about protecting industry than protecting our people or our planet.

My amendment was simple. It would have required the administration to report to Congress on the greenhouse gas emission impacts associated with any proposed rule and what any proposed rule's impacts are on low-income communities in this country.

The overwhelming scientific consensus is that climate change is real. No matter how often industry and many of my Republican colleagues try convince us that we have nothing to worry about, no matter how much manufactured science they gin up to create doubt, climate change is real.

If the administration is going to be forced to justify their rulemaking to Congress, let's make sure they include climate impacts in their justifications. The same goes for how the rules impact our poor communities. Why are people less important than Big Business?

My amendment aimed to remedy the negative impacts felt by these populations by changing the definition of what constitutes a major rule to include any rule that increases the health risks among low-income communities, period. But apparently those concerns don't warrant a vote on the House floor.

The majority's decision to block my amendment on climate change and environmental justice says more about the underlying legislation than any speech you will hear today.

This is not about good government. This is about House Republicans wanting to put their finger on the scale to benefit corporations at the expense of the health and safety of the American people and, yes, our planet.

This is a bad rule and it is protecting a bad bill, and both should be defeated.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3064, a comprehensive, 6-year surface transportation bill that is partially paid for by restricting U.S. companies from using so-called inversion to shrink their tax obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I won't belabor things by talking about that, but I have to say the previous question makes an awful lot of sense for us to do a 6-year plan. People in our States and in our localities are looking to us to give them some certainty. I hear this all the time from colleagues on both sides of the aisle. For us not to do that, to me, is extremely troubling; and, I believe, in the long haul, it is harmful to the economy of this country.

We need to pass a long-term surface transportation bill, and I genuinely believe most Members in the House of Representatives, Republican and Democrat, feel the same way.

The name of this bill at least flirts with being clever, I will give the majority that. But let me tell you that we really need to rein in around here. We need to rein in a Republican-led Congress that will no longer bring the remaining appropriations bills to the floor because it is more dedicated to seeing the Confederate flag fly high. I really don't understand that.

What happened here a few days ago, we had the Interior measure going forward. Someone complained, rightly, about the Confederate flag in public places.

□ 1315

All of a sudden, the Interior Appropriations and any other appropriations went away. I predict that we will probably wind up with a continuing resolution, rather than doing the work that the American people sent us here to do, and that is to complete the appropriations or remaining bills.

We need to be about the business of reining in a Republican-led Congress that says it wants to help small businesses and then makes sure to let the Export-Import Bank charter expire.

In the congressional district that I am privileged to serve, alone, $964,000 in lost business and lost jobs will occur with three companies that depend on the Export-Import Bank.

We need to rein in a Republican Congress that constantly attempts to undermine a healthcare law. I have forgotten now; most of us can't even remember how many times we have voted to repeal portions of or all of the Affordable Care provision which is in effect now—5 years—and we are still having these sideline votes that are going nowhere.

We undermine it, and it has provided millions of American citizens the opportunity to access affordable health care—and somebody please tell me what is wrong with that.

We are 50 years now into Medicare, and I remember, as if it were yesterday, that then President Ronald Reagan said that it would have a severe impact on the American economy—in other words, to paraphrase, that the sky was going to fall.

Well, 50 years out now with Medicare, we have seen the benefits to literally hundreds of millions of Americans who rely upon Medicare, and we demonstrably have seen its positive.

Yes, we are learning, even with the Affordable Care Act, that what is happening is Medicare is now having diminution of its costs, which is necessary to rein in the cost of health care in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and to defeat the previous question. Vote ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it has been said—and we have moved beyond the old adage many times—if it moves, regulate it; or, if it exists, to regulate it.

It is an interesting paradigm today because it is time for Washington to focus on creating a regulatory system that is flexible, allowing the market to decide the optimal path to implementation.

Regulations should be expedient and unambiguous, seeking to minimize the uncertainty facing industries and small businesses, and we must encourage innovation and bringing new products and processes not only to market, but to office places everywhere. Outdated regulations should be cleared off of the books, especially those created by those unelected.

As we have been here today—and I have, listening to the arguments—what is amazingly—from our side, I have wanted to talk about regulation and the overreach of many of our branches; the gentleman from Illinois brought it up tremendously, and I have talked about this in the Ninth District of Georgia, where I am from—is that, for many years, I believe Congress decided, for whatever reason, it was much easier to give to agencies to promulgate rules and regulations. They said it is much easier.

In fact, I have even heard from the floor today that we don't have the expertise, and it is much better to do it offsite. I just tend to find that is wrong.

I think it is that Congress has the ability to listen to those experts, to listen to those opinions, and then provide something that unelected bureaucrats do not, and that is have the people who elect us, whom we face every time we go home—when I go to the grocery store, when I go to the ball games, when I go to my church, when I go to the places that I go to and they ask me questions, then they are holding their elected official accountable—then we take that, and we balance that to make good decisions for all, in our districts and in our country.

What is amazing to me today is many of the arguments made today have nothing to do—there are many things we could debate here today, but we are here to debate—by the way, I will just remind everybody—the rule for the REINS Act, not the plethora of other things that would be want to, could have done, should have done—we are here on the issue of regulatory reform. We are here on the REINS Act.

Frankly, if I was part of this administration who wants to create this sort of entrenched Federal bureaucracy, I wouldn't want to talk about regulatory reform either. I would want to talk about anything else. I would want to

talk about anything else besides the burden that keeps crushing down from Washington on small-business owners.

Then, of course, as well, there is the argument that did come up, that if you really, really, really want this, undoubtedly, you are really, really, really just wanting to protect big businesses and make dirty—from our perspective, I have heard it before, decrease regulations so that people are put in harm's way or that the environment is worse off.

The reality is that is an old argument and really just needs to go away. I come from the Ninth District of Georgia, in my humble opinion, one of the prettiest places in all the world. Our farmers, our residents all enjoy the clean air. They enjoy the greatness of what we have and the businesses that are a part there and the regulations that, when rightly controlled, help us achieve that American Dream.

There is no one who, voting for this, or even talking against it, would want to actually say: I am voting for this because I want to actually pick up a glass of water that is tainted and drink it, or I want to make it worse for somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple rule. It says let's bring forward some fiscal sanity and regulatory sanity. Let's put it back in perspective.

I believe the circle of government, when the Founders put it out there, was based on the fact of having the Executive to carry out the laws, the Congress to make those laws, and the judicial branch to interpret those laws. Our country works best when that is in alignment.

What we are asking for is let's bring it back into alignment. Let's take the REINS Act, let's take this step toward bringing some certainty for our businesses because, at the end of the day, when our businesses have certainty, it does affect the people.

It is not a nameless, faceless place on a brick wall somewhere, those business names that we want to talk about business. It is about those people who get in their cars in their neighborhoods and their apartments and their townhomes, and they drive to a place of work, or they walk to their place of work, and they make a paycheck; they earn a living so that they can do the things that I believe that they have wanted to prosper in and to take care of their families and to move that American Dream forward in their life.

It is up to this building to look after them. It is up to what the Republican majority is putting forward to say: We care about all Americans; we care about their ability to earn a living; we care about their growth, and we care about their safety.

Proper regulation done in the proper way is the way to do that. I will always stand on that side.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 380 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 9. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3064) to authorize highway infrastructure and safety, transit, motor carrier, rail, and other surface transportation programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3064.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 380, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 675.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 167, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

YEAS—240

Abraham	Bucshon	Diaz-Balart
Aderholt	Burgess	Dold
Allen	Byrne	Donovan
Amash	Calvert	Duffy
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Babin	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Barletta	Chaffetz	Ellmers (NC)
Barr	Coffman	Emmer (MN)
Barton	Cole	Farenthold
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (MI)	Comstock	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Fleming
Black	Cook	Flores
Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Forbes
Blum	Cramer	Fortenberry
Bost	Crawford	Foxx
Boustany	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Brat	Curbelo (FL)	Garrett
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Gibson
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Gohmert
Buchanan	DeSantis	Goodlatte
Buck	DesJarlais	Gosar

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Ribble
Richmond
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1353

Messrs. AGUILAR, FATTAH, and WELCH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 167, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

AYES—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind

Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz
Zeldin

□ 1403

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 675) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2015, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

YEAS—409

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1409

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2015, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, to improve the processing of claims by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 427.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 427.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1412

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. MARCHANT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Regulatory reform plays a critical role in ensuring that our Nation finally achieves a full economic recovery and retains its competitive edge in the global marketplace. Congress must advance progrowth policies that create jobs and restore economic prosperity for families and businesses across the Nation, and it must make sure that the administration and its regulatory apparatus are held accountable to the American people.

America's small-business owners are suffering under mountains of endlessly growing, bureaucratic red tape; and the uncertainty about the cost of upcoming regulations discourages employers from hiring new employees and expanding their businesses. Excessive regulation means higher prices, lower wages, fewer jobs, less economic growth, and a less competitive America.

Today, Americans face a burden of over $3 trillion from Federal taxation and regulation. In fact, our Federal regulatory burden is larger than the 2014 gross domestic product of all but the top nine countries in the world. That burden adds up to $15,000 per American household, nearly 30 percent of the average household income in 2014.

□ 1415

Everyone knows it has been this way for far too long. But the Obama administration, instead of fixing the problem, knows only one response: increase taxes, increase spending, and increase regulation.

The results have painfully demonstrated a simple truth: America cannot tax, spend, and regulate its way to economic recovery, economic growth, and durable prosperity for the American people.

Consider just a few facts that reveal the economic weakness the Obama administration has produced. In the June 2015 jobs report, the number of unemployed workers, workers who can only find part-time jobs and workers who are now only marginally attached to the labor force, stood at 10.8 percent. They number over 16 million Americans.

America's labor force participation rate remains at lows not seen since the Carter administration, and the median household income still is below the level achieved before the financial crisis.

The contrast between America's current condition and the recovery Ronald Reagan achieved is particularly stark.

Four-and-a-half years after the recession began in 1981 the Reagan administration, through policies opposite to the Obama administration's, had achieved a recovery that created 7.8 million more jobs than when the recession began. Real per capita gross domestic product rose by $3,091. Real median household income rose by 7.7 percent.

To truly fix America's problems, the REINS Act is one of the simplest, clearest, and most powerful measures we can adopt. The level of new major regulation the Obama administration has issued and plans to issue is without modern precedent.

Testimony before the Judiciary Committee during recent Congresses has plainly shown the connection between skyrocketing levels of regulation and declining levels of jobs and growth.

The REINS Act responds by requiring an up-or-down vote by the people's representatives in Congress before any new major regulation—defined in the bill generally as a rule that has an effect on the economy of at least $100 million—can be imposed on our economy.

It does not prohibit new major regulation. It simply establishes the principle "No major regulation without representation."

By requiring Congress, which is more directly accountable to the American people, to approve or deny major regulations proposed by the administration, the REINS Act provides Congress and, ultimately, the people with a much-needed tool to check the one-way cost ratchet that Washington's regulatory bureaucrats too often turn.

During the 113th and 112th Congresses, the REINS Act was passed by the full House of Representatives multiple times, each time on a bipartisan vote.

I thank Mr. YOUNG of Indiana for introducing this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 15, 2015, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 427, the "Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015," reported to the House. As you know, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over the rules of the House and special orders of business.

Because of your willingness to consult with my committee regarding this matter, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Rules Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 427. In addition, the Committee reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Rules Committee for conferees on H.R. 427 or related legislation.

I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the committee report to accompany H.R. 427 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2015.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on the Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 427, the "Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015," which the Judiciary Committee ordered reported favorably, as amended, to the House on April 15, 2015.

As you noted, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral of the bill. I am most appreciative of your decision to forego further consideration of H.R. 427 so that it may proceed to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Rules is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I am pleased to include this letter and your letter in our committee's report as well as the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 427.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, I am writing concerning H.R. 427, the Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015, which the Committee on the Judiciary ordered reported on April 15, 2015.

The bill amends section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by providing that any rules which affect budget authority, outlays, or receipts that are subject to the congressional approval procedure outlined in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, U.S.C., are effective unless it is disapproved in accordance with such section. In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 427, the Committee will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 427 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman,
Committee on the Budget.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 427, the ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015,'' which the Judiciary Committee ordered reported favorably, as amended, to the House on April 15, 2015.

As you noted, the Committee on the Budget was granted an additional referral of the bill. I am most appreciative of your decision to forego further consideration of H.R. 427 so that it may proceed to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Budget is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I am pleased to include this letter and your letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 427.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in opposition to H.R. 427.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015, otherwise known as the REINS Act, would amend the Congressional Review Act to require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before any major rule issued by an agency can take effect.

Additionally, H.R. 427 imposes deadlines for the enactment of a joint resolution approving a major rule that could charitably be referred to as Byzantine.

Under new section 802, the House may only consider a major rule on the second and fourth Thursday of each month. Last year there were only 13 such days on the legislative calendar compared to the 80 major rules adopted in 2014.

Furthermore, under new section 801, Congress may only consider such resolutions within 70 legislative days of receiving a major rule. This process would constructively end rulemaking as we know it.

Now, Mr. Chair, the reason why my friends on the other side of the aisle contend that we need this kind of gumming-the-works legislation, which would result in the passage of no new regulations, is because these new regulations are stifling economic growth.

They point to the Obama administration and say that it is because of regulations enacted or promulgated and placed into operation under the Obama administration that has caused our economy to be at a point where they are saying we are not as economically vital as it should be.

What they are failing to tell the American people is that it was the George Bush Republican economic policies of the first part of this century that led to the Great Recession, the economic meltdown, the fact that there were not regulations that prohibited predatory lending, and other economic policies which contributed to the economic meltdown. They won't tell you it was because of the lack of regulation that caused that.

But, indeed, if you go back and talk to Alan Greenspan, who chaired the Federal Reserve and was a big antiregulatory capitalist, he had to come back after the Great Recession and admit that he was wrong.

His policies were those that contributed to the economic meltdown, which, despite horrendous opposition from the opposite side of the aisle against the policies of Democrats and President Obama, they tried to obstruct those changes. But they were enacted and, as a result, America's economic recovery has been quite notable.

Corporate profits are up. Even though productivity is up and wages are steady, workers have not participated in the upswing in this election, even though jobs have been created for the last 65 straight months under the Obama administration.

But the wage growth has been stagnant, and it is because of the trickle-down Republican policies that have caused this. Now they want to blame the lack of monies in the pocketbooks and pockets of Americans, working people, on regulations.

Even if agencies reduce the number of major rules in contemplation of the bill's onerous requirements, Congress would still lack the expertise and policy justifications for refusing to adopt a major rule.

As over 80 of the Nation's leading professors on environmental and administrative law have noted in a letter to the Judiciary Committee earlier this year, without this expertise, any disapproval is, therefore, more likely to reflect the political power of special interests, a potential that would be magnified in light of the fast-track process.

Lastly, by upending the process for agency rulemaking so that Congress can simply void major rules through inaction, the REINS Act likely violates the presentment and bicameralism requirements of article I of the Constitution.

As Professor Ron Levin, a leading expert on administrative law, noted during the hearing on the REINS Act last Congress:

''The reality is that the act is intended to enable a single House of Congress to control the implementation of the laws through the rulemaking process. Such a scheme transgresses the very idea of separation of powers, under which the Constitution entrusts the writing of the laws to the legislative branch and the implementation of the laws to the executive branch.''

Indeed, as the Supreme Court noted in the landmark case INS v. Chada: ''The Constitution does not contemplate an active role for Congress in the supervision of officers charged with the execution of laws it enacts.''

The court also clarified that it was profound conviction of the Framers that the powers conferred on Congress were the powers to be most carefully circumscribed. By providing that no law could take effect without the concurrence of the prescribed majority of both Houses, the Framers reemphasized their belief that legislation should not be enacted unless it has been carefully and fully considered by the Nation's elected officials.

It defies credulity that so many of my Republican colleagues who so strongly oppose crony capitalism and hold the Framers' intent so dearly would support H.R. 427, which is a bald attempt by corporations and special interests to shield themselves from any oversight and, in the process, shred article I of the Constitution.

Furthermore, Speaker BOEHNER has also said that the Republican-led, do-nothing Congress, the most ineffective in modern history—and I will note that we are getting ready to adjourn tomorrow, a day early, for a 6-week adjournment with all of the work that remains for Congress to do.

Speaker BOEHNER also said that the Republican-led, do-nothing Congress, the most ineffective in modern history, should be judged by the number of laws it repeals, not the number of laws that it passes.

It therefore follows that this obstruct-at-any-cost approach would carry over to blocking the most critical agency rulemaking, thereby threatening agencies' ability to protect Americans' health, safety, well-being, and economic growth.

Who stands to gain from Republican obstructionism? Corporate giants that are holding our country hostage through a deregulatory agenda and political influence that would rival the industrial monopolies from the past century.

Unsurprisingly, it is many of the same corporations that are continuing to show record profit margins that are also pushing deregulation and fewer taxes because they have an ''obsession with short-term profits at the expense of long-term value creation,'' according to Henry Blodget, the CEO of Business Insider.

Unquestionably, H.R. 427 would be nothing short of a catastrophic event for the everyday Americans who stand to lose the most from the majority's myopic and reckless treatment of our Nation's regulatory system.

Mr. Chair, we need real solutions to help real people, not yet another thinly

veiled handout to large corporations, not another messaging bill to take back to the district over the August recess.

We need legislation that creates middle class security and opportunity, and we need sensible regulations that protect American families from financial ruin, that encourage competition, that bring predatory financial practices to an end, legislation that brings the United States into conformity with the rest of the developed world's employment policies by guaranteeing paid sick and parental leave, legislation that increases our global competitiveness by creating an affordable higher education, and legislation that increases the minimum wage from a paltry $7.25 an hour.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose H.R. 427, yet another deregulatory bill in the majority's business-focused, crony capitalist agenda.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have to agree with my friend from Georgia. I agree with him on his statement that this administration's recovery has been amazing. It has been amazingly bad.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

□ 1430

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, if you look at what is happening in our economy right now, why the economy is struggling so badly through this Obama economy, it is because of radical regulations coming out of Washington.

Every time I go home and meet with small businesses in my district in southeast Louisiana, the common thread is that it is not the local business down the street that is the main threat to their business.

The main threat to small businesses throughout my district—and I hear it from my colleagues as well across the country—are the thousands and thousands of pages of these radical regulations that come out of these Federal agencies, unelected bureaucrats that are imposing, in essence, new law that is making it harder to create jobs in this country.

Hard-working taxpayers deserve a Federal Government that is more efficient, more effective, and more accountable; and that is what the REINS Act does, Mr. Chairman. The REINS Act forces real accountability in regulations that are coming out of Washington.

Whether it is the IRS or the EPA or the NLRB or HHS or CMS, the alphabet soup of Federal agencies that is crippling our economy with all of these regulations is what is holding our economy back.

Why not have a mechanism that says, if a rule is being proposed by a Federal agency by an unelected bureaucrat that is so important that it is going to have a major impact on our economy, shouldn't it at least go through the transparency of coming before the elected representatives of the people, Mr. Chairman?

Why not have these conversations on C–SPAN, not in the dark annals of some Federal bureaucratic agency in Washington, some unelected bureaucrat that is going to wake up one morning and say they are going to create a new law that is going to devastate our economy?

Shouldn't that at least go through public hearings? Shouldn't it have to be passed by the elected people in Congress who will be held accountable every 2 years for the consequences of those regulations?

Let's stop crippling our economy. Let's stop holding our economy back with these radical regulations, Mr. Chairman. Let's pass the REINS Act and bring real accountability into the process of creating regulations in Washington.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. The REINS Act would create new obstacles to the promulgation of regulations designed to protect American workers' health and safety and to protect the environment.

It would jeopardize the economy by impeding regulations for financial services and throw sand in the gears of government efforts to address growing inequality and prevent discrimination.

Congress already has the right to disapprove any rule through the Congressional Review Act or through appropriations bills or other legislation. This bill would essentially impose a procedural chokehold by requiring that any major rule receive affirmative House and Senate approval within 70 legislative days.

As an example of the effect of this bill, we note that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA, is in the process of updating a nearly 70-year-old standard to keep workers from contracting a progressive and frequently fatal lung disease called chronic beryllium disease.

In the 1940s, workers at the Atomic Energy Commission plants were contracting acute beryllium poisoning. To deal with the problem, two of their scientists sitting in the back of a taxicab on the way to a meeting agreed to set the beryllium exposure limit at 2 micrograms per cubic meter of air. Established back in 1948, that standard is still in place today and is often called ''the taxicab standard'' because there was no data supporting that number.

In 1975, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health advised OSHA to issue a new, more stringent protective standard. That effort faltered. Now, one cost of inaction is an estimated loss of 100 lives per year each year this new standard is delayed.

Another is the fact that we have to pay over $300 million in Federal compensation to workers and their survivors who have contracted chronic beryllium disease and who are employed by the Energy Department's contractors and vendors.

Today, over 100,000 workers are exposed to beryllium, and workers in my district are not alone in asking the government to be on their side. There is substantial stakeholder support from beryllium producers and labor representatives to cut the standard exposure limit by 90 percent.

Over the last 17 years, OSHA has worked to update that standard, based on numerous scientific studies and expert recommendations, and now, the new standard is working its way slowly through the regulatory process; and under the present laws and procedures, it still might be another year or two before the final rule is promulgated.

Despite overwhelming scientific evidence that this nearly 70-year-old standard fails to protect workers, there are still a few who object. By requiring a bicameral resolution of approval prior to the rule ever taking effect, this legislation will make it easier for a well-funded special interest group to block needed workplace protections.

The underlying bill does nothing but prioritize special interests above the protection of lives and limbs of American workers. I, therefore, urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the author of this piece of legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the leader and Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing H.R. 427 to the floor today.

I introduced the REINS Act because people in my home State of Indiana want to hold someone—someone—accountable for the job-killing rules and regulations coming out of Washington, D.C.

Each day, government agencies impose an average of 10 new regulations on America's businesses, both big and small. It is no surprise to discover that the costly, confusing government regulations that come out of this body—ObamaCare mandates, EPA regulations, or IRS tax penalties—are exciting some feedback from my constituents.

In fact, the collateral damage wrought by Federal Government regulations is consistently cited as one of the biggest barriers to business creation and expansion and growth in household income in this country.

One Indiana businessowner, who employs 16 family men and women in Floyd County, recently called my office. He wanted to know who had voted in support of a peculiar new IRS rule that is going to penalize him if he helps his employees pay for health insurance.

Now, this IRS rule can cost employers more than $36,000 per employee per year if they continue to offend the sensibilities of Washington's regulating

class by reimbursing workers for healthcare coverage.

As the son of a small-business owner and someone who hears a lot from local businesses back in Indiana about their challenges, about their opportunities, I know how costly regulations impact the small company's bottom line.

While this broad, new IRS rule will undoubtedly have a major impact on smaller enterprises across the Nation, it was written by unelected, unaccountable regulators here in Washington, D.C. It never came before Congress for an up-or-down vote.

That is what the REINS Act is all about. It is about holding officials at Federal agencies and the Congress of the United States accountable for the harmful regulations drummed up each year, regulations which are laws in everything but name. They hurt American jobs and wages when they are implemented, and they need an additional filter of accountability here in the people's House.

Who should be held responsible, I would ask opponents of this legislation, for these rules that have a $100 million-plus impact on our economy if not the people's elected representatives in Congress? For too long, Congress has delegated much of its constitutional authority to executive agencies here in Washington, D.C. This has empowered unelected Federal officials to implement sweeping rules and regulations that are often ineffective, redundant, counterproductive, and costly.

Consider the impact of such rules on another business in my home district in Indiana. It is a local farming operation. When we add up the impact of county, State, and Federal regulations, these Hoosier farmers must meet hundreds of reporting requirements dictated by an alphabet soup of different government agencies—EPA, USDA, HHS, IRS, NLRB. It goes on and on and on. It is mind numbing, really.

The burden on their operation and its ability to grow and compete has been punishing. For example, one regulation alone requires them to treat water left over from cracking eggs like industrial waste. It costs hundreds of thousands of dollars each year for this business in consulting and equipment fees just in compliance costs.

Now, with the EPA assuming broad new authority over bodies of water in the United States, these farmers are taking more time and resources away from their farm to track these ill-defined WOTUS regulations coming down the pike.

Now, America's job creators will tell you the future is uncertain. Our rulemaking process is out of the people's control. It needs to be reined in. Wouldn't it make sense for small-business owners and farmers to have a larger voice, to be given a bigger say in the rulemaking process, especially when regulations can dictate whether their business succeeds or fails?

That is exactly what my legislation, the REINS Act, provides. It gives the job creators and the American people a voice. It injects a measure of accountability back into the democratic process. The REINS Act requires that Congress must approve any new major rule proposed by the executive branch before it can be enforced on the American people.

Remember, our small businesses are our Nation's economic engine. They represent 99.7 percent of all national employers, 56.1 million of our Nation's private workforce. Small and family-owned businesses, new startups, and entrepreneurs create two-thirds of all job growth in the United States.

Meanwhile, small businesses spend an estimated $10,500 per employee to comply with Federal regulations. It is no wonder that, for the first time in 35 years, more American companies are being destroyed than they are being created each year.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Compliance with costly Federal regulations leads to higher consumer costs, lower take-home pay, and even reduced hiring.

A businessowner who owns a parts manufacturing company in Wabash, Indiana, summed it up best. From his standpoint, when it comes to the vast array of rules and regulations his company must follow, they are not only onerous; they add zero value to his business, and they put him at a competitive disadvantage to foreign competition.

We could, frankly, spend a lot more time than today here on the floor going through each of the different challenges with our Federal regulation system, but in the end, Congress needs to be forced to account for the regulations resulting from our sweeping legislation like ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank.

The REINS Act accomplishes this objective. The REINS Act, like the Hoosiers I represent, demands accountability. I commend it to the consideration of all my colleagues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I often hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle repeat false information, and it is unfortunate that it would be perpetrated that economic growth has been hurt because of an explosion of regulations during the Obama administration.

I will be the first to admit that, with the historic passage of the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled 16 million Americans to now have access to the healthcare system—16 million people—it could have been more if the policies had not been obstructed so much; if we hadn't had 50-plus votes to do away with the Affordable Care Act, we would have more people having access to the healthcare system in this country, but bringing that many people into the healthcare system and actually changing the healthcare system required new regulations, and so people have been trying, for 75 to 100 years, to establish health care for everyone in this country.

The Affordable Care Act was the closest that we could come to that ideal, but it was a transformational bill, and it did require new regulations to nurture it and to get it to this point, which has been a complete success, despite all opposition.

□ 1445

And then we had the Dodd-Frank legislation that was passed as a result of the Great Recession, which was caused by a lack of regulation.

So we had regulations that had to come forth as a result of the passage of that legislation to protect the health, safety, and financial well-being of everyday Americans. And so with that act having passed and controls put on excessive speculation in the financial services industry, we have seen economic growth. That is the bottom line. We had 64 straight months of private sector job growth. That is 12.8 million private sector jobs created amidst a regulatory system that is proworker, proenvironment, prohealth and prosafety, and proinnovation. That is a significant accomplishment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Small Business Committee and a fighter for small businesses and the families that they represent.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Before I get into my prepared remarks, I have to respond to my good friend from Georgia's comments about the Affordable Care Act, which many have come to start referring to as the ''Unaffordable Care Act'' or ''ObamaCare,'' as most people refer to it.

There certainly was a need to help some of those folks who didn't have insurance, and there were ways of doing that. By passage of this legislation, we have adversely, negatively impacted, I think, far more Americans than we have helped. We have seen Americans' rates go up, deductibles go up, premiums go up, and they are getting less quality health care for that. So it has been a disaster for many Americans, and a lot of it is still unfolding.

And then, on Dodd-Frank, which the gentleman also mentioned, what we have seen as a result of that—and I happen to be the chair of the Small Business Committee, as was mentioned—one of small businesses' greatest challenges is access to capital, getting money so that they can grow or start a business or grow an existing business and create more jobs.

Because of Dodd-Frank, we got a whole new army of bureaucrats looking over the shoulders of banks—and the smaller banks, too, like community banks, who had nothing to do with this

so-called economic meltdown. Bureaucrats are looking over the shoulders of credit unions, making it tougher for them to make loans to small businesses.

So those two pieces of legislation, which many of my friends on the other side of the aisle are proud of, I think have been disastrous for this country.

Getting to this particular piece of legislation, half of America is employed by small businesses. In fact, 70 percent of the new jobs created in this economy are created by small businesses. Families rely on small businesses to put food on the table and a roof over their heads. They are very critical to the American community and to our American economy.

There is not a small-business owner I know who thinks that the government creates job, but they do know that government can keep them from creating jobs. It does it with one-size-fits-all regulations. It does it by perpetuating uncertainty and increasing barriers to success.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The REINS Act forces government to think before it acts. It protects the American people by ensuring that those that they elected get a say in major regulations—not all regulations, just regulations that would have a significant impact on the economy.

Some may falsely claim that this bill is about deregulation. It is not. It is about accountability. It is about making government think before it acts. And if it chooses to act, the American people can hold their elected representatives—us—accountable for making that decision, not some nameless, faceless bureaucracy, but their elected representatives. That is what this is all about. It is commonsense legislation.

I commend the gentleman from Indiana for offering this. I also want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for handling this on the floor today.

The REINS Act is a good piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I would inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), another fighter for his district and those who are affected by regulation.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution vests all legislative powers in Congress. Unfortunately, past Members of this institution have given away a lot of that power to government agencies like the EPA, the Department of Health and Human Services, and an alphabet soup of agencies. President Obama is using his pen and telephone to talk to the ideologues who work in and run these agencies to change laws, to make laws without coming to Congress. Unelected, faceless Federal bureaucrats are making regulations that have the force of law, not elected representatives of the people.

There are reams of rules. There are so many rules out there, I bet the average person can't go a couple of hours without violating a rule or regulation they probably don't even know about.

The REINS Act is a great first step in reining in these job-killing regulations. The legislation before us is important to America. The REINS Act brings accountability back to the system.

When a regulation with an economic impact of more than $100 million comes out of one of these agencies, it has got to be approved by Congress. That is our job; the Constitution says so, the people who elected us to make laws. And the people will hold us accountable for those laws if they are bad laws.

How do you hold a faceless Federal bureaucrat accountable? We have seen through the VA that it is practically impossible to fire one of these bureaucrats. But every 2 years you have got the opportunity to fire somebody in this House, and every 6 years you have the opportunity to fire somebody on the other side.

Let Congress do the job the Founding Fathers intended. Put the people's representatives back in charge. Follow the Constitution.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) made a great point when he was reading through the Supreme Court decision talking about the constitutional responsibility of this branch of government to make the laws. That is what the REINS Act does. It gives us back the power.

Another gentleman on the other side spoke about the taxicab standard, how it came up in a taxicab and how this random regulation has been law for years. If the REINS Act had been in effect, that would have come before Congress, and we could have asked the question: Where is the science behind that?

It would have worked then, and it will work when we pass it now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the REINS Act.

For far too long, Congress has allowed unelected Federal bureaucrats to take responsibility for the policymaking in this town. Too often, these unaccountable individuals in Washington make decisions that affect the daily lives of western Pennsylvanians with little regard for how they impact one's livelihood and family.

For instance, we learned a month ago in a Supreme Court decision that one agency, the EPA, failed to appropriately consider the costs and benefits of its MATS proposal, which is estimated to cost $9 billion, with a benefit of only $4 million to $6 million.

Solid, middle class jobs like those in some parts of the energy industry and in my district are being regulated right out of existence. More broadly, consider that in 2015, thus far, more than 150 regulations have been finalized, with total costs exceeding $60 billion and more than 10 million hours of paperwork.

It is this unaccountable culture that hinders the very job creation and economic growth we need in cities and towns across America that will provide opportunities for Americans to get back in the game and to get this country back on track.

There is a bigger issue here, Mr. Chairman, and that is what is represented in this bill. It goes to the constitutional structure of our government, where we are supposed to have an executive branch that is supposed to enforce the law, a legislative branch that makes the law, and a judicial branch that adjudicates the law.

For close to 100 years, this body has ceded responsibility for making laws to the executive branch. This bill is a start towards restoring the proper structure of government and accountability.

When regulations are passed that people don't agree with, there is no way to hold those regulators accountable; but if Congress had a say, you could hold Congress accountable. This is what self-government is all about.

I reflect on 34 years ago, when a certain gentleman spoke on the west front of this Capitol and had these words to say: ''From time to time we've been tempted to believe that society has become too complex to be managed by self-rule, that government by an elite group is superior to government for, by, and of the people. Well, if no one among us is capable of governing himself, then who among us has the capacity to govern someone else?''

I thank Mr. YOUNG and the committee for its work on the REINS Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill as a means to restoring the original, proper constitutional structure of who is responsible for the laws that come out of this town. You would think that Members of Congress would want to take credit for good regulations and protect people from bad regulations. Again, that is what this legislation does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The economic elites who are the patrons of many of my friends across the aisle believe in trickle-down economics, which George Herbert Walker Bush termed to be ''voodoo economics.''

My friends believe that when you put a quarter in the pocket of a rich man, there is a hole in that pocket and the quarter trickles down and falls out into nickles and dimes and is distributed to the waiting working class people of the country. They believe that is how the economy works: give the rich the money, let them operate in an unregulated environment, and then somehow, magically, the economy trickles down to those waiting at the bottom of the scale waiting for some kind of a handout.

That is not how our economy works. It works from the ground up. It works with people going to work, making a decent wage, delivering services for a period of time—8 hours a day, that is a regulation; 40 hours a week, that is a regulation. We didn't used to have those during times when people were predominantly poor, and the Nation was poor as a result; but due to these regulations like the minimum wage, the 40-hour workweek, the health and safety regulations on the job, we were able to build a middle class in this country that sustained us up until the time when Ronald Reagan won the Presidency and established the current climate of trickle-down economics.

We have seen during that time what has happened is the rich have gotten richer and the poor have gotten poorer. The working poor have had less to work with and the middle class has been squeezed so that there are not as many working middle class people as there were once before.

So the REINS Act is a gift to the economic elites who have had their way with the economy for the last 40 years. They want to stab the heart of the American economy now by passing this act, the REINS Act, which would not deregulate, but it would stop all future regulations from coming to the fore. That is something that America does not need.

So I am going to urge my colleagues at the appropriate time to oppose this legislation and oppose voodoo economics, oppose trickle-down economics.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to just say that the fact of the matter is we are not talking about voodoo economics here. We are talking about representative democracy.

The American people elect their Representatives from 435 congressional districts; 50 States elect their Senators, and they send us to Washington, D.C., to write the laws of the land.

The laws that the gentleman referred to were all written by the United States Congress, signed into law by various Presidents. Then those laws are turned into regulations, and that is where there is no more representative democracy.

The bureaucracy that writes the regulations has no accountability. They write regulations that cost too much, that strangle the job creation that we both—the gentleman from Georgia and I would like to see greater job creation and more jobs for the middle class in this country.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

This bill is about restoring representative democracy to the American people and fairness to the American people and protecting their economy and protecting their jobs by making sure that bureaucrats are held accountable and send those regulations back to the Congress for an up-or-down vote that, yes, those regulations comport with what the Congress intended when they wrote the law—or don't comport.

If they comport, they take effect; if they don't, they don't take effect.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I stand today in strong support of the REINS Act of 2015.

The gentleman from Georgia said, in opposition to this bill just a few moments ago, that we should be opposed to it, because ''it would end rulemaking as we know it.''

What a great statement on why we should vote for the REINS Act because that is exactly what we are trying to do. We must end rulemaking as we know it.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill because I know, firsthand, how this administration's overbearing regulatory policies have devastated my State, West Virginia; its businesses; its workers; its fundamental way of life. The people of West Virginia's Third District deserve better. All West Virginians deserve better. All Americans deserve better.

The Economist recently estimated that Federal regulations cost our Nation more than $1.8 trillion per year. In West Virginia, for example, the EPA has implemented sweeping rules and regulations that have driven out thousands of good-paying jobs, reduced demand for West Virginia coal, and raised energy prices for all Americans.

This administration is out of touch with our Nation's hard-working families. This bill, the REINS Act, will protect our communities, small businesses, and workers from the administration's crushing regulatory onslaught.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues have repeatedly argued to the fact that—or to the allegation that the rate of Federal regulations is growing, but a recent report by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service reported that the length of the Code of Federal Regulations has no bearing on the scope or impact of Federal regulation.

In other words, just because the volume of paper is growing, they want to argue that this means that there is an onslaught, an explosion of Federal regulations.

As I pointed out earlier, yes, there have been new regulations having to do with Dodd-Frank, which protects us from another economic meltdown that we suffered under the Bush administration, and also the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled 16 million Americans to have access to the healthcare system who did not have it prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

This argument that regulations are killing us is nonfactual.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have only one speaker remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will close and just say that this debate has been about whether or not we need a law that would stop Federal rulemaking in its tracks.

This debate has been about whether or not, as we move forward into the future, as society advances, as technology takes us to places where we have never been before, as medical care and breakthroughs in the ability to keep people alive, as that explodes, as things change, as they do in the annals of human history, the question is whether or not we are going to have a Federal bureaucracy that keeps up with the change and keeps up with the need for an implementation regimen to enact or see that the laws that are enacted by Congress can, in fact, be accomplished.

With no regulations to support the measures that Congress passes—but I will note that this Congress doesn't pass much, but that is what we are here for, to keep up with change and to legislate, so that change is good for Americans, their health, safety, and well-being.

When we do that, if we have a regulatory regime that is gummed up and inoperable, then it hurts America's ability to compete in this global marketplace. It hurts America's economy to be an economy where all people can share in the prosperity of it.

This is what this debate has been about. Are we going to change America? Are we going to throw out the Administrative Procedure Act, which has been an orderly way and predictable way for regulations to be promulgated and placed into effect?

Are we going to do away with that and then subject that rulemaking process to a dysfunctional process like we have here in Congress today, where we can't even pass the Export-Import Bank legislation—which, by the way, you say, government does not create jobs, but there will be government jobs lost as a result of us going home early without having passed the Export-Import Bank reauthorization.

Government does create jobs, and we are going to lose tens of thousands of

jobs because of our inability or our refusal to bring a measure to the floor which has the votes—bipartisan votes—to pass this Chamber and which has already passed the Senate in a transportation bill.

We are going to go home without having done that, and I will tell you we will go home without having—if this legislation passes, we will go home without passing a single regulation, and government will be gummed up. Who will prosper? It is the economic elites who make money, regardless.

I will call on my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

During this debate, my friends on the other side of the aisle have raised quite a few false alarms.

If this bill passes, why, all important regulations will stop, they say; but that is not true. All regulation that is worthy of Congress' approval will continue.

If this bill passes, why, expert decisionmaking will stop because Congress will have the final say on new major regulations, not Washington bureaucrats; but that is not true. Congress will have the benefit of the best evidence and arguments expert agencies can offer in support of their new regulations.

Congress is capable of determining whether that evidence and those arguments are good or not and deciding what finally will become law. That is the job our Founding Fathers entrusted to us in the Constitution. We should not shirk from it.

I will tell you, though, what will stop if this bill becomes law is the endless avalanche of new, major regulations that do not deserve Congress' approval because they impose massive, unjustified costs that crush jobs, crush wages, and crush the spirits of America's families and small-business owners.

Think about what that will mean to real Americans suffering the real burdens of the Obama administration's overreaching regulations. Let me tell you about some of them who have testified before the Judiciary Committee.

Think of Rob James, a city councilman from Avon Lake, Ohio, a small town that has faced devastation by ideologically driven, anti-fossil fuel power plant regulations.

These regulations were expected to destroy jobs in Avon Lake, harm Avon Lake's families, and make it even harder for Avon Lake to find the resources to provide emergency services, quality schools, and help for its neediest citizens—all while doing comparatively little to control mercury emissions that were the stated target of the regulations.

The Supreme Court just invalidated those regulations, but not before multiple years of job-crushing compliance costs had to be borne by those who challenged the rules.

Think of Bob Sells, from my district. He runs a Virginia-based division of a heavy construction materials producer. His company and its workers were harmed by EPA cement kiln emission regulations that were technically unattainable and vastly changed from what the EPA proposed for public comment, other EPA emission regulations that were stricter than needed to protect health, gerrymandered to impose expensive controls on other types of emissions, and that prohibited commonsense uses of cheap and safe fuel that could eventually help the environment and the Department of Transportation regulations that, without increasing safety, vastly increased recordkeeping for ready-mix concrete drivers, unnecessarily limited their hours, and suppressed their wages.

This is what the REINS Act will stop: overreaching, unjustified, immensely costly regulation that, unless Congress stands up to protect the American people, this administration will continue to load on to the backs of struggling American families and small-business owners.

Support the American people. Support the REINS Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chair, as a cosponsor of H.R. 427 I rise in strong support of the REINS Act.

Our bill is imperative to ensuring that federal agencies, and those in the White House, are held accountable for the expensive and intrusive regulations they are imposing on the American people.

The REINS Act simply requires an up or down vote by Congress on any costly regulation proposed by a federal agency before it is allowed to take effect.

This is a common sense check on regulators who too often ignore the impact of their job-killing regulations.

The United States was founded on the principle of separation of powers, a system that exists to protect the people from the unchecked, unilateral actions of a faceless bureaucracy.

Unfortunately, the current Administration has issued regulations at record levels and ventured into new regulatory areas that go far beyond the originally authorized regulatory authority.

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that over the last five years, the Obama Administration has issued 82 "major rules"—or rules with more than $100 million in economic impact—each year.

Bureaucratic red tape and costly mandates have forced small businesses to close up shop, have resulted in other businesses laying off workers and have made U.S. businesses less competitive.

America's job-creators and small businesses are the lifeblood of our communities, and our economy, and we cannot stand by and let them be overrun by rules and regulations. It's time to rein in the regulators and bring some accountability to their unchecked power.

The American people deserve a government that is both accountable for their actions and one that operates under a structure meant to protect their freedoms.

I believe it's time that we stand up and put a stop to this abuse of power, and the REINS Act is a critical step towards the achievement of that goal.

I'm standing with hard-working Americans, the nation's small businesses and America's job-creators. Let's pass H.R. 427 and restore common sense in our government.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise today support of H.R. 427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act of 2015.

In the two terms of the Obama Administration thus far, the Executive Branch has issued increasingly costly regulations on a variety of issues, without much thought to the devastating effects on the economy.

The REINS Act would give Congress, and therefore the people, the power to determine whether all major regulations that have an estimated economic impact of over $100 million, significant adverse effects on employment, or a major increase in costs for consumers take effect. This would return Congress to a proper role of oversight.

As a small businessman, I know firsthand the crippling impact of an overzealous federal government. The REINS Act would finally empower members of Congress to engage in the rulemaking process and return our regulatory scheme to a common sense one that promotes economic growth, creates jobs, and increases wages for working families in the First District of Iowa while protecting our natural resources, environment, and health.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to enact this pro-growth legislation that assists job creators across my district and across America.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114–230. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 427

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

''Sec.
''801. Congressional review.
''802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.
''803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.
''804. Definitions.
''805. Judicial review.
''806. Exemption for monetary policy.
''807. Effective date of certain rules.

"§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any;

''(ii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

''(iii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

''(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days, or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day, or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

"§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.';

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'; and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within three legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within three session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred

has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the Constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date, or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) The term 'Federal agency' means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1).

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

''(3) The term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule.

''(4) The term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

''(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

''(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties.

''(5) The term 'submission date or publication date', except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

''(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

''(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of

reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.''.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 5. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–230. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF IOWA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 3, insert after ''shall'' the following: ''publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

□ 1515

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Chairman GOODLATTE, for his kindness in allowing me to come forward with an amendment here.

My amendment is quite simple, and I believe it should be bipartisan. My amendment, quite simply, requires agencies to make available on the Internet the data, the science, studies, and analyses that a major rule is based on.

This transparency allows everyone access to the source information and the same information so we can all be on the same page when we talk about these things. No one is left in the dark.

You know, Iowans ask me—and I am sure the same questions are asked to other Members when they are home—How do regulations come to these conclusions? How do these regulators get to where they get to when they do these regulations? What science or data do they use? Is it sound science?

They want to see the same data and science. They ask me: Well, can we see it, too? And I don't have a good answer for them at the time. But I want to make sure that they do.

So this amendment allows Americans to see that science that the regulators use. My amendment helps answer these questions by simply making this information available.

Federal regulations affect every aspect of a hard-working American's day, from the moment they wake up until they go to bed at night.

They affect America's job creators, big and small, with sometimes exorbitant costs in order to comply, but also devastating costs of lost opportunities to grow their businesses and create more jobs.

Federal regulations have an enormous, a giant, impact on the health of our national economy to the tune of $1.88 trillion in 2014. Federal regulation is a constantly growing entity.

The Code of Federal Regulations, as we know, is monstrous in size, cost and effect on our economy, and our job creators and on the bank accounts of hard-working Americans.

I have a real dedicated interest in tackling this issue of regulations because they affect our rights and the economy, and I am willing to work with anyone on these issues.

I have other ideas. I think we should know who these regulators are, who is writing these rules and regs, what is their background.

We, as Members, put our names on amendments and bills, but we don't know the names of the people who are writing these regulations. Those are ideas that I have, also.

We do financial disclosure reports here in Congress. Members do as well as our senior staff. I think we should consider the impact that this would have on those who do these regulations, making them do a financial disclosure report. These are just some of the ideas.

But today my amendment is about making sure the science and data that these regulators, what they come to a conclusion on, are made available to the public so we can all be on the same page and there is transparency and we are not left in the dark.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, this Young amendment looks eerily familiar to the so-called Secret Science Reform Act, H.R. 1030, that the House passed in a partisan vote back in March, except the problem is that this bill is actually even worse.

H.R. 1030 would have applied these harmful restrictions to the EPA, but this amendment that we are looking at today would affect every single Federal agency.

Let's look. The amendment would require an agency, as part of its rulemaking process, to make all information used in the creation of a rule publicly accessible, including all of the data.

That would mean that any data that is considered confidential, such as health information or business records, would most likely become off limits.

So, for example, an agency trying to create labeling requirements for toxic chemicals wouldn't be able to use a study that uses personal health data as long as that data is deemed confidential.

New scientific methods and data could be restricted because the information includes data protected by intellectual property laws.

When we passed the Secret Science Act on a partisan vote last March, I mentioned in my opposition that it would force the EPA to choose between protecting our health and environment and maintaining the privacy of patient medical records and the confidentiality of business records. And if that argument isn't enough, let's consider the costs.

When the House Science Committee was considering the bill that I mentioned previously, the Secret Science Act that does exactly the same thing that the Young amendment does, except to all Federal agencies, Democrats on the committee pointed out that the Congressional Budget Office estimated just for that one bill that it would cost the EPA $250 million to comply with the new regulations.

If that is how much it is going to cost the EPA for one regulatory requirement, imagine what the cost would be if you expand this mandate across every single Federal agency. The cost would be astronomical.

Between the cost and the harmful restrictions that this imposes on our Federal agencies, the amendment sets up an impossible hurdle for those agencies to overcome.

We are asking them to decide between compromising institutional review board ethics and doing their job to protect the American people.

It is very clear that the Young amendment and provisions like it are not, in fact, about transparency. It really is to block Federal agencies from doing their jobs, their jobs of protecting our air, giving us clean water, making sure that our food supply is safe, checking on medical devices so that they don't harm us, our prescription drugs so that they don't make us sick, our privacy safeguards for our workplace information, our workplace safety standards, protections against Wall Street and its predatory lending practices.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose this harmful and antiscience amendment, oppose the final bill, and oppose this amendment because of the restrictions that it would place on the American people.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, how much time is left?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, this amendment I oppose. It would require agencies to publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which a rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, cost-benefit analyses, and where the public can access this information online.

While this amendment purports to make scientific information available that is used in developing a rule, the amendment does not define or limit what would actually constitute the term ''data.''

As a result, the term could include sensitive health data, classified data, confidential business information, and all other forms of information subject to a rulemaking by any Federal agency.

Especially in light of the recent disclosure that the personal and sensitive information of millions of Federal employees maintained by the Office of Personnel Management was hacked, Congress should be working to prevent Federal data breaches by reducing the accumulation and potential loss of sensitive data rather than requiring that the publication of such vast amounts of sensitive data be the rule of law.

We just simply cannot afford that in this day and time. In sum, this amendment would exacerbate the risk of identity theft and data breaches.

For those reasons, I must oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Ms. EDWARDS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I support his amendment.

Mr. Chair, the REINS Act restores to Congress the accountability for regulatory decisions that impose major burdens on our economy. By doing that, it ultimately strengthens the ability of the people to hold Washington accountable.

There could hardly be a better way to ensure that Congress will exercise its authority under the bill soundly and that the people can hold Congress and Washington accountable than through the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment guarantees that, when agencies publish new regulations, they will let Congress and the people know immediately how to access online the key scientific, economic, and cost-benefit information on which the agencies base the regulations.

With this real-time access to information in hand, Congress will be better positioned to scrutinize the agencies' decisions, and the public will be better positioned to hold Congress accountable if Congress approves regulations that it shouldn't.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, Americans deserve to know how they are being regulated and the science that is being used to affect our daily lives.

Right now we are left in the dark, Mr. Chairman. We need sunlight. Sunlight is the best disinfectant here. We are unable right now to challenge what we can't see, and that is a hard fight for the American people to put up against.

I am urging favorability for this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, beginning on line 12, strike ''sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C)'' and insert ''clauses (i) through (iii) of section 804(2)(A) or within section 804(2)(B)''.

Page 18, beginning on line 11, strike ''the Administrator'', and insert ''—''

''(A) the Administrator''.

Page 18, line 15, by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 18, line 17, by redesignating subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 18, line 21, by redesignating subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 18, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert ''; or''.

Page 18, insert after line 25 the following:

''(B) is made under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. Law 111-148).''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as I have traveled across the Eighth District of Missouri, one of the largest concerns I hear from my constituents is the uncertainty surrounding the Affordable Care Act.

Individuals are concerned about how the relationship with their doctor will change and how their healthcare costs are rising. Businesses are left with uncertainty as well.

They are afraid to hire folks because of the healthcare costs, which leaves them understaffed. Hospitals are consolidating, and insurers are merging as a result of the law.

The simple truth is that my constituents have fewer options. The Affordable Care Act is hurting health care and hurting jobs in Missouri and across the country.

That is why I am offering an amendment to protect families and job creators from the mounting uncertainty of the Affordable Care Act.

My amendment revises the definition of a major regulation to specifically include any regulation made under the Affordable Care Act. With over 3,000 pages of Federal regulations already issued and many more to follow, Congress must protect folks from this troublesome law and keep it from causing further damage to our healthcare system.

Mr. Chairman, there is a broad bipartisan concern to the Affordable Care Act. This administration has demonstrated its own uncertainty through the delays to several key provisions of the bill.

Congress must stand up for the folks back home and give the American people a voice. My amendment does just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because it would make the REINS Act thoroughly problematic insofar as the Affordable Care Act is concerned.

One of my principal concerns about the REINS Act is it would jeopardize the health and safety of Americans by substantially delaying and possibly derailing critical regulations from ever going into effect.

As currently drafted, the REINS Act only applies to major regulations, that is, regulations having an annual effect of $100 million or more on the economy; regulations causing a major increase in prices or costs for consumers,

individual industries, governmental agencies, or geographic regions; and regulations having a significant adverse impact on competition, employment, investment, and productivity.

This amendment, however, would subject all regulations, not just major regulations issued under the Affordable Care Act, to the REINS Act's burdensome requirements.

It is obvious that this amendment has a different purpose. It is yet another attempt by the majority to undermine the implementation of the comprehensive healthcare reform legislation that was enacted in 2010, the Affordable Care Act, which, I might remind my colleagues, has been upheld not once, but twice, by the United States Supreme Court.

We cannot allow the majority to do through this antiregulatory bill what it has repeatedly failed to do during the last 4 years, namely, to defeat healthcare reform. The REINS Act is a hopelessly flawed bill, and this amendment would only make it worse.

Accordingly, I must strenuously object to the amendment and oppose the amendment. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support his amendment.

The REINS Act restores to Congress the accountability for regulatory decisions that impose major burdens on our economy. This amendment strengthens congressional accountability for regulations under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare.

The PPACA was imposed over the will of the American people. Implementation of ObamaCare has demonstrated that the act imposes a detrimental and unworkable reform of the Nation's healthcare system; and one after the other, promises made to the American people by the act's supporters when the law was passed have been broken.

Moreover, the Obama administration's own actions to waive or suspend ObamaCare requirements have made clear that regulatory actions to implement the act form a ''seamless web.'' Too often, actions to avoid one adverse effect of the act's implementation send ripple effects of unfairness or other harmful consequences throughout the ObamaCare web, requiring adjustments of other aspects of implementation. This, too, justifies the amendment's requirement that Congress approve any new regulations promulgated under the act.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment protects the folks back home. It stops the Obama administration and unelected bureaucrats from issuing major new healthcare regulations, and it improves the role of congressional oversight.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 24, insert before the semicolon the following: '', including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Excessive government regulations are a significant barrier to private sector job creation. This Congress has made job creation a priority and, therefore, we believe it is important to have a role in reviewing these regulations to ensure that their proposed benefits outweigh any potential economic harm.

The Sessions-Davis-Wenstrup-Barr amendment would require an agency's report to Congress to include an assessment of estimated jobs gained or lost as a result of the implementation of a rule. These agencies would also be required to specify whether those jobs will come from the public or private sector. This assessment will be part of the cost-benefit analysis required to be submitted to the Comptroller General and made available to each House of Congress prior to consideration of a rule.

Over the past 6 years, our Nation's cumulative regulatory burden has increased exponentially; and, unfortunately, this out-of-control administration has shown no signs of slowing down. The addition of 27 major new rules last year brought the administration's 6-year total to an astounding 184 new regulations. This has cost the country thousands of jobs and an estimated $80 billion annually.

When regulations are considered for approval under the REINS Act, it is imperative that Congress have a clear picture of their effect on jobs. This amendment will help us guard against job-killing regulations and will give Congress important oversight over the executive branch's regulatory agenda.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would mandate that the cost-benefit analysis for a proposed rule required by the REINS Act that is submitted to Congress include an analysis of any jobs added or lost as a result of the proposed rule, differentiating between public and private sector jobs.

I should be clear that there is absolutely no credible evidence proving that regulations depress job creation. In fact, one of the majority's own witnesses at a hearing held in a prior Congress before the House Judiciary Committee clearly debunked the myth that regulations stymie job growth and job creation. Christopher DeMuth of the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank, stated in his prepared testimony that the ''focus on jobs . . . can lead to confusion in regulatory debates'' and that ''the employment effects of regulation, while important, are indeterminate.''

Even Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George Herbert Walker Bush administrations, has refuted the claim that regulations undermine the economy or job growth. He explains that ''no hard evidence is offered for this claim; it is simply asserted as self-evident and repeated endlessly throughout the conservative echo chamber.''

While I appreciate the sensitivity that the author of this amendment has for employment and job development, I would encourage him to support my amendment, which would except from the REINS Act's onerous requirements all regulations that the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job development.

My amendment would ensure that job creating rules are not delayed or derailed as a result of the REINS Act's nearly impossible procedural hurdles.

Unfortunately, this amendment could add even more analytical burdens on agencies by forcing them to make a speculative assessment of whether a regulation will facilitate job creation or have a depressive effect.

Instead of trying to turn Congress into a superadministrative agency, which is what the REINS Act would do, we should be considering legislation that would actually create jobs, stimulate our Nation's economy, and help

millions of struggling Americans regain their financial footing with meaningful ways to encourage full employment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), my friend, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support his amendment.

The bill restores to Congress the accountability for regulatory decisions that impose major burdens on our economy. As Congress makes those decisions, one of the most important factors to consider is whether new regulations produce jobs or destroy them.

The bill requires that when agencies submit new regulations to Congress, they will also submit their cost-benefit analyses of the regulations. The amendment guarantees that each of those analyses will include a specific assessment of the jobs the regulations create and the jobs the regulations destroy, distinguishing between private sector and public sector jobs.

With that information, Congress will be in a better position to determine whether to approve the rules, and the American people will be in a better position to hold Congress accountable for its decisions.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment. I think it is only right to require very costly and burdensome regulations being created by this administration's regulatory environment to actually show the taxpayers the cost benefit of what the executive branch's decision is going to be on the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 20, after line 8, insert the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job growth.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would except from H.R. 427 all rules that the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation.

As with many other deregulatory bills we have considered this Congress, the proponents of H.R. 427 argue that it will grow the economy, create jobs, and increase America's competitiveness internationally.

But we cannot pretend that this politicized legislation is about economic growth or American prosperity.

As I have noted during the consideration of each of the antiregulatory bills that we have considered in the 114th Congress, there is simply no credible evidence in support of the majority's reiteration of ''job-killing'' regulations undermining economic growth—zero.

The tired rhetoric that my Republican colleagues have repeated again and again since the passage of the REINS Act in 2011 has not changed in light of the changing facts on the ground.

The latest report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that unemployment has fallen to 5.3 percent. While there is more work to do to grow the economy and help our Nation's middle class, there have been 64 straight months of private sector job growth. That is 12.8 million private sector jobs created amidst a regulatory environment that is proworker, proenvironment, propublic health and prosafety, and proinnovation.

And to those who would brush aside these strong employment figures, the Department of Labor also reported last week that claims for unemployment benefits have dropped to the lowest levels in over 40 years, the lowest level since November of 1973.

Do these numbers mean that the major rules adopted during the Obama administration have decreased employment, grown the economy, or contributed to the drop in unemployment benefit claims?

While I would submit that regulations have a positive effect on sustainable economic growth, the reality is that there is little correlation between regulations and the economy.

Don't just take my word for it; take the word of the San Francisco and New York Federal Reserve Banks, which found zero correlation between employment and regulation.

Take the word of Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George Herbert Walker Bush administrations, who strongly refuted the claim that regulations undermine the economy or job growth, explaining that Republicans ''assert that Barack Obama has unleashed a tidal wave of new regulations, which has created uncertainty among businesses and prevents them from investing and hiring. No hard evidence is offered for this claim; it is simply asserted as self-evident and repeated endlessly throughout the conservative echo chamber.''

Take the word of the Washington Post, which gave ''two Pinnochios'' to industry estimates of the costs of regulations earlier this year.

Take the word of the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, which debunked claims that regulations have a trillion dollar cost to the economy.

Mr. Chairman, we need real solutions to help real people, not yet another thinly veiled handout to large corporations and the economic elite.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and to oppose H.R. 427.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures regulations that the Office of Management and Budget determines will lead to net job creation.

The danger in the amendment is the strong incentive it gives the OMB to manipulate its analysis of a major regulation's jobs impacts. Far too often, the OMB will be tempted to shade the analysis to skirt the bill's congressional approval requirement.

In addition, regulations alleged to create net new jobs often do so by destroying real, existing jobs and creating new, hoped-for jobs associated with regulatory compliance.

For example, some Environmental Protection Agency Clean Air Act rules will shut down existing power plants. The EPA and the OMB may attempt to justify that with claims that more new ''green'' jobs will be created as a result.

In the end, that is just another way in which government picks the jobs winners and the jobs losers, and there is no guarantee that all of the new ''green'' jobs will ever actually exist.

The REINS Act is not intended to force any particular outcome. It does not choose between clean air and dirty air. It does not choose between new jobs and old jobs. Instead, the REINS Act chooses between two ways of making laws. It chooses the way the Framers intended, in which accountability for laws with major economic impacts rests with the Congress—the elected Representatives of the people.

It rejects the way Washington has operated for too long, where there is no accountability because decisions are made by unelected agency officials.

The amendment would undermine that fundamental accountability, so I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, to the extent that a regulation would or would not present a choice between clean air and dirty air, I think we can all, in unison, conclude that we would come down in favor of clean air.

If the choice became whether or not a regulation would promote clean water or dirty water, then I am sure that most Americans would agree with me that we would want a regulation that would ensure clean drinking water.

Unfortunately, if the REINS Act passes, the jobs that will be created by the regulations which would enforce the requirement that air and water be clean will not come to pass. We would do without the jobs, and we would have dirty water and dirty air.

I would submit that my colleagues on the other side run to the support of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill, which would be badly undermined by this amendment, which would remove from Congress the ability to determine which regulations make sense and which don't, which regulations comport with the underlying law that the Congress passed and which do not.

That is the key to this legislation, and it is the key to why Members should oppose this amendment. I urge them to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule intended to ensure the safety of natural gas or hazardous material pipelines or prevent, mitigate, or reduce the impact of spills from such pipelines.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It would ensure that oil and gas pipeline safety rules and pipeline spill prevention or mitigation rules are not considered ''major rules'' under this bill.

By design, the REINS Act would likely delay or stop virtually all future Federal rulemaking. We could spend hours listening to some of the countless health and safety problems that this bill would cause. I commend my colleagues for raising some of these issues in the other amendments that are being offered today and debated.

My amendment focuses on protecting oil and gas pipeline safety and spill mitigation rules from the needless and costly delays imposed by this bill. These rules are particularly important to me and to my constituents in the wake of the recent oil spill in my district.

On May 19, line 901 of the Plains All American pipeline ruptured just north of Santa Barbara, California; and it spewed over 100,000 gallons of crude oil onto Refugio State Beach and the surrounding areas. At least 20,000 gallons of the oil spilled into the Pacific Ocean and spread along nearly 100 miles of pristine California coastline, devastating local wildlife, covering our beaches in thick tar, and closing valuable fisheries.

One of the other tragedies of this spill is that it likely could have been prevented—or at least minimized—if the pipeline had been using state-of-the-art automatic shutoff and leak detection technologies.

These systems are available and are already in use in other pipelines in the area, but this pipeline does not have these technologies because its Federal regulator—the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA—currently does not require the use of these safety systems.

Like many communities across the country, the central coast of California, which I represent, has called for action. The good news is that Congress, on a bipartisan basis, has listened and has demanded action to improve pipeline safety rules.

In 2011, we came together and unanimously passed the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act, which required PHMSA to issue 42 new pipeline safety standards; yet, 4 years later, PHMSA has yet to complete 16 of these requirements, including the rules to strengthen standards on automatic shutoff and leak detection systems.

This unacceptable delay has not been lost on this Congress. Just 2 weeks ago, we held a bipartisan hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee on the long overdue implementation of these pipeline safety standards.

Both Republicans and Democrats chided PHMSA for dragging its feet because we all agree that these rules are long overdue and must be completed as soon as possible. It is baffling now that, just 2 weeks after this bipartisan hearing, we find ourselves considering a bill that would delay these pipeline rules even further.

Let's be clear. That is exactly what the REINS Act would do. My amendment would protect these important safety standards from the added layers of bureaucracy that the REINS Act would impose.

I hope that my colleagues will join me again today, as they did 2 weeks ago, in working to ensure that PHMSA is not further delayed in fulfilling its obligations. They can do this by voting for this amendment, which would simply ensure oil and gas pipeline safety rules are not considered ''major rules'' under the REINS Act. It would not exempt these rules from the main reporting requirements, but it would minimize the additional delays created by the bill.

If this bill were to become law as written, PHMSA's pipeline safety rules would not take effect until both the House and the Senate affirmatively voted to approve them, but both the House and the Senate already voted unanimously in 2011 to require PHMSA to write these rules. Going around and around in circles makes no sense.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of this bill claim that the REINS Act is all about more efficient and effective government. How is it more efficient or effective to require Congress to reconsider and reapprove rules that it has already voted unanimously to establish?

The simple truth is that the REINS Act is not about efficient or effective government. It is a partisan gimmick that will do nothing but gum up the works and needlessly delay important health and safety rules that our constituents depend on.

My amendment won't make this a good bill—and I intend to oppose its final passage—but my amendment would at least help to ensure that the REINS Act does not delay oil and gas pipeline safety standards any more than they already have been. This is something which, I hope, we can all agree on; so I urge my colleagues to stop the delays and support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act's reforms regulations that concern natural gas or hazardous materials pipeline safety or the prevention of oil spills and their adverse impacts.

We all support pipeline safety and the prevention of harm from pipeline spills, but there is no assurance that the amendment would guarantee the achievement of those goals.

On the contrary, the amendment would shield from congressional accountability procedures regulations that actually threaten to decrease safety. They also would shield from the bill's congressional approval requirements new, ideologically driven regulations intended to impede Americans' access to new sources of inexpensive, clean, and plentiful natural gas.

This amendment clearly says that the Congress can and has voted to have pipeline accountability and safety measures regulated but that the Congress doesn't care what those regulations are.

The Congress does care what the regulations are, and that is why they should come back here so that the Congress can confirm that the regulations written comport with the legislation already passed. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, this amendment is straightforward and common sense.

There is broad, bipartisan agreement that stronger oil and gas pipeline safety standards are long overdue. I hope there is similar agreement that further delaying these safety rules puts communities like mine in California and hundreds of communities across the country at risk.

My amendment would simply ensure that these safety rules are not subject to the needless, burdensome delays created by the REINS Act. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The REINS Act is intended to make sure that Federal Government regulations get it right—solve the problem intended to be solved by the Congress in the manner intended by the Congress. Supporting this amendment would defeat that purpose; so I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 20, after line 8, insert the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule relating to protection of the public health or safety.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to H.R. 427 would exempt rules concerning public health or safety from the onerous requirements of this legislation.

It is simply an acknowledgment that, when a rule is necessary to protect public health and when it is beneficial and in the public interest, the rule be put into effect without unnecessary delay.

If this legislation is enacted without this amendment, it will create a regulatory environment that will make it nearly impossible for agencies to safeguard the public well-being.

For instance, the Department of Transportation implemented an economically significant rule for the implementation of positive train control systems on January 15, 2010. This safety feature is designed to correct operator errors and to slow or to stop a train in order to prevent train-to-train collisions and overspeed derailments.

Investigators from the National Transportation Safety Board have said that this technology is necessary to prevent accidents like the derailment of an Amtrak commuter train in Philadelphia on May 12 of 2015, which killed 7 people and injured 200 more; yet, under the REINS Act, this vital technology would require a joint congressional resolution, with an unrealistic timeline for implementation, before being mandated, needlessly putting the lives of millions of Americans at risk who ride Amtrak every year.

Proponents of this legislation may argue that H.R. 427 contains an emergency exemption which allows a major rule to temporarily take effect following an executive order stating that there is an imminent threat to public health and safety.

However, as the positive train control system rule illustrates, not every threat to the public welfare will manifest itself overnight, and not every agency's rule is implemented as a reaction to a product recall or to a sudden tragedy.

Even when a threat is not imminent, the fundamental responsibility to protect the public health and well-being remains. This legislation would substantially hinder the ability of agencies to fulfill this obligation, placing Americans at greater risk for the benefit of corporate interests.

In its present form, the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards—an alliance of more than 150 consumer, labor, faith, and other public interest groups—has characterized the REINS Act as ''the most radical threat in generations to our government's ability to protect the public from harm.''

□ 1600

Echoing this analysis, 83 of our Nation's top administrative and environmental law professors describe this legislation as ''unnecessary to establish agency accountability and unwise as a matter of public policy because it undercuts the implementation of laws intended to protect people and the environment.''

While my amendment will not cure all the flaws in this legislation, it will address one of the most glaring problems and preserve the ability of agencies to protect public health and safety.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts from the bill any rule pertaining to health or public safety.

Health and public safety regulation, done properly, serves important goals, and the bill does nothing to frustrate the effective achievement of those goals.

But Federal health and public safety regulation constitutes an immense part of total Federal regulation and has been the source of many of the most abusive, unnecessarily expensive, and job- and wage-destroying regulations.

To remove these areas of regulation from the bill would be to severely weaken the bill's important reforms to lower the crushing cumulative cost of Federal regulation and increase the accountability of our regulatory system to the people.

These include regulations such as the Environmental Protection Agency's multi-billion-dollar Utility MACT regulations. The Supreme Court recently invalidated those regulations, but not before the targets of the regulations had to spend multiple years' worth of compliance costs.

Had the REINS Act been in place, Congress could have refused to approve those regulations to begin with, saving billions of dollars in unnecessary cost.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I just would say, in conclusion, that the

amendment will, in fact, strengthen the ability of Federal agencies to protect the public health and well-being, and there are instances, as the example I just gave, where the failure to act will endanger the lives of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment to improve a badly flawed piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I urge support for the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment as the designee of my colleague, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who regrettably is unable to be with us today.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that pertains to the safety of any products specifically designed to be used or consumed by a child under the age of 2 years (including cribs, car seats, and infant formula).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, this amendment improves H.R. 427 by exempting those regulations that are critical to protecting the health and safety of infants.

More specifically, the Jackson Lee amendment provides a special rule pertaining to the safety of any product specifically designed to be used or consumed by a child under the age of 2 years, which includes cribs, car seats, and infant formula.

As a member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, I am very concerned about the REINS Act and the complications and delays to the rulemaking process it would create regarding regulations that would protect the health and safety of children.

This legislation would amend the Congressional Review Act to prohibit a major rule from going into effect unless Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days. Otherwise, the rule does not go into effect.

Effectively, no regulations will ever be enacted because it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to move any proposed legislation through Congress within 70 days.

Moreover, subjecting agencies to additional reporting requirements and congressional review, as mandated by H.R. 427, would not only be wasteful, it could be damaging or even deadly, especially when it comes to regulations designed to protect children and infants.

For example, much like the version of the bill that we debated in previous sessions, the REINS Act would delay product safety rules affecting family products like toys, cribs, and children's clothing.

In particular, restrictions put forth in H.R. 427 could result in further delay to agencies attempting to take action to protect children as it relates to harmful and deadly products, such as safety caps on medicine, flammable clothing, and tipping furniture, just to name a few.

Notably, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission reports that a child dies every 2 weeks from furniture or TVs tipping over, and injuries from falling furniture occur every 24 minutes.

We cannot afford to put the lives and safety of infants, toddlers, and children at risk while Congress entangles any real possibility for immediate and preventive action.

The REINS Act is strongly opposed by many individuals and organizations all across the country, including opposition by more than 450,000 members and supporters of the Center for Science and Democracy at the Union of Concerned Scientist, as well as 83 academics in the field of administrative and environmental law, and an alliance of more than 150 consumer, labor, research, faith, and other public interest groups representing the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards.

We should not hinder the democratic process and stymie regulatory agencies' ability to protect the safety and security of the American people, especially infants.

At a minimum, regulations promulgated to protect the safety of infants and children should not be subjected to the strictures of H.R. 47.

The Jackson Lee amendment protects children and infants. I urge all Members to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act's reforms regulations intended to protect young children and infants from harm.

Child safety is a goal all Members share, but to shield bureaucrats who write child safety regulations from accountability to Congress is no way to guarantee child safety.

The only thing that that would guarantee is less careful decisionmaking and more insulation of faceless bureaucrats from the public.

Congress needs a better mechanism to make sure that Washington bureaucrats make the right decision to protect child safety when we delegate legislative authority to regulatory agencies.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bad amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, no one is attempting to shield bureaucrats from anything. This amendment is designed to shield infants, to protect children.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the elected Representatives of the people are the best ones to be held accountable for the laws and regulations passed and adopted in this country, including those that protect children.

This would turn back to a situation where unelected bureaucrats can take whatever time they want to, write whatever regulation they want to, and then that would take effect without the Congress having to have the ability to say, yes, that truly will protect children or, no, that will not protect children.

We should have that responsibility. That is something that the American people expect from their elected representatives. For that reason, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 8 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would exempt any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards from the new onerous approval process created by the bill.

In other words, my amendment would allow the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, to continue to issue rules under the current system, thereby making it easier to protect Americans from nuclear disaster.

Today's bill, in the name of so-called reform, adds new procedural hoops that agencies and departments must go through before regulation can be issued, including requiring a joint resolution of approval for every major rule.

The result is simply to impede, obstruct, and delay the attempt of government to accomplish one of its most basic functions: to protect the health and welfare of its citizens.

Not surprisingly, groups who care about protecting public health, safety, and environment, such as the Natural Resources Defense Council, Public Citizen, and the Union of Concerned Scientists, oppose this bill.

According to the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which represents a coalition of many such groups, this bill ''is nothing more than a back-door way to gut enforcement of existing legislation and future safeguards that big-money interests do not want. It would force Congress to refight its previous debates, wasting time and money, and paralyzing vital agency work.''

Americans should rightfully be scared that this bill will put their health and safety at risk. One example that highlights this fact is the subject of this amendment: nuclear power.

The risks and dangers of nuclear power were made all the more real by the nuclear disaster in Japan at Fukushima 4 years ago. We all watched in horror when that country was devastated by the earthquake and resulting tsunami.

That disaster then caused its own disaster: the meltdown of three reactors at the Fukushima nuclear power plant.

That led to the release of radioactive isotopes, the creation of a 20-kilometer exclusion zone around the power plant, and the displacement of 156,000 people. Inside the evacuation zone all farming has been abandoned.

In 2011, Virginia was struck by a relatively rare, but strong, earthquake, felt up and down the eastern seaboard. It caused a nuclear power plant near the epicenter to have to go offline.

For me, this concern hits close to home. A nuclear power plant, Indian Point, about which many people have had concerns for years, lies just less than 40 miles away from my New York City district.

There are 20 million people living within a 50-mile radius around the plant, the same radius used by the NRC as the basis for the evacuation zone recommended after the Fukushima disaster.

Indian Point also sits near two earthquake fault lines and, according to the NRC, is the most likely nuclear power plant in the country to experience core damage because of an earthquake.

To keep my constituents and, indeed, all Americans safe, I am offering this amendment today.

Because of the catastrophes that can result from disasters, be they natural or manmade, at nuclear power plants, prevention of meltdowns is the key.

Since Fukushima, the NRC has issued new rules designed to upgrade power plants to withstand severe events like earthquakes and to have enough backup power so as to avoid a meltdown for a significant length of time.

The NRC must have the ability and flexibility to issue new regulations to safeguard the health and well-being of all Americans.

However, H.R. 427 is intentionally designed so new and vital regulations will likely never be put in place. We cannot permit the NRC to never be able to create new regulations.

Therefore, I urge you to support the Nadler amendment to exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the onerous new requirements for rulemaking imposed by this bill. In that way, the NRC would have the ability to safeguard public health and safety, as it should.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act congressional approval procedures all regulations that pertain to nuclear reactor safety standards.

REINS Act supporters believe in nuclear safety. We want to guarantee that regulatory decisions that pertain to nuclear reactor safety are the best decisions that can be made, but that is precisely why I oppose the amendment.

By its terms, the amendment shields from the REINS Act congressional approval procedures not only major regulations that would raise nuclear reactor safety standards, but, also, regulations that would lower them.

All major regulations pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards, whether they raise or lower standards, should fall within the REINS Act.

That way, agencies with authority over nuclear reactor safety will know that Congress must approve their major regulations before they go into effect.

That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve.

It is a solution that everyone should support because it makes Congress more accountable and ensures agencies will write better rules. All Americans will be safer for it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill prohibits any major regulation from going into effect unless both the House and Senate pass and the President signs a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days.

If the President and the Congress fail to approve the regulation within the timeframe, it cannot take effect and a subsequent joint resolution for the same regulation cannot be considered for the remainder of the Congress.

Because of the unrealistic approval deadlines and the requirement that both Houses approve each and every major rule, as well as the President, this bill would effectively prevent the promulgation of many critical protections that ensure Americans' health, safety, and economic well-being.

The proponents say they support regulation when it makes sense. But this is a vast government. It is a vast economy. It is a vast socioeconomic system.

To demand that Congress pass in both Houses within 70 days and the President sign a resolution of approval for every one of the thousands of regulations means most will never be considered.

□ 1615

That is why this amendment, to say that at least where people's lives are at stake in large numbers, where safety regulations to prevent nuclear disasters or to mitigate their effects are in question, that it not be subject to the same restrictive requirements that this rule would put into place, which would say that most regulations would never get adequately considered.

In closing, I want to say that this amendment is absolutely necessary if we want to make sure that the next time there is an earthquake, God forbid, or some other disaster, or even just a power failure, that a nuclear reactor doesn't have a terrible situation, that we don't get a nuclear meltdown, and that if we do, regulations are in place to safeguard people's lives and health.

I think if we are going to pass this terrible bill, the least we can do is exempt nuclear safety from it. I urge all Members to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the facts speak for themselves. During the course of the Obama administration, which I think most people would agree has been very aggressive at imposing new regulations upon our economy and on our society—it has averaged 81 a year, not thousands, but 81 per year.

I think many of us would agree that some of those regulations impose burdens that were not intended by the underlying legislation upon which those regulations are based, and therefore this is a very manageable way to make sure that regulations don't kill jobs and crush our economy. For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that ensures the availability of affordable medication and effective healthcare management for veterans.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), my colleague, I rise today to offer an amendment to prevent a spike in the copays that veterans pay for prescription drugs as a result of this misguided bill.

Every year, the Department of Veterans Affairs publishes a rule to ensure that veterans enrolled in the VA health program don't see as much as a 37.5 percent increase in their prescription drug copays. In this bill, the REINS Act, if it were signed into law, it would be very difficult, and perhaps impossible, for the VA to publish this rulemaking before January 1, 2016.

Let's face it, Congress doesn't exactly have a great track record on acting fast. I used to say, when I was in the Wisconsin Legislature, sometimes things move like a tortoise. In Congress, I explain they move more like an upside-down tortoise.

Under this bill, copayments for approximately 2.4 million veterans would increase significantly, causing economic hardship and health risks for many veterans struggling to make ends meet.

If this bill were to become law, veterans with a service-connected disability rating greater than 50 percent would see their prescription drug copays increase more than 11 times what they were paying last year. Veterans who are former prisoners of war or awarded a Purple Heart would see their copays go up nearly 38 percent. Veterans, who have been hit hardest economically after serving their country, would see their rates spike 22 percent.

We must ensure that those who bravely have served our country don't see Congress take money out of their pockets just to score political points. At this time, when we still have many veterans struggling to find a job, it is irresponsible for Congress to make it more difficult for the men and women who have served our country to pay more for the health care they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures all regulations from the Department of Veterans Affairs that concern the availability of affordable medication and effective healthcare management for veterans.

Affordable medication and effective healthcare management for veterans are goals every Member of Congress can support, but every Member of Congress also knows the Department of Veterans Affairs' appalling recent incompetence and negligence in administering its programs. Rather than diminish the Department's accountability to Congress for regulatory decisions concerning veterans' health care, we should increase the Department's accountability. That is precisely what the REINS Act does.

Under the legislation, the Department will know that Congress must approve its major regulations concerning affordable medication and effective healthcare management before they go into effect. That provides a powerful incentive for the Department to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with much of what the gentleman has said. The only problem is, as much as we have had some problems in the VA—and we need to take actions, and we are, including in Wisconsin where we have had an action that, in a bipartisan way, we have been working together on—the only thing worse could be the performance of Congress.

There is a reason why the public currently rates cockroaches, head lice, traffic jams, zombies, and even the band Nickelback higher than Congress. Clearly, we do not have a performance record that shows if we pass this bill we can absolutely guarantee that a veteran won't be paying more, a spike as much as 38 percent, or 11 times what they are currently paying.

I am not going to bet on Congress, and I am guessing the American public won't bet on Congress, but we have the ability with this amendment to at least say we are going to make sure those who have served our country won't pay more for their prescription drugs if we don't get our work done, because they have seen that all too often.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment says is, because the Department of Veterans Affairs is doing a remarkably bad job of providing timely health care to citizens, we should carve out that Department's responsibility for providing medications and timely health care and exempt it from the accountability that Congress, the elected representatives of the people, who are very responsive to the needs of veterans, would impose.

With the REINS Act, Congress could instruct, with the passage of legislation to help veterans, and say, ''You must report back regulations within a certain time period,'' which the Congress could then act upon in a timely fashion, assuring themselves that not only have the regulations been done quickly, but also that they are going to address the problems in an effective way that we have all identified with what is going on in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment which will simply preserve the bad system we have now for helping our veterans through a Department of Veterans Affairs that is unaccountable. We should, instead, make them more accountable by passing the REINS Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1655

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 427.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) kindly take the chair.

□ 1656

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. WESTMORELAND (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 114–230 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114–230 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 5 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. POCAN of Wisconsin.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 159, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

AYES—250

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—159

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

□ 1727

Messrs. CICILLINE, CARSON of Indiana, COURTNEY, COSTA, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BRADY of Texas and MESSER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CRENSHAW was allowed to speak out of order.)

14TH ANNUAL FIRST TEE CONGRESSIONAL CHALLENGE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to update my colleagues on a competition that takes place each year between House Democrats and House Republicans. It is called The First Tee Congressional Challenge.

It is a golf match that is patterned after the Ryder Cup golf matches that you watch on television from time to time. It is sponsored by Roll Call. The winner of the event each year is entitled to keep for a year what has been known as the coveted Roll Call Cup. I want to announce to the Members that, this year, the Republican team won the competition, so we will keep the cup. This is the fourth year in a row that the Republicans have won the coveted cup.

Let me just say ''thank you'' to all of my teammates. I would like to congratulate my teammates for their fine work and fine play. I would like to congratulate the Democrats for their sportsmanship. We had a couple of rookies who played well. It is a spirited competition, Mr. Chairman. It is a chance for individuals to meet some folks across the aisle and to build friendships.

It is made more meaningful by the fact that the money that is raised each year goes to an organization called The First Tee. It is a group that is active in all 50 of our States, and it has touched the lives of over 10,000 young people. It uses the game of golf to teach values such as hard work, honesty, and integrity. It is a wonderful organization. Over the years, we have raised over $2 million for The First Tee, so that makes it even more meaningful.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), my counterpart and the captain of the Democratic team.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend, and I congratulate him and the Republican team on a well-earned victory.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said many times in the last few years, elections have consequences. After we lost the majority, we also lost some of our advantage in terms of talented golfers. We need to do a better job of either electing good golfers or of recruiting some of the better ones we have.

The Republicans have a terrific team that is made up of truly honorable and wonderful people; and I think we all, on both sides of the aisle, get a great deal of enjoyment from this competition. We have made friends; and as Mr. CRENSHAW said, we have succeeded in raising an awful lot of money for a very, very good cause.

I thank the Republicans for a great competition, and I thank my teammates for their efforts, but they need to be practicing for the next year a little more. I also want to thank the sponsors who actually contributed to this event and made the fundraising possible.

We won 6 years in a row, and the Republicans have now won 4 years in a row. It is interesting how the streaks come along with the majority, so we will give it another try next year.

Once again, congratulations to the Republicans. Even more importantly, congratulations to The First Tee for the work that they do.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 167, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

AYES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng

Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Cramer
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1736

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 246, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

AYES—163

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—246

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Mullin
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1740

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 475 on H.R. 427, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "no" when I should have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 244, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

AYES—166

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—23

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1744

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 242, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

AYES—166

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell

Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—25

Bass
Blackburn
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Cole
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1748

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 243, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

AYES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—23

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1752

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 241, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch

Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—25

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Huelskamp
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1755

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 239, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

AYES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho	Young (IA)	Zeldin
Young (AK)	Young (IN)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—27

Ashford	Green, Al	Meeks
Bass	Jackson Lee	Moore
Bridenstine	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Butterfield	Jordan	Richmond
Carter (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clawson (FL)	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Cleaver	Levin	Thompson (MS)
Conyers	Lieu, Ted	Westmoreland
Fudge	Lujan Grisham (NM)	
Graves (GA)		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1759

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, and, pursuant to House Resolution 380, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nolan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 427 to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 6. PROTECTING GUARANTEED SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.

The exemption from treatment as major rules for certain classes of such rules (known as ''special rules'', as such term is defined under section 804(6) of title 5, United States Code) is intended to protect rules that protect Social Security and Medicare benefits for seniors.

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that would—

''(A) protect Social Security's earned benefits, and prevent cuts, including those caused by an increase in the retirement age; or

''(B) protect Medicare's guaranteed benefits, and prevent cuts, including those caused by a voucher system that forces beneficiaries to purchase health care in the private sector.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, my amendment would see to it that nothing in this legislation does any harm to Social Security or Medicare. Why? It is because, first of all, they are not entitlements; they are earned benefits that people started paying for the first day, the first hour that they ever went to work.

Our seniors rely on their Social Security and Medicare. Nothing has done more to lift more people out of poverty and give them health and life expectancy than Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation that we are looking at here proposes to provide relief, but in fact, it proposes to emasculate and do away with the regulatory process and, in the process, do great harm and great damage to the things, the many things that have made this country the great Nation that it is.

I have got to tell you, as I look around this room here and the age of this Congress, make no mistake about it; many of you were there when I was there, when our rivers were running sewers, when our lakes were catching on fire, when our coal miners and boat workers were dying young in life from fiberglass lungs and coal dust in their lungs.

I spent time in the sawmills; I owned one. You couldn't find anyone that could count to 5 on their hands because they were either missing fingers, hands, arms, or legs or had lost their lives for want of a little ventilation, for want of a safety switch or a guard of some sort.

The simple truth is that these laws, these regulations turned all that around. That is right; they turned all that around. Guess what. They doubled our life expectancy—maybe one of the greatest accomplishments of all time. We went from our grandparents, where life expectancy was 47, to darn near 80—what an incredible accomplishment.

Now, the question is: Do we want to protect that progress? I hope so. Do we? Do we want to pay it forward? Or do we want to turn it back? I should hope not.

Do we really want to paralyze these laws and do away with the rules and regulations that gave us clean water that we can drink and clean air that we can breathe without getting sick? I should hope not. Is that really what we want to do?

Do we want to do away with the healthy, safe working conditions that extended life for people who worked hard to build a life for themselves and their families? Is that what we really want to do? Do we want to do away with food safety that protected us from the drugs and the chemicals that ended our lives prematurely? Is that what we want to do? I should hope not. No. No.

Do we want to do away with the Wall Street regulations, the billionaires who play so fast and loose with other people's money? Well, we sure as heck don't want to turn Social Security and Medicare over to them, do we? Imagine what they would do with Social Security and Medicare. It is devastating, and it is frightening.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment protects both. That is the least we can do. My amendment protects Social Security; it protects Medicare, and that is the least that we can do for a generation that gave us so much.

Last, but not least, had it not been for these regulations, had it not been for Social Security and Medicare, half of us wouldn't be here—that is right—because we increased the life expectancy from 47 to 80, so show some gratitude. Show some being grateful. Let's protect Social Security and Medicare.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House in 2011, the President of the United States promised the American people to reduce barriers to growth and investment: ''When we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them.''

Mr. Speaker, those were just the President's words. His actions have been starkly different. Throughout the entire 6-plus years of the President's administration, a flood of new major regulations has been burying America's job creators and households at record levels.

To make matters worse, when Congress declines to legislate the President's misguided policies for him, he takes his pen and his cell phone, and he increasingly resorts to unilateral regulatory actions to legislate by executive fiat.

The REINS Act, in one fell swoop, puts a stop to that and ensures that Congress, the body which the Constitution assigns the power to legislate, will possess an additional check on the most significant legislative decisions

imposed on the American people through regulation.

The motion to recommit seeks only to distract from the urgent needs to reform our regulatory system and reduce unnecessary burdens on the public. I think Americans are tired of the other party telling them that their bureaucrats know better than their own elected officials.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, reject this motion to recommit, and show America that Congress can act for the good of American job creators and Americans who desperately want and need jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 241, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 481]

AYES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—25

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Engel
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1817

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 165, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 482]

AYES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed

Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—165

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1824

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the vote on H.R. 427 I was inescapably detained and away handling important matters related to my District and the State of Alabama. If I had been present, I would have voted "no" on final passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion. H. Res. 380, Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this resolution. H.R. 675, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill. Young (IA) Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment. Smith (MO) Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment. Johnson (GA) Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Capps Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Cicilline Amendment #1 to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Cicilline/Jackson Lee Amendment #2 to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Nadler Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Pocan/Moore Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Motion to Recommit H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the motion. H.R 427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today to attend the funeral services for U.S. Navy Petty Officer Second Class Randall Smith. Had I been present, on rollcall No. 470, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 471, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 472, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 473, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 474, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 475, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 476, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 477, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 478, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 479, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 480, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 481, I would have voted "no," and on rollcall No. 482 (Passage of the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act), I would have voted "yes."

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 387

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mr. Clay.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR PRIVATE CALENDAR FOR 114TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On behalf of the majority and minority leaderships, the Chair announces that the official objectors for the Private Calendar for the 114th Congress are as follows:

For the majority:
Mr. GOODLATTE, Virginia
Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Wisconsin
Mr. GOWDY, South Carolina
For the minority:
Mr. SERRANO, New York
Mr. NADLER, New York
Ms. BASS, California

RECOGNIZING THE HUNTINGDON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, FAIR

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in 1831, a tradition was started in Huntingdon County, Pennsylvania, which would go on to become a staple of the summertime agriculture expos.

This August 9, the Huntingdon County Fair is celebrating its 125th fair, located at their 69-acre site, which has evolved over the decades to boast hundreds of agricultural exhibits. Ranging from equine shows to wine tasting, the Huntingdon County Fair provides areas of interest for almost everyone.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I am proud to rise today to congratulate the people of Huntingdon County and those countless volunteers and community members who have made this time-honored event a Pennsylvania tradition, including the parents and friends of 4–H, FAA youth members, and the Huntingdon County Agricultural Association.

Here's to wishing them 125 more successful fairs for the next generation and generations to come.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID PROGRAMS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the 50th anniversary of the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Since 1965, these landmark programs have provided affordable health insurance coverage and access to care for our Nation's seniors and most vulnerable populations. Few programs have improved the lives of Americans as significantly as Medicaid and Medicare.

Fifty years ago, almost half of elderly Americans lacked health insurance. Today, Medicare provides lifesaving insurance to nearly 100 percent of adults over 65.

Medicaid continues to be a lifeline for millions of children, pregnant women, people with disabilities, seniors, and low-income families. Over 70 million Americans currently rely on Medicaid for affordable health insurance. Medicaid covers more than one in three children, pays for nearly half of all births, and accounts for more than 40 percent of all long-term care.

On the anniversary of this historic law, we celebrate the successes of Medicaid and Medicare. We must renew our commitment to further strengthening them so they remain available in perpetuity for generations to come.

□ 1830

RECOGNIZING JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES OF SOUTH FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jewish Community Services of South Florida and its upcoming annual Milk & Honey event, which will take place on August 30 and starts at the Greater Miami Jewish Federation.

This tremendous, faith-based, nonprofit organization has worked to improve the lives of South Florida residents since 1920. It is one of our State's largest and most reliable social service organizations.

Among the many important services that the JCS of South Florida provides are those focused on supporting our elderly. This year's Milk & Honey event will, again, bring together hundreds of volunteers to assemble food baskets and hurricane preparedness kits for vulnerable South Florida seniors.

My community liaison, Harriet Carter, and I have participated in many events of the JCS of South Florida, and I thank all the volunteers who will make this year's Milk & Honey event a smashing success.

SUPPORTING DRAFT LEGISLATION CONCERNING THE VA BUDGET AND CHOICE FUNDING

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I participated in laying a wreath at the Arlington Cemetery to honor our fallen veterans and military members.

Today, we need to do more than a ceremony. We need to honor our veterans now by passing the VA budget legislation.

I support this draft legislation because it addresses the $3 billion shortfall for fiscal year 2015 that veterans had, and it keeps hospital and medical facilities open for our veterans through the end of the fiscal year.

This legislation allows the VA to use the dollars for health care provided to veterans and family members under the program provided by the non-VA provision. This bill allows VA to access this money. In addition, $500 million may be used for pharmaceutical expenses related to the treatment of hepatitis C at the VA.

This is a cure many of the veterans need, especially those who served in Vietnam; and I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation before we go home.

As the Army says, this is one team, one fight; and we need to look out for the VA and veterans.

SUPPORT MONTANA JOBS

(Mr. ZINKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Montana jobs and to rally against this administration's war on American coal.

In Montana, coal means good-paying jobs. Those are blue collar, union jobs. Coal means economic opportunity. Coal means affordable utilities for families and manufacturers, and coal means Montana.

In the words of Crow Chairman Old Coyote:

> For the Crow people, there are no jobs that compare to the coal job. The wages and benefits exceed anything else that is available. A war on coal is a war on the Crow people.

Montana could lead the Nation in coal production; but, unfortunately, President Obama and his EPA are waging a more aggressive war on coal than they are against ISIS.

Montana alone, and our coal, produces $1.7 billion in royalty payments; and that pays for schools, bridges, and our infrastructure.

The EPA's Clean Power Plan will kill Montana jobs. Those are real jobs, like in the Rosebud mine in Colstrip, and across our State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support Montana and support our Nation's energy independence through coal.

RENEW VOTING RIGHTS ACT

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, nearly 50 years after the Voting Rights Act was signed into law, we still see efforts to weaken voter protections and suppress votes.

Discriminatory voting laws, such as strict photo ID requirements and reduced early voting, disproportionately impact minority voters in the name of preventing widespread voter fraud, a problem that simply does not exist.

Clearly, since the Supreme Court's decision 2 years ago to erode some of the VRA's most critical protections, including preclearance requirements that protect against disenfranchising laws, the Voting Rights Act is still needed more now than ever before; yet Republicans have refused to allow a renewed and strengthened Voting Rights Act to come to the floor.

This should concern everyone who believes the right to vote is one of the most fundamental to our democracy. It is time we renew and strengthen the Voting Rights Act.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IS MODERN-DAY SLAVERY

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because it is past time we call human trafficking what it really is: modern-day slavery.

Every year, up to 300,000 children are at risk of being sex-trafficked here in our country. On average, these children are first sold into sex slavery before their 13th birthday. As a father, I can't fathom anything more disgusting.

Earlier this year, I supported legislation that we successfully passed aimed at stopping sex trafficking, but the fight is far from over. Human trafficking generates $9.5 billion worldwide each and every year, and the criminals that profit off of sex trafficking aren't going to give in that easily.

For example, right now in my district, backpage.com, a disgusting Web site that facilitates online sex trafficking, is suing Cook County Sheriff Tom Dart because he stood up to the evil and corrupt people who profit off of the exploitation of minors.

It is our collective obligation to do everything that we can to put a definitive end to this atrocity. I commend Sheriff Dart for standing up for what is right, and I pledge to work with my colleagues here in this House, on both sides of the aisle, to stop this abhorrent crime.

A SURVIVOR'S STORY

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Amanda Jones was kidnapped in Dallas, Texas. She was 15 years of age, and then she was sold for sex at the hands of human traffickers.

Children right here in the United States are bought and sold for sexual

exploitation in urban, suburban, and rural areas. Their souls are stolen from them, and no community is immune.

Amanda was in slavery for 9 years. She eventually escaped with her daughter and, thankfully, found services through a new wonderful organization in Dallas, New Friends New Life. New Friends New Life is primarily funded by Dallas donors, and it provides services to victims to address their unique needs. It helps them rebuild their lives.

Amanda now helps other trafficked victims become survivors instead of victims. We need more programs like this one, where survivors help each other.

Now, through funding in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, more services will be available to victims like Amanda. We can stop traffickers in their tracks because our children are not for sale, in our town, in our State, or in our country.

And that is just the way it is.

THANK YOU AND BEST WISHES TO MARK WELLMAN

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment this evening to offer my appreciation and sincere best wishes to Mark Wellman, my chief of staff for the last 4 years, who is leaving us at the end of this week to accept an appointment as a professor of constitutional law at the United States Military Academy at West Point.

Mark has superbly served as a congressional staffer for more than two decades—first, with our late colleague, Congressman Paul Gillmor of Ohio; and then, following an earlier tour at West Point, in my office.

During all of those years, he has served with distinction in the National Guard, including a tour in Iraq, and has risen to the rank of colonel.

He is an outstanding individual, a gentleman of the first order, the world's most loyal Chicago Cubs fan, and a great American. He will be truly missed.

Good luck, Mark, and God bless you.

RECOGNIZING SEVERAL UNSUNG HEROES IN THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

(Mr. RATCLIFFE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to recognize several unsung heroes in the Fourth Congressional District of Texas.

Several counties in my district are just now beginning to recover from recent flooding at historic levels, so I appreciate the opportunity to thank all the sheriff and fire departments in communities across our district in Grayson, Fannin, Lamar, Red River, Bowie, Hopkins, Delta, and Cass Counties.

Emergency coordinators like C.J. Durbin-Higgins, Joyce and Steven Molder, and Robert Flowers in Grayson County; and Jim Roberts, Deborah Lann, and James Carlow in Bowie County, as well as so many others, are deserving of our gratitude.

While our first responders' efforts have been vital and, in some cases, heroic, many folks back home are still suffering. Mr. Speaker, I want my constituents to know that they can still reach out to my office if they need any assistance or help with any issues related to flooding.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE TOM MCCLINTOCK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a non-party subpoena, issued by the Madera County Superior Court, Madera County, California, for documents in a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

TOM MCCLINTOCK.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

JULY 28, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 202(a) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146) I am pleased to appoint the following individual to the Commission on Care:

Mr. Michael Blecker of San Francisco, California

Thank you for your consideration of this appointment.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

THE IMPACTS OF COAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topics of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, we want to talk about these three subjects as it relates to coal. You have already heard recent remarks made a few minutes ago about the war on coal, but we want to talk about the impacts of coal, the regulations, and the Clean Power Plan. That is what we are going to be talking about tonight are these three primary subjects.

I want to put things in perspective. We want to talk about how does this coal industry—you hear us, many of us that come from coal country, we have been fighting about coal, fighting for coal—why do we do that?

Look at the impact. For those of you that aren't coming from a coal community, now, we mine coal in 27 States, but just look at this, the impact, what it has—between coal mining at $58 billion a year and then the generation of power from coal totals $142 billion.

Now, maybe that doesn't mean a lot to a lot, but $142 billion, put that in context with the automobile industry. All of us are familiar with cars. We all hear the commercials on television. We know about the discussion about how you have got to have the latest car.

This is bigger than the car industry. The automobile industry is $130 billion. That is why many of us, all across this country, are concerned about this future of the coal industry. It is larger than the automobile industry. I want you to understand that. Everyone should make sure they grasp the impact of that.

This war on coal that many of us have been talking about for some time, I want to make sure that people understand how it affects us individually and affects a State like West Virginia.

□ 1845

Just 7 years ago the unemployment rate in West Virginia was the seventh best in the country. But after 7 years of a war on coal, after regulation after regulation after regulation, West Virginia's unemployment rate now has dropped and we are in the last place in the Nation.

Think about that impact for all of us. You go from number 7 to 50th in just 7 years. Combine that with the families of our coal miners. Just in the past 3 years, 45 percent of the coal miners in West Virginia have lost their jobs, 45 percent. These are people. These are real people. They are not statistics.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) uses this chart. He has shown us over the years—my 5 years in Congress—he showed us that these are the people we are talking about all over this country who are losing their jobs.

But in West Virginia, 45 percent of them have lost—in the coalfields of

West Virginia, the unemployment rate is staggering, and that hasn't stopped the administration.

We are talking about unemployment rates in counties two and three times the rate of the national figures: 13.5 percent, 13 percent, 12 percent, 10 percent. That is tough for a family, a community, a State, all to be able to survive.

We keep talking about mines shutting down. I want people to understand, when you shut down coal mines, you really affect a community. These people all have families. When these men lose their jobs, it affects other people.

The administration and the EPA can shut down our coal mining industry. Yes, they can. They are doing a pretty good job of it, if that was their intent, was to shut down and for people to lose their jobs.

But think about it. When these men lose their jobs, it is not just the coal miners who are losing their jobs. It is the other individuals in the community.

We are talking about the railroad workers, the barge operators, the trucking industry, all that come to pick up the coal at the mine to take it to the power plant.

The machinists, the concrete suppliers, the people that put the conveyor belts in, and the building that we have to do with it, all of them lose their jobs. The timber industry.

Then go outside and talk to the school board when the school boards are struggling to make ends meet because so many of their employers are gone and their tax base is eroded with it. But, also, go to the grocery store and find out that is the impact. Grocery stores, pharmacies, restaurants, apartment buildings.

We have got a map that shows, again, the impact of this as we get into this. We have got several speakers here tonight to talk more about it.

This is a location of all the power plants across America. There are over 500 coal-fired plants operating today around this country.

But just in the last month the Sierra Club, Bloomberg, Earthjustice, and all have been touting the fact that they want by the year 2017 to take one-third of those red dots off the map.

Almost a third of our capacity to generate electricity can be gone because of the rules and the way some of the environmental groups are pursuing this. One-third of them.

Now, in terms of grid reliability with this, you have to deal with what they have talked about. If we continue to shut down coal-fired power plants and don't replace them, whether that is with wind, solar, or gas, our grid reliability is going to be in question.

How many times are we going to lose our power? FERC has already said that, if we don't do something by 2017, they are saying the Midwest is going to start experiencing rolling blackouts. So let's be careful with this.

I am going to stop now. We have tried to frame some of the argument about this history of how we got to this point that you are seeing the frustration in Congress. But I wanted to put that again in context.

This industry is bigger than the automobile industry, but we don't have the big communities. We don't have the Detroits and the Grand Rapids. We just have Farmington, Lumberport, small towns that make up the backbone of rural America. That is what we are trying to fight for.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for his comments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Thank you to my colleague for yielding.

You made a comment just a minute about, you know, we don't have the Detroits, we don't have the New Yorks, we don't have the big cities in coal country.

We may not have those big cities in coal country, but I guarantee you those big cities get some of their electricity from the coal that is produced by the coal miners that live in our region.

Over the past 5 years, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation has spent more than $10 million of its budget to pursue a wholesale rewrite of one of the agency's regulatory programs.

Dubbed the ''stream protection rule'' by the agency, this massive regulatory undertaking has little to do with protecting streams and much more to do with riding roughshod over State regulatory programs.

This rule rewrite means more Americans will be out of work and that electricity bills of hard-working families could increase.

As OSM's related draft environmental impact statement indicates, the Appalachian Basin, home to thousands of Ohioans who depend on the coal industry for their livelihood, to put food on their table, to put clothes on their children, to send their children to school, could see as many as 450 production-related jobs lost per year, with potential adverse impacts of $37 million annually.

This appears to be of little concern to the administration, as Interior Secretary Sally Jewell was recently quoted as characterizing the job loss in coal country associated with this rule rewrite as ''minor.''

I invite Secretary Jewell to join me on a trip to any coal mine in Ohio and directly tell the hard-working miners—look them in the eye and tell them that this new rule has only minor impacts.

I will clear my schedule, and I will be available any day, anytime, to go with her if she wants to come there.

Furthermore, this regulation omits and ignores the relevant input from those stakeholders with the most expertise in regulating mining, the States who have been doing it for years.

In fact, 9 of the 10 States originally involved in the rules development have withdrawn their support due to OSM's exclusionary tactics.

This is unacceptable, and it is why I urge the House to consider H.R. 1644, the STREAM Act, as soon as possible.

Introduced by my colleague from West Virginia, ALEX MOONEY, the STREAM Act would direct the administration to conduct a comprehensive study of the effectiveness of the Stream Buffer Zone Rule that has been in place since 1983. We have been doing this for a long time and protecting streams in the process.

While this study occurs, a prohibition on the promulgation of new rules addressing the stream protection or stream buffers will be implemented to ensure that the Secretary incorporates the findings of the study into any future rulemaking.

This is just one example, Mr. MCKINLEY, of the regulatory overreach of this administration and its devastating impacts on coal miners, on families that depend on the coal industry for their livelihoods, and the businesses that depend on cost-affordable, reliable electricity across our country.

I appreciate you giving me the time to share that.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Thank you. You have been one of our stalwarts in pushing this legislation for all 5 years you have been here on this.

So I know people across this country recognize the work that you are doing on behalf of the coal miners and this whole industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I am proud to be on your team.

Mr. MCKINLEY. We have a host of other folks here to address the issue. We have got this chart up. Eventually, we are going to get to that in the next part of it.

But what we are talking about here is here are all the regulations. These are all the regulations that are affecting the coal industry, the manufacturing industry, all promulgated from the Clean Air Act. We will get to that in a minute. But, in the meantime, let's hear from some more individuals.

I yield to the gentleman from the Third District of West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Congressman MCKINLEY, thank you for your leadership as chair of the Coal Caucus. It does great work. I am honored to be a part of it, and I am honored to work with you.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know and as the people of America need to know, we are at a critical point in this war on coal, and it truly is a war on coal.

Coal is vital to the people of West Virginia and to West Virginia's economy and to this country. Coal supports many crucial investments in southern West Virginia, in my congressional district.

Its revenues help support tourism, roads, and infrastructure. It will make King Coal Highway a reality and make sure we do not have a bridge to nowhere, like we already have in southern West Virginia.

Coal puts food on the table. Coal pays the bills. Coal supports families. Coal generates the revenue that provides for our roads, our schools, our police, and our fire departments. Coal keeps the lights on.

But, sadly, this administration doesn't recognize the value of coal or of the people who work to mine it. They are proposing regulation after regulation to make it harder to mine coal, harder to burn coal, and harder to produce affordable energy from coal.

We have lost an estimated 43 percent of our coal jobs in just the last 6 years. While that is a sobering number, it is more than a statistic.

Each one of those employees has responsibilities. They have bills. They have families. They have rent or house payments. How will they provide for themselves and others without their coal jobs?

We must stand up for West Virginia jobs, West Virginia energy, and West Virginia coal. That is exactly what I am doing in Congress as a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

At one hearing, I did ask EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy to come to West Virginia and listen to us. She declined. So I brought Logan County coal miners to Washington to testify before Congress.

They shared how coal provides good paychecks to support their families and how they are worried overregulation will put them out of work.

I am working in Congress to ensure our miners will be able to provide for their families and that our State still has access to affordable domestic energy. I will continue to fight each and every day.

Thank you for your leadership.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Thank you for your comments.

Before we go to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman KELLY, I just wanted to add, because you talked about education, that the Duke Energy plant over in New Richmond, Ohio—the closure of that cost them $1.5 million out of their school system, out of their property taxes, with that.

You are absolutely right when we talk about the impact it is going to have on schools when we start depriving that.

But then you have FirstEnergy's Albright plant. They lost $380,000. The AEP plant over in Lockbourne, Ohio, is $406,000.

This is real money that is hurting the communities. It is depriving our school systems of money, all pushing an ideology. So thank you for joining this fight.

I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is about time. Time is running out. I think right now we look at what is happening in coal country and nothing could be more alarming than what is happening.

This is one promise the President kept. When he ran as a candidate, he said: You can continue to generate electric power by burning coal. But if you decide to go that way, we will bankrupt you. That is one promise he has kept.

Now, in Pennsylvania alone, coal is responsible for over 40,000 jobs and 40 percent of our electric power. The Associated Press calls it the workhorse of America's power system.

But the extreme overreach by the EPA is threatening jobs and forcing energy costs for families and manufacturers to skyrocket, which hurts every single American. That is something I think the general public has to understand.

While maybe they don't go down in those mines and while maybe they don't bring that precious product out from underneath the ground and while maybe they don't work in a coal-fired power plant, one thing they do know is, when they hit that switch to turn on the power, it is reliable because of coal.

Coal has always been the standard. Coal has always driven the fact that we not only have coal that is abundant, we have coal that is accessible and we have coal that is very affordable.

□ 1900

Why in the world would we go away from this workhorse of America's power system? That is one of the reasons we reintroduced the Coal Country Protection Act; that is H.R. 2637.

It is just a commonsense bill that would stop any EPA regulations from affecting America's power plants until four outcomes are achieved: number one, no job losses; number two, no loss in GDP or economic growth; number three, no higher electric rates; and, number four, no interruption in the reliable delivery of electrical energy. These are pretty commonsense goals.

Now, who would be able to verify that or who would certify? Well, the Secretary of Labor could do it; the Congressional Budget Office could do it; the Energy Information Administration could do it; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission could do it, and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation could do it.

You said about time. It is about time, but it is time not just for the coal country people to stand up and fight for coal; it is time for the whole country to stand up and fight for coal. It is well past the midnight hour.

As we continue to shut down mines and lose jobs and shut down communities and raise people's electric rates and then people at home sit back and wonder: What are they doing in Washington? Why do they continue to hurt us at every turn?

The answer is the people making some of this policy have never done what you have done; they have never walked in your shoes; they have never had to do what we have done in coal country to protect electric power.

Why in the world would we do this now at a time when the country is looking for jobs, at a time when the country is looking for less dependence on foreign nations for energy? Why now? Why, Mr. President? Why continue to push in the direction you have been pushing?

The bottom line is this is just not about coal country; this is about our whole country.

Mr. MCKINLEY, I would like to thank you for fighting this fight. The 5 years we have been here together, this has been something we fought to go every day in every way and will continue to do.

It is time now for the people in America to also be heard. Please do not sit in silence and suffer in silence when your voices need to be heard. We need to have everybody standing up for coal, standing up for the production of electricity that is affordable and reliable, and we just need to look at where we are going and say: My goodness, the people we sent to represent us, the people we sent to protect us, it is time for them to stand up and do exactly what they took a pledge to do.

I thank you for all your efforts. I thank my colleagues for being here tonight. This is something we will never give up on, we will never walk away from. It has come to our shoulders. We can't ever walk away from it because it is not an option.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the biggest shortcomings here is I don't think other Members of Congress and I don't think the American public understand the magnitude of this industry. That is why I started off with that chart, to show you that between the coal and the coal-fired electrical plants, it is larger than the automobile industry.

Now, just walk with me, just imagine that if we told the automobile industry that they had to cut back one-third of their capacity of cars, but that is okay, they are going to say, because what we do is people will ride bikes or they will take the train or the bus. That is not our culture in America. They would fight back, too.

You and I are fighting—and the rest of these people that represent our coal fields. We have enjoyed the cost of electricity coming from low cost because of coal. In America, all across, we showed 49 of the 50 States burn coal—49—and this administration wants to stop that, wants to cut back.

I would say, if you are going to cut back the coal industry, then look at the automobile industry as well; if you are going to go after one huge component of our economy, go after the automobile industry as well with it.

Thank you very much for what you said.

We talked about a lot. Now, let's continue on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

I think Congressman GIBBS from Ohio, I think you had some remarks you wanted to make.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order on this very important topic.

In the very near future, this affects every Ohioan across the country, but very soon, the EPA is expected to release its Clean Power Plan. This is just another burdensome regulatory scheme that will increase energy costs.

The Energy Information Administration—that is the government agency dedicated to the impartial analysis of data—reported it will cause the price of electricity rates to rise for consumers.

Ohio families are already stretching their budgets as much as they can, struggling to make ends meet. Raising their monthly electric bills is just going to make their struggle worse.

Earlier this month, the House passed the Ratepayer Protection Act, as you know, to stop the implementation of a clean power plan while the courts address the legal challenges to the plan and give Ohioans a break from the EPA's heavy-handed regulations.

Sadly, the EPA's refusal to listen to the public and industry input is not without precedent. When considering the redefinition of waters of the United States rule, the agencies did not take into account the opinions of their State partners. Within hours, 27 States and countless organizations filed lawsuits challenging the rule.

Additionally, at the end of June, the Supreme Court found that the EPA failed to consider compliance costs when proposing new rules for power plants.

If the EPA continues to push forward with this plan, it will only hurt those who want reliable, affordable energy. It is time to set aside partisan agendas.

I encourage the EPA to start from scratch and work with the stakeholders and industry partners to create a commonsense plan that strengthens our energy infrastructure and safeguards our environment.

Again, Congressman MCKINLEY, I thank you for holding this Special Order today—and Mr. Speaker—because this affects a large region of our country. I know you talked about, what, 400 coal-fired plants across the country.

This is important to our economy, and you have to have reliable and affordable energy for businesses to grow and create jobs. This Clean Power Plan is going to lay around and strangle our businesses and put people out of work across the Midwest and across my State in Ohio.

I thank you for doing this tonight.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Thank you very much. Thank you for bringing up the Ratepayer Protection Act because, as you know, after we followed the MATS rule, after the Supreme Court ruled that unconstitutional, you didn't hear the President complain because they had effectively accomplished everything they wanted before that rule.

I am afraid that is why the importance of this Ratepayer Protection Act is because, if we continue to shut down our coal power plants and deprive our communities of taxpayer moneys to run our schools, then that winds up—if it is ruled unconstitutional later on, then how do we recover the moneys that we have lost? Can we reopen a school that was closed because a community lost its operation? Do we recover? How do we recover that? That is why it is important.

I am really glad you brought up the Ratepayer Protection Act because we need to make sure that the courts have ruled before the action is taken. You and I are going to be paying more for our utility bills as a result of that if and until it is ruled unconstitutional. We know it is coming; they know it is coming. Thank you for bringing that up.

Our next remarks we have are from one of our—I can't say one of our newest Members, but he is a Member from Kentucky that has been very outspoken. I appreciate very much Congressman BARR from Kentucky.

Can you share some thoughts tonight?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, my colleague and friend, from West Virginia for his leadership in the Congressional Coal Caucus, to my colleagues from Pennsylvania and Ohio, and all over the country representing coal-producing States where good people—men and women—working in the coal mines literally power America.

They come from an industry—they work in the coal mines; they support the coal miners—an industry that provides affordable and reliable energy that powers the American economy and has been the backbone of the American economy.

Instead of celebrating that industry, instead of applauding the heroic work that these men and women do, day in and day out, underground and above ground, what is the response of the Federal Government over the last 6 years? It has been to singularly punish this industry.

I can't think of an administration from either party in the history of the United States that has singled out a single industry with the level of vindictiveness, frankly, and targeted a single industry and literally bankrupted many of these companies.

I don't understand it for a variety of reasons, but let me just share with you a little bit about the coal industry in Kentucky. We could very well be the poster child for demonstrating the tremendous negative impact and the consequences of this heartless, aggressive, anticoal policy from the EPA and from this administration's regulatory policy.

Since 2009, the Commonwealth of Kentucky has lost more than 8,000 coal mining jobs throughout our State. For every one coal mining job, three additional jobs are directly tied to every coal mining job. This is a direct result of the administration's war on coal.

Sure, there are competitive pressures from natural gas, and we celebrate the fracking boom and the result of discoveries in natural gas, but I can tell you what the coal industry says. It is not cheap natural gas that is the cause of these lost jobs; it is the fact that the Federal Government has put its heavy hand of regulatory power on the scales to make this industry noncompetitive.

Just to give you a sample of the problem, in the first quarter of 2015 alone, Kentucky's coal employment numbers dropped another 10½ percent.

What does that mean in total? Coal production in Kentucky has decreased to its lowest level since 1963. In 2015, production levels are currently half of what they were just two decades ago; yet demand for energy in the United States has suddenly increased.

There are more than just statistics, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to talking about the face of the war on coal. Many of my colleagues have shared these stories about what this really means, what all of these regulations really mean in the real world. It is not statistics on a page; it is not about coal production percentages on decline.

What it is really about, it is about Sally, the young woman in Wolfe County, Kentucky, that I met with tears in her eyes at the end of a townhall meeting.

She came to me as her Congressman and she said: Do they know what they are doing to our family? My husband lost his job because the coal mining employer that he works for didn't get a permit, and so now, he is out of work. Don't those people in Washington understand that I have got kids? We are going back to school; it is August, and I can't afford shoes for my kids. I had to go to Walmart and buy them flip-flops, just so they wouldn't be embarrassed to go back to school.

Now, I want the regulators in Washington, D.C., to come back to Kentucky, to eastern Kentucky, and meet Sally and look Sally in the eye and ask her to describe to them what the impact of this war on coal is for her.

What about Robert? Robert the coal miner from Wolfe County, Kentucky, in my district, he gets up at 3 a.m. every morning to commute an hour to go to work in the coal mines just to put food on the table.

Or what about James, who looks at me with an incredible expression and says: ANDY, don't they understand what they are doing? They are putting people out of work. They are making life harder on the American people. Surely, these are the people who say they are fighting for the working man. I am the working man. Congressman, what are they thinking?

Then you talk about Chris, Chris who says: Congressman, I don't know much about politics; I don't really care much about politics, but if you can go save my job, I am for you. Can't the politicians in Washington fight for people just to go to work and provide for their families? These are paychecks that these people depend on.

Finally, it is Curtis, Curtis who said to me that his father crawled on his

belly for decades to take care of his family, and because of his father's hard work, he had opportunities.

This is more than statistics. This is about real people who have been victimized by bureaucrats in Washington who are out of touch—if the bureaucrats in Washington would at least just go to these places—West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Kentucky—and look these people in the eye and ask them what they think about their policies.

Worst of all, it is all done in the name of the environment. We all love the environment. These coal miners love the environment. They come from a beautiful part of the country, in Appalachia.

It is not about not wanting to help the environment or environmental stewardship, but what is so sad is that these regulations aren't going to do a darn thing about global carbon emissions.

The Clean Power Plan rule that this administration has proposed would reduce global carbon emissions by less than 1 percent—for what, $8 billion in additional annual cost to our economy and thousands of American families without paychecks.

This is wrong. The Congress of the United States is right to stand up for these families. The Congress of the United States is right to stand up for jobs.

That is why I support all of the legislative work done by this House by these good Members—the STREAM Act from my colleague and friend from West Virginia; the coal residuals bill that the gentleman, the chairman, has championed and done a great job in supporting, my colleague, ED WHITFIELD, the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee on the Ratepayer Protection Act; the REINS Act, which we just voted for and passed out of this House, which would stop all of these costly regulations.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to stand up for American jobs, for American energy, and for American-produced coal power. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman touched on something that I don't know that our listeners or even the other Members of Congress quite grasp, but the gentleman touched on it in one statement he made. It is the claim that CO_2 emissions of the world are the target of our global warming issue.

I will just accept, for discussion purposes, that that is the basis of their war on coal, this ideological fight that we are involved in. I will use the United Nations' statistics—not the Republican caucus', not the coal country's numbers, but the United Nations'.

They say: Congressman BARR, if you were to stop all coal-fired capacity in every school, church, hospital, power station—if we were to stop all burning of coal in America in total so that there became no coal being consumed in America—you would reduce the CO_2 emissions of the world by two-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. BARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I would also make this point that this is the United States of America.

In the United States of America, we solve problems through entrepreneurship, free enterprise, and innovation. We put a man on the Moon because we are Americans. We believe in freedom, and we believe in innovation.

If there is a problem with carbon emissions and climate change, then we should solve the problem the American way, through fossil energy research. What we should not do is supply a Soviet-style, command-and-control solution from Washington, which will not solve the problem.

What we need to be doing is exporting American technology to China and India and other countries that have inferior electricity-generating capabilities.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to touch base again before we go to our last speaker.

Again, these are all of the rules. This is the overwhelming number of rules that we are trying to deal with in America in dealing with fossil fuels, from ozone to new source performance standards. I could go on.

There is the regional haze and the greenhouse gas tailoring rule. We have to deal with those. Let me show the impact as already predicted is going to happen. It is that we are going to see higher utility bills. If we want to see that, just keep doing it because that is exactly what is going to happen.

This chart has been produced that shows, just in West Virginia 7 years ago—let's just say for discussion—you had a $100 bill for your monthly electric. Now, because of all of the rules, we are at $160. That is a 60 percent increase in the cost of utilities. Some might argue it is because of the cost of coal. No. The cost of coal has dropped.

The point here is that the power plants—the utilities—are having to put excessive money into the production of electricity to meet some of those rules that we talked about over there. It is coming out of our pockets. Someone is paying for that. You and I are paying for that.

In addition, we are already 60 percent up. Look at Arizona. They are suggesting that the increased cost in Arizona is going to go up 40 percent; in the State of Washington, 37 percent; in California, 24 percent. All we have to ask is: Is this what the consumers want?

Let me show you another chart here.

This talks about where coal is being used. Now, this administration has been very effective in shutting it off. You have heard the horror stories of what has happened in Kentucky. I have heard of some of it in West Virginia. In Ohio, it is the same story—in Indiana, in Illinois. The impact it is having on our industry is destructive. They are destroying the industry. The industry is on its knees now.

But what about overseas?

The International Energy Agency has already indicated that they have a voracious appetite for coal elsewhere outside of America. No one else is following the administration's lead on this idea of this war on coal.

They are still burning coal. They are burning coal every which way they can. Whether it is in China or in India—wherever they are—they are using coal. As a matter of fact, from the year 2000 to 2013, they increased their appetite for coal by 70 percent; but in America, we dropped. It is important to understand where this fight is and what we have to do to fight for the individuals.

Mr. Speaker, as we start to wrap up our discussion tonight about coal and its impact, about the Clean Power Plan and the effective regulations, I yield to the gentleman from the Second District of West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), one of our newest Congressmen.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MCKINLEY for his leadership on this issue and in our great State of West Virginia. I thank Congressman BARR for his great comments and for his telling some personal stories about how this affects real Americans from different States.

Mr. Speaker, our great country is blessed with abundant natural resources. Unfortunately, President Obama has made a campaign commitment to destroy coal as a domestic energy source, and he is intent on fulfilling that promise.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Office of Surface Mining, under the Department of the Interior, released its latest set of rules and regulations that will cripple the coal industry not only in West Virginia, but across the country. These new rules and regulations are over 2,500 pages in length.

If you do not know exactly what that looks like, here it is, ladies and gentlemen. It is six folders full of new regulations—2,500 pages. This is what it looks like, okay? The Department of the Interior has given us 60 days to go through this. It is a lot of work. At the very least, a 120-day extension is needed beyond the current 60-day comment period.

I have already joined Chairman BISHOP of the Natural Resources Committee, on which I serve, and 43 Members of Congress in sending a letter to the Obama administration, requesting a 120-day extension of the comment period for the recently announced job-killing stream buffer zone regulation right here.

My hard-working staff and I of the Second District of West Virginia have been going through this very hard over the last several days since it came out. We have been trying to look at all of

the ridiculous regulations in this bill, and we have come across a couple of things that, I think, are worth pointing out so far.

For instance, on page 1201 of the proposed regulation, it reads:

> Ensure that electric power transmission lines and other transmission facilities that are used for or are incidental to surface mining activities on the permit area are designed and constructed to minimize electrocution hazards to raptors and other alien species with large wingspans.

The Office of Surface Mining is worried about protecting raptors and other birds from electrocution, so they have created a special regulation just to prevent that from happening. That is right. Here it is—required. We found on page 1201, buried within thousands of pages of regulations, that coal companies are to build special power lines to prevent ''raptors from getting zapped.''

I wonder if the environmentalists have the same concerns for their own projects. According to the Smithsonian, somewhere between 140,000 and 328,000 birds die each year from flying into wind turbines.

On page 1100 exactly, we have even more new rules here. It reads:

> You may not conduct any surface mining activity that is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species listed by the Secretary or proposed for listing by the Secretary or that is likely to result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat in violation of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

That is a long sentence with a lot of ''ors.'' This absurd regulation would prohibit mining near animals that the Director of the Interior has simply proposed for listing as endangered or as threatened.

It would be one thing to prevent mining operations around animals that are actually endangered, but this regulation goes far, far beyond protecting endangered species. This is a stunning regulatory power grab that an environmental extremist Secretary will use to put miners out of business.

Even more ridiculous is just the heart of this rulemaking, which is to fundamentally change the definition of a ''stream'' to include temporary streams. Temporary streams are, essentially, ditches that fill up with water when it rains, and the water goes away quickly. They are calling them ''streams'' now.

A recent study from the National Center for Mining estimates that these rules will destroy as many as 80,000 coal jobs across the country. My colleague Congressman ANDY BARR put some names to those stories of individuals who are losing their jobs. He just referred to them in his remarks, and I appreciate that.

These are hard-working American taxpayers who are simply trying to provide for their families; and these idealistic, extremist regulations are putting them out of work. It is harming families not only in our States of West Virginia and Kentucky, but across the country. These new regulations would be catastrophic to the coal industry and to all of the hard-working American families who depend on coal to keep their energy costs low.

The economy of the Appalachian Region and West Virginia, in particular, are uniquely threatened by these regulations because of our mountainous topography and abundance of small streams.

Industry estimates say this administrative action could mean 45 to 79 percent of the coal reserves in the Appalachia would no longer be usable. The damage from such a critical blow to the industry would create a ripple of hardship in our State.

I think my colleague Congressman MCKINLEY mentioned this already, but over 90 percent of the energy consumed in West Virginia is produced by coal power, and distress in the coal industry will raise home energy prices and business energy costs for everybody. Low-income folks are going to struggle with this.

Furthermore, approximately 60 percent of West Virginia State business tax revenue is derived from coal revenues. A significant decrease in these revenues would put a severe financial strain on the State budget, and it could potentially hurt crucial services in our State, like public schools, State-funded health clinics, and the funding of our law enforcement agencies.

I want to continue to work with my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee, and I thank my colleague from West Virginia and my colleague from Kentucky for cosponsoring my bill, H.R. 1644. It is also known as the STREAM Act.

I want to first move it swiftly through committee before any real damage can be done by this harmful new rule. It is time that the administration wakes up and realizes that their regulations are hurting hard-working American taxpayers for no good reason.

□ 1930

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments on that and for bringing up also the Clean Power Plan as we were wrapping up with that.

Because I am intrigued—and maybe the rest of the Members should be as well—with the idea that is being promoted by the senior Senator from Kentucky, which is maybe we should not be so quick to jump on the Clean Power Plan.

The President may very well be overturned on this constitutionally. But if the States implement this voluntarily and impact our schools, our communities, our environment, our health care, our hospitals, by shutting down, we won't be able to recover from that.

So the Senator has come up with an intriguing concept, and that is just say no. It kind of reminds me of Barbara Bush a few years ago.

As a result of that, we already have several States that are either saying no or are deeply and seriously considering saying no.

States like Oklahoma, Indiana, Wisconsin, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi are not going to jump on this legislation just yet.

The rule, they are coming from the administration because they have seen the strategy here, which is just to use a bullying tactic, push it through, knowing full well 5 or 6 years from now it is going to be overturned in the courts. But we will never get our jobs back.

Those individuals that you were talking about, Congressman BARR, those individuals that came up to you, they are not going to have a job.

They will have left Kentucky. They will have gone someplace else to try to find something else. They are going to be uprooted from their communities.

No, we have to fight. This is the fight now.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I agree with you 100 percent.

I would just mention, too, it is not just about the coal mining jobs and the coal miners who will lose their jobs.

My district is mainly not a mining district. My district mainly is known for thoroughbred horses and bourbon distilleries and cattle, in addition to the University of Kentucky and the City of Lexington, but we do border the coal industry.

What I do know about those senior citizens on fixed incomes or low-income folks who live in those noncoal-producing counties in my district is that their electricity bills are going to double or triple if this Clean Power Plan goes into effect.

I have talked to the utilities. Over 90 percent of the electricity in Kentucky comes from coal. Coal keeps the lights on. Coal provides affordable energy.

The estimates from the utilities is that, in a single year, folks who live below the poverty line are going to see their electricity bills increase by two times, maybe three times, and that is simply something that they can't afford.

So this is an assault on low-income Americans, not just coal-mining families, but, also, fixed-income seniors and other low-income Americans.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I do appreciate the gentleman's additional comments.

So as we leave here tonight, let's make sure that we go back over what we have talked about.

We have talked about the impact on coal. We have talked about the individuals, as you just referred to on their electric bills. We see the drama that is going to play out over this.

We have seen the numbers of regulations that are coming forth with this, with these bullying tactics, this hostility toward coal. We have seen this last result, the Clean Power Plan. These have to stop. America needs to wake up.

This is something that is happening, but we have the ability here to reach

out and try to communicate to more people across West Virginia and the Nation, in Kentucky and Illinois, to Montana, to California, to demonstrate to them that you are already using coal. You are getting the advantages of coal.

Work with us to get the clean coal technology so that we can cut down our emissions. The idea of shutting off coal is short-sighted, and the rest of the world isn't following.

Someone said about leadership: You know, if no one is following you, then all you are doing is a man taking a walk.

So we have to find people that can lead. We have groups that are willing to take this on and fight for coal, fight for the jobs and the people that are affected by this.

So I thank you all for coming out here tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1994, VA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3236, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND VETERANS HEALTH CARE CHOICE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS (during the Special Order of Mr. MCKINLEY) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–234) on the resolution (H. Res. 388) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3236) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CALIFORNIA DROUGHT SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we had a most interesting discussion on coal. Let's continue on with natural resources for a few moments here.

I represent a good portion of the State of California. I put this map up as an opportunity for interested parties to observe what is happening in the State of California.

We are well into the fourth year of our drought in California. You can see from this map, in 2003, we had a serious drought, the yellow.

We are now looking at July 1, 2014. The yellow is now just a small part of the State of California, meaning it is still serious.

It is mostly out in the delta, out in the desert and in southern California, Imperial Valley, part of San Diego, Riverside, and San Bernardino County.

And there is a little bit of drought up here in the far north, north coast area, in Del North County.

The red and the brown, that is really, really serious. So California is really in a very serious state of hurt at the moment.

The drought is severe. It is having an enormous impact not just in the San Joaquin Valley, but really throughout the entire State of California.

Twenty-five percent water reduction is mandated by the State for the entire State. And so, in southern California, central California, northern California, that dramatic reduction in the consumption of water is well underway.

I live here in the central part, in the delta of California, which I will talk about at some length.

Three weeks ago this House passed legislation to address this issue, the Valadao bill. What it really was all about was a relaxation of the environmental protections and, thereby, a mechanism to basically take what water remains in northern California here in the Sacramento Valley and transport it down into the San Joaquin Valley here.

It is basically the classic water grab, which we have seen so much of over the years.

While all of that talk is going on here in Washington, D.C., what is happening is that California is doing what it has done so very well, and that is mine not coal, which we heard about from our colleagues from the coal states, but, rather, mine water.

This map basically shows what is happening in the aquifers of California. In June of 2002, you see a lot of green. The aquifers, while still depleted, were thought to be in pretty good shape.

In 2008, as a result of expansion of agriculture in cities and communities throughout California, the mining of water was going on so much so that we are now beginning to see these yellow and brown areas show up.

As the drought continued on from 2008 to 2014, we are beginning to see the very severe overdraft of the aquifers of California. Will these aquifers rebound when the rains return? Perhaps.

But we also know that many of them will not. And the result of this extraordinary overdrafting of the aquifers in California will place in jeopardy many, many communities, agricultural communities as well as the human communities.

We know that down here in the San Joaquin Valley along the eastern side communities are simply out of water.

The aquifers have been mined, overdrafted, to the point where there is no more ability to draw from the aquifers, and these communities are out of water today.

Extraordinary efforts are underway to provide these communities, many of whom are low-income communities with very little resources of their own, unable to dig deeper wells to provide themselves with water.

So part of the bill that passed 3 weeks ago attempted to address this, but in a very insufficient way.

There are alternatives. There are ways that California can and must deal with the drought, and they basically are short term, immediate, and long term.

That legislation has been introduced. I draw the attention to the Huffman bill, which is a comprehensive effort to deal with California's both short-term and long-term efforts.

I also draw attention to the Napolitano bill and basically draw your attention to how it should not be done, which was the Valadao bill.

Now, action is underway in the Senate. Our Senator, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, is about to introduce legislation. We have not had a chance to see the full legislation.

We do know that some of the Huffman bill is introduced into it, and we know that some of the Napolitano bill is also introduced.

I want to deal with those opportunities that present themselves and, at the same time, suggest that the Valadao bill should not be passed.

There is no need to push aside the environmental laws. There is no need to waive the California constitution and the water rights system in the constitution as the Valadao bill does. It is hidden, but it is there.

So what I want to really talk about is how we can address the California water needs. I call this the little sip/big gulp strategy. It is a proposal that I made some 3 years ago and continue to work on. It is a water plan for all of California.

It is similar to a program put out by the California administration, not for tunnels, not the California water fix, not the BDCP—all of those programs are simply a way to transfer water—but, rather, what we call a water fix, a water plan, for all of California.

Basically, what it involves is a mechanism to provide water for the growing population of California for the agricultural areas, Sacramento and San Joaquin, called the Great Central Valley, for the urban regions here in the bay area and down in southern California.

I will go through it very, very quickly.

Let's talk about southern California. Basically, it now takes water from northern California from the Colorado River. It brings water into the southern California area, where it is consumed.

After being cleaned, it is consumed. It is cleaned yet again, and a great amount of water is dumped then into the Pacific Ocean.

You say: Wait a minute. You mean to tell me they are taking water from northern California 400 or 500 miles from the Colorado River, bringing it into southern California, cleaning it, using it once, and then dumping it into the ocean?

The answer is yes. That is exactly what has happened, so much so that what I think is probably the fifth biggest river on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere is, in fact, the sanitation plants in southern California.

So the first option would be to recycle that water. That is very much a part of the Napolitano bill, as well as the Huffman bill: recycling. Use the water that is already there. Clean it and reuse it.

This is actually happening in Orange County down here. Orange County has one of the largest recycling programs anywhere in the United States. Good for them. But that much more can be done.

For maybe a billion dollars, a billion and a half dollars, you may be able to get 500,000 acre-feet of new water that is already in southern California.

So that is the recycling: San Diego, southern California, the great Los Angeles Basin, as well as the great San Francisco area.

Here in Sacramento a major recycling program is now underway by the Sacramento Regional Sanitation District. Good for them.

That water will be reused, some of it in the Sacramento area, the rest of it put back in the river as clean water and then available for environmental purposes in the bay as well as for the San Joaquin Valley and, indeed, all the way to Los Angeles.

So recycling is very, very much a part of the future of California.

A lot of people talk about desalinization. Yes, certainly there is now a desalinization plant that is opening that will be producing a significant amount of water down here in Carlsbad in San Diego County. There is also a desalinization plant in the Santa Barbara area.

□ 1945

Those are important. However, desalinization is far more expensive than recycling. The recycled water turns out to be quite cleaner than the ocean water. It doesn't have all the salts and other contaminants because it has already been significantly cleaned in the sanitation process—so recycling.

The most important and most immediate and, frankly, underway, as I said, 25 percent reduction in water consumption required in California now, that is called conservation. Clearly, conservation is the simplest, least expensive, and the largest source of water for the future.

Conservation is taking place by mandate now, but also a great deal of conservation is taking place in the agricultural areas up and down the coast as well as the agricultural areas in the Monterey Bay area and, actually, everywhere in California.

As much as has been done in the years leading to this moment, more can and must be done in conservation, both urban as well as agriculture. Perhaps estimates by the State government indicate somewhere between 3 and 5 million acre-feet of water can be saved through a very robust conservation program up and down the State.

Once again, this is in the Democratic legislation that has been put forth by Ms. NAPOLITANO as well as by Mr. HUFFMAN. A major and very, very important element in California water future is a continuation of this conservation program.

So you have recycling; you could do desalinization in certain places; and, thirdly, conservation, with conservation being the single biggest and the most inexpensive of all of the options.

There are things that need to be done. Money needs to be made available, Federal Government grants as well as State and local government, and participation by farmers and communities up and down the State.

Thirdly, we need to develop more storage. Here is where the twin tunnel concept that is being pushed by Governor Brown and the administration makes no sense at all. I want to put up a map that displays this a little better. I am going to go to the really big map here because this really needs to be understood.

This is a picture of the delta of California. It is an inland delta. It is the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere. It is basically this entire region here. Sacramento is up here; Stockton is here; Contra Costa County, Pittsburg, Antioch down here; and then San Francisco Bay begins right in this area.

So what we have here is this inland delta. The San Joaquin River comes up from the south. The Sacramento River, the largest river in California, flows from the north all the way from the Oregon border, Mt. Shasta, flows down through the Sacramento Valley, past the city of Sacramento, and comes in and joins the San Joaquin River in the delta of California.

I have had the pleasure to live in this area for the last 40 years and represent this area for, well, since 1974 in one way or another. It is an extraordinary ecological system. The largest estuary, it is the nursery for dozens of different species of salmon and other fish. It is extremely important for the ecology not just of the delta, but also of the entire West Coast. It is from this area that the salmon go out to sea, providing thousands upon thousands of jobs and recreational opportunities—other species, in this area, of fish. It is also a major flyway for the waterfowl that migrate north and south through the area.

It is also a very rich agricultural area, several hundred thousand acres of agricultural land, and provides enormous recreational opportunities with more than a thousand miles of rivers, sloughs, and waterways of various kinds.

It is in trouble. It is in serious jeopardy because of the transfer of water from the north through the delta to the great pumps here at Tracy that could pump up to 15,000 cubic feet of water per second out of these pumps, sending that to the San Joaquin Valley here, and then on into Los Angeles.

This is the hub, and this is where the controversy exists. What the Governor wants to do is to start up here in one of the richest agricultural areas in all of America and basically create two, three intakes and two massive tunnels that come all the way down here to the pumps, in the process destroying a lot of the agricultural land. The pumps are big enough. These tunnels are capable of carrying 15,000 cubic feet of water per second; and with intakes that are at 9,000, you add another intake, you can get the full 15,000.

Keep in mind, the Sacramento River flowing past Freeport, Sacramento, flows at somewhere around 15,000 cubic feet per second water into the Sacramento and into the delta. So this system that the Governor wants to build is big enough to literally drain the freshwater from the delta, destroying this extraordinary ecological system, the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

So we say to the Governor, why would you build something that has such destructive capacity? A recent report that was done on the economic benefits of this—remember, it is about $15 billion to build these two tunnels and the intakes and the pumps that go with it, about $15 billion. The economic analysis that was recently published in the Sacramento Bee said, well, wait a minute, the total economic benefit of all of this is like $5 billion over the lifetime of the tunnels. That is 50 years. You are spending $15 billion in the next decade or so, and you are only going to get $5 billion of economic benefit? It doesn't make much sense.

The other thing that is so foolish about this proposal is there is no storage. There is no storage north of the delta. There is no storage south of the delta. There is no storage in the delta. So where are you going to put the water? It is really nonsense.

So what we are saying is don't waste $15 billion or $17 billion here. Don't set up a system that could destroy the ecology of the delta and the agriculture of the delta and put at risk the communities that rely upon the freshwater. Don't do that.

There is a better option that is available. We call that the little sip/big gulp.

First of all, fix the levees. Fix the levees, the key levees that allow for the transport of water through the delta that protect the communities of the delta, that protect the flow of water as well as the agriculture. Probably less than a billion dollars and you could armor these levees. You could

upgrade those levees to maintain the current flow of water, when necessary, through the delta to the pumps, and at the same time protect communities such as Stockton and the communities down here in the Contra Costa area. That is the first thing. That gives you about half of the water that would be needed.

So where does the other half come from? The other half is what I call the little sip. I think you can see this on the map. This is the Sacramento deepwater shipping channel. It actually intersects the Sacramento River way up here in Sacramento, taking water, a little bit of water into the shipping channel and coming down here to a community called Rio Vista. About 40 percent of a system is already in existence.

If you were to put a fish screen here at the opening on the Sacramento River, allowing 3,000 cubic feet per second of water to flow into the shipping channel, down the shipping channel, capture that water way down here where the shipping channel ends, there are levees on either side of the channel. Capture the water there, and then bring the water across to Old River, which is right here. Bring that water across to Old River, and it goes then to the pumps here at Tracy.

So what you have here is a mechanism which we call the little sip, 3,000 cubic feet per second, big enough to be operated virtually every day of the year in a normal water year—not this year with the severe drought, but in a normal water year.

Oh, by the way, you could not operate the big tunnels, either. So this big project that the Governor wants to propose could not be used this year because there simply isn't water in the river.

But this little project in most every year, both the low flow as well as the high flow in the average year, could take that 3,000 cfs every day, bringing it down to the pumps here at Tracy, delivering 2 million acre-feet of water every year. That is the little sip.

When you have the big rain flows, which we hope to have in the future, and actually did have twice this year, you could turn the big pumps on down here, and you could take the rest of the 2 million or 2½ million acre-feet, giving you the 4½ million acre-feet that is desired to flow south to southern California and to the San Joaquin Valley. Little sip/big gulp.

You have, in fact, protected the delta because you are going to have to maintain the levees, bring them up to code so that they are 100-, 200-year flood levees, and you have set up a mechanism that could not destroy the delta because it is only 3,000 cubic feet per second coming out of the Sacramento River way up high. You avoid all of the destruction that would occur in the Clarksburg-Courtland area up here, that would occur as a result of the three intakes or four intakes that would be built on the Sacramento River, and all of the disruption that would occur as you build these two massive tunnels.

These tunnels are 40 feet in diameter. We are talking about, well, actually higher than this ceiling here in the Chamber. This is probably like 30 feet to the ceiling. But it would be 40 feet, two massive tunnels, 40 feet in diameter, that would be drilled down through the delta, through some of the most complex soils anywhere in the United States, disrupting all of this area and creating the opportunity for an existential threat to the delta because they are so big and can take so much water.

What would this cost? Maybe a third, maybe less than a third, maybe a quarter, because so much of it is already built. You already have the channel all the way down to here. You would have about a 10- to 12-mile pipeline across the delta into the Old River or a new canal built along the Old River to the pumps at Tracy. It makes a lot of sense.

The rest of the money, perhaps another $10 billion or $12 billion that would be otherwise spent on the massive twin tunnels could then be used for storage systems south of the delta.

Let me put this down for a second and put up the map of California. Where would those storage systems be?

Here is the delta once again. South of the delta there is a reservoir here called San Luis. It needs to be repaired because of earthquake potential. You can expand that. Just to the south, you have Los Banos Grandes Creek. That would be Los Banos Grandes Reservoir. There are numerous reservoirs that could be built along the California aqueduct as it comes into the Central Valley.

Most important of all are the aquifers. Remember this: The aquifers of the Central Valley are seriously overdrafted. These are the major storage reservoirs of California. So as water is brought out of the delta, we need to make sure that that water is put in surface storage reservoirs where possible, San Luis, maybe Los Banos Grandes. Los Vaqueros Reservoir here in Contra Costa County needs to be upgraded, added to. So you have these surface storage reservoirs that are certainly going to be necessary, and most important of all, you have got the aquifers.

As we look to the future, we need to figure out the hydrological systems to bring water through the canals when it is available and recharge the aquifers of the San Joaquin Valley. Some of them will not be able to be recharged. They are gone. Once you drain those aquifers, they may never be able to recover. But some could be recovered, and those are the ones we need to identify, and we need to recharge them.

Similarly, in the Sacramento Valley, north of the delta, there are several storage opportunities available to us. Some of these have been studied.

Way up here is the largest reservoir in California, the Shasta Reservoir. There is talk—and it has been studied—to raise the dam and increase the capacity perhaps by 130,000 acre-feet of yield here at Shasta. Further south, not on the river, but an off-river reservoir called Sites Reservoir, which my Republican colleague, Mr. LAMALFA, and I are authoring legislation to build Sites Reservoir, which would take water during the flood flows on the Sacramento off stream, pump it into this reservoir, a very large reservoir, about 1.9 million acre-feet, and that water would then be available to be put back into the Sacramento River for export to the south or for salinity control, freshwater into the San Francisco Bay, and also would create the opportunity for the reoperation, that is, to work in conjunction with Folsom Reservoir here in Sacramento, the Feather River Reservoir, the Oroville Dam and Reservoir, and the reoperation of the Shasta as well as the Yuba reservoirs.

□ 2000

In other words, this would great flexibility to the way in which we would then be able to operate the Sacramento River system for the benefit of the environment, for the benefit of exports to the southern valley—San Joaquin Valley, as well as southern California—and for salinity control in the environment of the delta. At the same time, like the San Joaquin Valley, there are enormous aquifers here in the Sacramento Valley that need to be maintained and recharged so that what we could build, if we thought about it in this holistic way, we would build a system that would be conjunctive use, so that when there was a lot of water, we would store that water. We would store it in off-stream reservoirs. We would store in an expanded Shasta. We would store it in the underground aquifers of the San Joaquin Valley or in the reservoirs along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, as well as in southern California.

When you recycle in southern California, you could then store that water in the aquifers that exist here in the Los Angeles and the southern California basin. These aquifers actually have greater capacity than the Shasta Reservoir.

So you have got the aquifer of the San Fernando. You have got the aquifer of the San Gabriel, the San Bernardino, Orange County, West Basin, and several other smaller aquifers in the Los Angeles Basin. Of course, there are others as you move south towards San Diego.

That is the storage system that you would then use in a conjunctive water management program. This is the holistic approach that we need to look at. I call it the little sip in the delta. Build a small facility—3,000 is not small—3,000 cubic feet per second facility, taking that water out of the Sacramento River at Sacramento; put it into the deepwater shipping channel—the Sacramento channel all the way down here just north of Rio Vista—take it across

the delta, put it in a canal into Old River to the pumps, 3,000. The remaining water would be taken out of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta when it is available, when the delta smelt and other fish are not at the pumps, and turn the pumps on, sending that water south to be stored or used in the aquifers stored in new surface storage reservoirs along the way. Of course, north of the delta, you would have the surface storage reservoir at Sites and perhaps the enlargement of Shasta, then the ability to use it.

So why don't we do it? For the $15 billion that the Governor wants to spend on digging two tunnels that do not create 1 gallon of new water, but do create an existential threat to the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere. Don't waste your money. Don't spend $15 billion on a $5 billion benefit—and that is over 50 years.

Why would you ever make that investment when you could do something that creates water, creates perhaps as much as 5 million acre-feet of new water for California's future, water that would be available from recycling and storage in southern California aquifers, available from storage north of the delta, the replenishment of the aquifers in the great Central Valley of California, and the creation of new storage surface reservoirs along the way? And most important, conservation—we have to conserve. It is mandated now. It is part of our future.

This is a water plan for all California. These ideas are not new. I didn't dream them up, although I put them together. And interestingly enough, 3½ years ago, when I made this first proposal, about a year later the Governor and the Department of Water Resources put forth a paper called a Water Action Plan for California, and it is exactly the same—without the tunnels.

Their Water Action Plan didn't speak to the tunnels. It did speak to storage north of the delta; it did speak to conservation; it did speak to the aquifers; it did speak to desalinization and recycling—all of those things that have been in the water plan for California for about 30 years.

This is not new. I have been involved in these issues since the 1970s, and I know that if we were to back away from the twin tunnel proposal, which is so destructive of the delta, and went to the little sip/big gulp strategy, using all of the various mechanisms available to California, we could create maybe 5 million acre-feet of new water. We could address the future drought that California will have again some day in the future.

Now, what about today's drought? I want to deal with that.

The people of California last November passed a $7 billion water bond. That water bond allows for conservation, replenishment of the aquifers, surface storage—perhaps Sites Reservoir, yet to be determined—and recycling, replenishment of the aquifers and, most important for now, today, money for those communities that are out of water and have no water at all so they can drill their wells deeper or bring in surface water from nearby rivers or communities that may be available.

That is a particular problem here in this area of the San Joaquin Valley and a few of the communities up here in the Sacramento Valley and up in the foothills. We need to provide that immediate relief for those areas, and we need to get on with conservation and some of the money that is necessary in order to do that. The water bond is available. That money is going to be coming out over the next 18 months or so as the State of California moves projects forward.

Immediately, and this is what I hope would be in the legislation that we should pass here in Washington is that we would use those Federal programs that exist today—and there are a multitude of Federal programs that already exist in Federal law, money that is already appropriated but not focused on the drought, not only in California, but throughout the West. And what I would suggest as we move legislation forward—perhaps this will be in Senator FEINSTEIN's bill. I would hope so. And if not there, as we hopefully all work together on solving the problem of drought in the West, particularly in California, that we focus our attention on the immediate opportunities that the Federal Government can presently present to solve problems.

The Environmental Protection Agency has the clean water grant programs. The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, has the WaterSMART program, which is conservation and recycling. We know that the Army Corps of Engineers has programs. There are other programs spread throughout the Federal Government that, if they were focused immediately on the needs of California and other States, that money could move to solve the community problems.

The clean water grant program could be used to provide water programs for those communities that are out of water—the recycling, conservation programs. All of those have money that is presently already appropriated but not focused; and if they focus that money so that it was in coordination, augmented, and supplemented and ahead of the California water bond programs, you could advance the water bond programs by as much as 18 months. It will take that long for California to move that money out of the bond.

So move the Federal Government in conjunction, in alignment with the programs that the State of California already is planning to do but doesn't yet have the money available. Put the Federal money there. Do the planning, the engineering, the environmental reviews, if necessary, and you advance so that today's drought can be dealt with. Now that is beginning to make sense.

I think we can do this. We need to push aside all of the fighting we have had over these many, many years. Don't take water from somebody, but work on programs to expand the water potential for all California. Don't push aside the environmental laws, because it is, in fact, the environmental laws that protect this largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere—San Francisco Bay and the fishing industry up and down the coast, all the way to the Columbia River between Oregon and Washington.

Don't put us in a situation where we are destined to fight, but rather put us in a situation where we can work together. That is my plea to my Republican colleagues who pushed that bill through here basically on a party-line vote and now headed to the Senate. I ask Senator FEINSTEIN to work with those of us that represent the delta and that have worked for generations and decades on how to protect the delta.

There is a solution. I call it a little sip/big gulp. You can put any name you want to on it. In fact, the Natural Resources Defense Council came up with a similar program that they called a portfolio approach: conservation; recycling; desalinization, aquifers; storage systems, both large and small, surface and aquifer. It is all there. This is not new. This is working together to solve a major challenge to the largest economy in the United States, the seventh largest economy in the world, the largest population—35 million people. This is a challenge, but this is a challenge we can do.

So my plea to anybody that cares to work on water is to work with us. There are ways we can solve and mitigate the current drought and solve the problem for the future drought. It is there. It is not going to be any more expensive than the massive tunnel programs that the Governor is proposing.

In fact, if you took that $15 billion and you were to spend it on building Sites Reservoir, expanding reservoirs to the south, putting in the systems for the underground aquifer replenishment and recycling programs in southern California, how much progress could we make? Well, we could solve the problems for the next drought, and we could mitigate and reduce the harm of the current drought. That is what it is all about: working together, taking the best ideas of one group or another.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered this issue, hopefully making some sense of what is a very complex problem for California and, therefore, for the Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

NATIONAL SECURITY, THE RULE OF LAW, AND PLANNED PARENTHOOD VIDEOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be able to address you

here on the floor of the House of Representatives and to speak some words here that hopefully will be picked up by the rest of the country that causes us to think a little more, think a little deeper, and think about the destiny of this country, Mr. Speaker.

I come to the floor to talk to you this evening about a couple of topics. One is national security, and the other is the rule of law. I will say the third thing that threads into that is the Planned Parenthood videos. We have now seen three of them, as they penetrate into our conscience.

Let me address first the Planned Parenthood videos. It has been now several weeks since the first video came out that showed the supposed doctor that worked for Planned Parenthood cavalierly discussing how to harvest the organs of innocent little unborn—aborted, though—babies, and the cavalier approach to that: sitting there over dinner, chatting away as if they were talking about a soccer game or maybe talking about spending the weekend with their family, having a glass of wine and talking about taking organs out of innocent little creatures that are created in God's image, as we all are, Mr. Speaker. That was video number one.

It should have shocked us to our core to see the attitude, but it didn't confirm decisively what was actually going on. It implied—and it was fairly strong evidence—but it didn't confirm.

The second video was the older lady sitting in a different restaurant, chatting along about how a transaction would be to harvest kidneys and lungs and livers and hearts and brains and body parts from innocent babies who just wanted a chance to live and love and laugh and learn; to worship, to grow, to enjoy life—to enjoy that first right, that right to life that comes before the right to liberty, which comes before the right to the pursuit of happiness, as our Founding Fathers prioritized those rights in the Declaration of Independence, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1915

That lady, in the second video, wanted enough out of that, that she—I will use that word again—''cavalierly'' said: I want a Lamborghini.

I am sure she would say to us: I was just joking.

Well, to joke about that topic in a setting like that, that told me it wasn't just a casual conversation. There was attention being paid to the business deal that was being negotiated, and it didn't seem like it was conclusive, but there was a direction and a course for that conversation.

Now, today, we see a third video, a video interviewing a young woman who has worked in a Planned Parenthood center whose task was to harvest the organs of little babies. The video shows the separation of that, shows the little feet, the little arms, the little hands.

It shows the kidneys; it shows the brain. It shows the pieces of that little baby that was perfect in every way until it was torn apart by the abortionist, using a technique, a methodology that is designed to preserve the most valuable organs so that they can be sold on the market to laboratories and for medical experiments, Mr. Speaker.

When I saw that video today and I saw each of the other two videos when they came out, the first day that one was available, and then I saw one, and I saw the second video as a preview before it came out to the public.

Either one of those, when I was listening to the verbiage, certainly told me that there is an evil, evil element within Planned Parenthood, a cavalier attitude, a ''this is the business we do'' attitude; not a human compassion was exposed in either one of those first two videos.

I have been in a lot of debates about abortion. I have read a lot of material about it. I have listened to a lot of testimony about it. Sitting on the Judiciary Committee, we moved legislation that put an end to partial-birth abortion or at least attempted to, and so we have had a lot of life-and-death debates in the Judiciary Committee here in the House of Representatives.

When I saw the video of the young woman talking about the task that she was given, pick up these forceps and begin to separate these organs and sort them out, and these are good, and the lab will take that, and essentially, These will bring good money, let's make sure we protect them, it sickened me.

It caused my gut to knot up, Mr. Speaker, in a way that reminded me of the first time I walked into a funeral home to see the dead body of a loved one. That is an experience in anybody's lifetime that you remember. Seeing this video is an experience that I will remember.

As I watch this Congress and I think how Congress is reacting, I am glad that there are investigations going on. I am glad that the Speaker has spoken up on this issue. I am glad that there is a pro-life movement in this country.

I am glad that there are people that are protesting and there are people that are making their positions known to the Supreme Court, to the United States Congress, to the President of the United States.

However intransigent the President will be on this, this is a subject that should have the immediate attention of the Department of Justice. This would be something that Loretta Lynch should be on now, should be conducting an investigation now, should be bringing about the evidence and preparing a prosecution against the people that have, essentially, admitted in the videos that they have committed a crime, perhaps multiple crimes.

This isn't about there is a piece or there is an argument on one side versus an argument on the other side.

Planned Parenthood says: Well, we don't do it for a profit. We just do this to get our money back out of the costs we have to preserve these organs and pass them along. After all, this poor mother is just making a contribution to science, and so we should appreciate that.

That is not what the Congress thought when they passed the laws against trading in little, unborn baby body parts, Mr. Speaker. It is about the law, and the law says thou shall not do such a thing.

No amount of excusing away; no amount of trying to explain that it was with a positive motive, instead of a profit motive; no amount of saying that, Well, that is just our costs, and we are recovering our cost; no amount of saying that the money that comes from the taxpayer into the pockets of Planned Parenthood doesn't ever go to abortion because it will be said now, hundreds of times, Mr. Speaker, in fact, thousands of times, it will be said: Money is fungible. Money is fungible. Money is fungible.

If you dump a half a billion dollars into Planned Parenthood's coffers—that is out of the pockets of the taxpayers. We hand them the debt, borrow the money from the Chinese, hand it over to Planned Parenthood, and Planned Parenthood then uses that to run their operation to free up some of their other operations that end up being what they call an operation, which is an abortion, that is snuffing out the lives—we are closing in on 60 million little babies since Roe v. Wade in 1973, closing in on 60 million.

At the same time, we have people that are arguing that we need to open up our borders and let an unlimited number of people come into America because our birthrate is not high enough to replace the people that are dying off as they reach the end of their life.

Rather than to say let's bring every one of these babies to birth, give them an opportunity to fill their lungs full of free air, give them an opportunity to live, to love, to learn, to laugh, give them an opportunity to contribute to this country, to this society, rather than do that, we abort the babies and bring in people from another culture and think we are making America a better place, when we have the sin of up to 60 million abortions on our country, on our heads, on our conscience, on our Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker, and on this Congress, to a degree, the House and Senate, and certainly on the President of the United States, who said he—and I will leave his family out of it, Mr. Speaker, but I think some know the thought that crossed my mind.

It is time for this Congress to step up to defund Planned Parenthood. I won't be satisfied with just a moratorium of waiting around for a year while we study this situation and put together maybe a select committee that can look at it for a while longer and hold some hearings in Congress. They are going to look at the videos and listen to the testimony on both sides.

All that does, Mr. Speaker, is give Planned Parenthood an opportunity to spend some of those millions of dollars, some percentage of the half a billion dollars that we send to them out of the taxpayers' pocket, borrowed from the Chinese, and indebted onto the children that are born, to lobby this Congress to tell us: Well, there is really some good there at Planned Parenthood after all, and so we should continue to fund them.

That is what we are faced with, Mr. Speaker.

The object is this: Shut off all funding to Planned Parenthood; they should not receive one dime of taxpayer dollars further.

There has been a strong movement on this over the years since the time I have been here, and the States want to move, too, Mr. Speaker. The States want to shut off funding to Planned Parenthood.

They are afraid that Congress, or the President of the United States, through one of his executive edicts, will order that the funding going to a State that would cut off the funding to Planned Parenthood would be cut off itself, that their Medicaid money might be stopped by this administration if a State would deign to cut off funding and no longer subsidize Planned Parenthood.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress needs to deal with this. We need to give the States all authority to cut off any funds, in the discretion of their own legislature and Governors, any funds that go to any organization that provides abortion. They will call it services or counseling.

If we do that, then we can restore a component of the culture of life in this country. If we do that, we begin to respect and appreciate innocent, unborn human life, we will see families that will grow. We will see children that are cherished. We will see more and more foundation of education and faith and wholesomeness in our country.

If we turn our backs on those innocent, unborn, little babies that are being systematically aborted, while we are subsidizing Planned Parenthood with borrowed tax dollars, under the guise of somehow they do some good, this is evil, Mr. Speaker. What is happening to these innocent babies and what is happening to the mothers is evil, and it is evil for profit. It is on video, and we have seen three of these videos, Mr. Speaker. We are not done yet.

This Congress should not just pledge to study this for a year. This Congress—and we go forward with funding for the fiscal year, next fiscal year, we have got the witching hour, September 30, at midnight.

It is likely to come as a continuing resolution. That continuing resolution has to have in it the language that will cut off the funding to Planned Parenthood. I will cut it off to any organization that provides abortion, as they say, services or counseling.

That subject is on the front of my mind, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to get that off of my chest.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. KING of Iowa. The next piece that I want to talk about is our national security. As we are watching presidential debates unfold—and our 16 or so candidates that are announced for President of the United States, I am grateful for every one of them.

I have never seen such a field of candidates that step up and want to serve this country from the Oval Office, the high quality of the character and the integrity that they have, the varied experience, and the success that they have demonstrated in their lives. There have been a lot of easier times to win the Republican nomination than there is now, Mr. Speaker.

As I look at the candidates that are out there—and I have been tuning my ear, encouraging them—I have yet to hear any of the candidates deliver a compact, inclusive approach to how to defeat Islamic jihad.

I listen to them speak, and I like the components that I hear from them. One of them says: We win; they lose.

I like that; but how are we going to do that? We need a strategy.

One of them says: If you attack us, we will kill you.

Okay. Well, let's kill them first. That is fine with me. They have declared war on us.

ISIS, for example, has established a caliphate. They declare it to be a caliphate. It is a caliphate. In northern Syria and in north and western Iraq, that real estate that they control is a caliphate, and they threaten all of the rest of the region, and they threaten us. They say that their black flag is going to fly over the White House. Well, some would say that will be a cold day, Mr. Speaker.

We have seen some dramatic changes in history over the last few years. I would say to the United States: We need to step up to this. We need to recognize our enemy. We need to defeat our enemies.

Our enemies are Islamic jihad, and Islamic jihad is comprised of the element within Islam that believes that their path to salvation is in killing us and that they can bring out some kind of worldwide revolution where, in the end, it will just be the purest of the pure of Islamists that are left on the planet. They will have killed everybody else; and all, whoever is left, must knuckle down to sharia law.

We need to defeat the ideology, Mr. Speaker, and when I say defeat the ideology, and I am speaking to a group of people, I will often see that look on their face, such as: Why do you think you can defeat an ideology? You can't defeat an ideology. You can't change a culture. You can't defeat ideology.

I recall one of those rebuttals that came to me, and I said, tell that to the Japanese. In fact, in World War II, in a 3½ year period of time, this country, with our allies, very powerfully, this country defeated three ideologies: the ideology of Japanese imperialism, the ideology of Italian fascism, and the ideology of German nazism.

All three of those ideologies went down in flames in a 3½ year period of time, in the face of—I will say this, Mr. Speaker—the superior culture.

The Western civilization, a superior culture that has a robust free enterprise, that has people that volunteer to engage in the economy, into the military, that reach out and pull each other up the ladder.

This robust United States of America, coupled with our allies, reaching across the map of Western civilization, rose up, rose up and defeated three ideologies in a 3½ year period of time in the Second World War; and then it took on a fourth ideology, which was the Russian version of communism. That took about 45 years. They were a little more tenacious.

It was not then just a kinetic operation. It wasn't just going up in flames. I am grateful that it wasn't. Instead, it was the economic and then political collapse of the Soviet Union brought about this way.

□ 2030

Ronald Reagan saw this. Margaret Thatcher saw it. Margaret Thatcher went to Ronald Reagan and said: With Mikhail Gorbachev, I have found a man with whom we can do business.

I don't quite understand the motive of Gorbachev, and he seems to have a little bit of revisionist history that comes out of him from time to time.

But I also know that Pope John Paul II traveled throughout areas of Europe and went into Poland and told them do not despair because they could be a free people.

The forces of the ideology of western civilization, western Christendom, as Churchill described it in his speech in Fulton, Missouri, are the forces that stood up against Russian communism.

In about 1984, when Jeane Kirkpatrick stepped down as Ambassador to the United Nations under Reagan, she made a statement upon her departure which was this.

She said: What is going on in this cold war—and that was near the height of the cold war—what is going on is Monopoly and chess on the same board. The United States and the Soviet Union are playing chess and Monopoly on the same board. It is just that the only question is: Will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before the Soviet Union checkmates the United States militarily?

That was the question. It was succinctly put. And I believe that will also show up on her Wikipedia page, but I happened to find it in the Des Moines Register back in that year, 1984.

Jeane Kirkpatrick was right. Five years later the Soviet Union imploded. On November 9 the wall went down in Berlin, and that was a symbol. Actually, I will say literally the Iron Curtain came crashing down throughout

Berlin and the Iron Curtain all across Europe went crashing down.

People flowed freely back and forth. The free world had defeated the ideology of communism that was the Soviet version of it. For a time, freedom echoed all the way across Eastern Europe all the way to the Pacific Ocean. And it can be restored again, Mr. Speaker.

That is the foundation that we have that we work with. We are the people that—because of free enterprise, because we have idea people with good educations and a solid moral foundation and a good work ethic, this country has generated more patents than anybody else, created more inventions than anyone else, but cooperated with especially the western world and with the creativity that we have.

We have been able to rise up against ideology after ideology, defeat three of them during World War II and defeat Soviet communism in a 45-year period of the cold war.

Now we are faced with another ideology that rises up to challenges: Islamic jihad. If you go back to the time of Mohammed, about the last 20 years of his life and for 100 years after his death, there was a conquest going on of—shall I call them religious conversions by the sword? And, as the conquest was going on, Islam was invading and occupying most of the known world at the time.

By 732 AD, Mr. Speaker, the Islamists were outside the city of Tours in France when Charles Martel brought his infantry into the trees to face the cavalry charge of the Islamists.

And cavalries don't operate very well in the forest, Mr. Speaker, and that is how the Charles Martel, Charles The Hammer's infantry defeated them there and chased them out of Tours and across the plains and left their bones scattered a long ways back towards Spain. That was 732 AD.

And you can fast-forward again and again to catch some of the milestones: In 1571, the battle of Lepanto where an Islamist navy was sunk by the Holy League navy that went to meet them in the Aegean Sea.

You can go to 1683, when Vienna was surrounded by Islamists of the time. On July 14, they surrounded Vienna, and for more than 2 months—they besieged Vienna for roughly 2 months.

And then, on September 11, the three German infantries under three German kings and Jan Sobieski, the Polish king, brought his cavalry, they held a service at Kahlenberg Church, which was razed. It was in ruins at the hands of the Islamists.

But they held a service there in the evening of September 11 and prayed for God's deliverance of their battle the next day that it already enjoined on September 11 and the deliverance of Vienna, which happened, as in the famous battle of Vienna, September 11 and 12, 1683.

It goes on. Then September 11 became the date that lived in infamy for the people who attacked us on September 11, 2001—New York, Pentagon, and Pennsylvania—and then again on September 11, 2012, Benghazi.

That date means something to them. It ought to mean something to us. They have been fighting western civilization for 1,400 years, and they have been adapting themselves to the technology that is created in the western world, creating very little themselves, but borrowing our technology, Mr. Speaker.

And some of that technology that is now being borrowed is the Internet, the Internet that is being used to inspire and to recruit and to direct the Islamists that are attacking Americans and attacking people that are not in alignment with ISIS and with Islamic jihad.

That is the effort that is coming and the ability that they have to use the Internet to coordinate and communicate. They will say as high as 100,000 tweets and emails and communications a day are coming out of ISIS and Islamic jihad in the broader definition of it. As high as 100,000 a day.

We need to bring about warfare against them. And it means not just defensive warfare to protect ourselves, but offensive warfare to attack them through the same medium that they are using to attack us.

So here is the list. It is not just a kinetic war against them, which they have declared against us, the kinetic war.

We need to do cyber warfare, financial warfare, educational warfare against them. We need to build a strong alliance with especially the moderate Muslim countries in the Middle East, those who should be our allies but for being a—let's say given the short end of the stick from our State Department during this administration.

And I am speaking of countries like Egypt; the United Arab Emirates, for example; Jordan, to a lesser degree. But they are natural allies to the United States. They are natural allies. In fact, they are allies to Israel today. They have been attacking our Islamist enemies in that part of the world.

The Egyptians allowed for planes to fly out of there, to fly into Yemen. And the Emirates sent some of their Air Force there. You have seen the Saudis do the same thing.

We can build an alliance in the Middle East with Saudi Arabia, whom I have got slightly less confidence in than I do in Egypt, and in the United Arab Emirates, with Jordan, and, also, working in cooperation with Israel.

When President el-Sisi of Egypt says to me that his relationship with Prime Minister Netanyahu is stronger with Egypt and Israel and President el-Sisi and Prime Minister Netanyahu stronger than it is with the United States, we should be troubled by that, Mr. Speaker.

We should be troubled by a foreign policy that has alienated the Egyptians, that has caused the UAE to wonder: What is America doing? Why are we paving the road to Damascus for our enemies? Why would we consider doing such a thing?

So this strategy, a strategy that I have put into an op-ed in the National Review, which was just published here in the last couple of days, Mr. Speaker, lays out a strategy to conduct cyber warfare, both offensive and defensive, and economic warfare to shut off the funds that are flowing to Islamic jihad wherever they might be flowing from, wherever they might be flowing through, whoever might be doing business with them and thinking they are going to profit.

We have got to turn that the other way. And then we need to shut down and shut off, if we can—and this is the most difficult component of the task—the educational system out there that is teaching this kind of hatred into the next generation. Build alliances with the moderate Muslim countries, as I have said, encourage them.

We need to be arming the Kurds with everything that we can get to the Kurds, everything the Kurds can use. And that doesn't mean send it through Baghdad to get the Baghdad stamp of approval. It means directly to the Kurds along with special operation forces that could be on the ground with the Kurds and call in airstrikes and support the Kurds as one jaw of the vice that will squeeze ISIS in Iraq and in Syria.

The other jaw of the vice is a natural. It is already there. It is Assad. And when those two jaws of the vice to come together and crush ISIS, by that point, we can take a look at Assad and decide how to approach the power that may be left in Syria at that point in time.

This is just a quick list, Mr. Speaker, of a strategy to defeat the ideology of Islamic jihad. The time has come for us to do that.

I want to see a Presidential candidate—or 16 of them, I hope—who can articulate a vision to bring about the defeat of this enemy that has been bringing battle against western civilization for 1,400 years, that targets the United States of America as the great Satan and the center of their efforts. They would like to destroy all of the United States of America.

And while this is going on, we have got a treaty proposal from the President of the United States with Iran. In the spring or summer of 2008, as a candidate, he said to Iran: Mr. Ahmadinejad, if you will unclench your fist, we will extend our hand. I would remind the public of that, Mr. Speaker.

Because that fist is still clenched in Iran. And the President is poised to hand over $150 billion to the Iranian economy that will juice that economy up.

It will allow them to bring conventional weaponry to bear. It will allow them to fund more Hezbollah. It will allow them to continue to develop the most recent version of centrifuges.

And even if they comply, in 10 years, the situation is set up where, rather than one weapon, it is 100 weapons, ICBMs sticking out of the sand in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker.

There is much to be done for this western civilization. We need to strengthen our culture. We need to believe in who we are. We need to sort the best things out of what we are and strengthen them. We need to cull out the weaknesses that we have. And we need a leader whom God will use to restore the soul of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending the funeral services for U.S. Navy Petty Officer 2nd Class Randall Smith.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 27 and today on account of official business.

Mr. LEVIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of official business at Trans Pacific Trade Partnership.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 876. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1482. An act to improve and reauthorize provisions relating to the application of the antitrust laws to the award of need-based educational aid.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 29, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2308. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Captain John W. Korka to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2309. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Law and Policy, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — 2013 Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Rule Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) and Amendments; Delay of Effective Date [Docket No.: CFPB-2015-0029) (RIN: 3170-AA48) received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2310. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Maine: Alna, Town of Lincoln County [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8387] received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2311. A letter from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Imposition of Special Measure against FBME Bank Ltd., formerly known as the Federal Bank of the Middle East Ltd., as a Financial Institution of Primary Money Laundering Concern (RIN: 1506-AB27) received July 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2312. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Performance Standards for Ionizing Radiation Emitting Products; Fluoroscopic Equipment; Correction; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-0828] received July 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2313. A letter from the General Counsel, Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Removal of Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board Regulations received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2314. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 140117052-4402-02] (RIN: 0648-XD985) received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2315. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting draft legislation entitled ''Federal District Judgeship Act of 2015''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2316. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Update to NFPA Standards, Incorporation by Reference (RIN: 2900-AO90) received July 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2317. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Attorney General's Third Quarterly Report of FY 2015 on the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994, pursuant to the Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110-389); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

(Omitted from the Record of July 27, 2015)

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1656. A bill to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas; with an amendment (Rept. 114–231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state or the Union.

(Filed on July 28, 2015)

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 455. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a northern border threat analysis, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2786. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to submit a report on cross-border rail security, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 388. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3236) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–234). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 3231. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 3232. A bill to protect unpaid interns from workplace harassment and discrimination; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 3233. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to protect unpaid interns in the legislative branch from

workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 3234. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs an Office of Failing Medical Center Recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3235. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to make grants to States for screening and treatment for maternal depression; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 3236. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, Education and the Workforce, the Budget, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3237. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to award grants for municipal solid waste prevention and recycling program development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 3238. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 3239. A bill to provide enhanced security at Armed Forces recruitment centers through the installation of reinforced bulletproof glass and entry doors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 3240. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a plan for the purchase and installation of an earthquake early warning system for the Cascadia Subduction Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 3241. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to authorize the establishment of, and provide support for, State-based universal health care systems that provide comprehensive health benefits to State residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 3242. A bill to require special packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 3243. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. REED, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 3244. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a pilot program to improve care for the most costly Medicare fee-for-service beneficiaries through the use of comprehensive and effective care management while reducing costs to the Federal Government for these beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 3245. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from contracting with entities that donate or match employee donations to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3246. A bill to provide for the temporary use of Veterans Choice Funds for certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3247. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to exempt covered heavy-duty tow and recovery vehicles from certain weight limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 3248. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out a pilot program on issuing grants to eligible veterans to start or acquire qualifying businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 3249. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Pat Harrison Waterway District approximately 8,307 acres of National Forest System land within the Bienville National Forests in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3250. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the abuse of dextromethorphan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 3251. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude coverage of advance care planning services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3252. A bill to provide grants to eligible entities to develop and maintain or improve and expand before school, afterschool, and summer school programs for Indian and Alaska Native students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3253. A bill to establish procedures for the expedited consideration by Congress of the recommendations set forth in the Cuts, Consolidations, and Savings report prepared by the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 3254. A bill to amend the Dale Long Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2012 to change the retroactive application of the Act to cover injuries sustained by rescue squad or ambulance crew members on or after December 1, 2007, rather than June 1, 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 3255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain amounts realized on the disposition of property raised or produced by a student farmer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. LONG, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PALMER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. CULBERSON):

H.R. 3256. A bill to require each agency to repeal or revise 1 or more existing regulations before issuing a new regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COOK, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3257. A bill to amend section 6906 of title 31, United States Code, to provide funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program for an additional five years, to provide a five-year extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for

a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 3258. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish a scholarship program for dislocated workers or unemployed individuals transitioning into manufacturing employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3259. A bill to grant authority to the President to detain non-diplomatic officials of the Government of Iran in the United States and non-diplomatic officials of the Government of Iran in certain other countries until all United States citizens held by the Government of Iran are released and returned to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 3260. A bill to require all newly constructed, federally assisted, single-family houses and town houses to meet minimum standards of visitability for persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3261. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful benefit and lower prescription drug prices under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 3262. A bill to provide for the conveyance of land of the Illiana Health Care System of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Danville, Illinois; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3263. A bill to make innovative technology loan guarantee support available for battery storage technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the Saver's credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3265. A bill to simplify the process for determining the need and eligibility of students for financial assistance under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 3266. A bill to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3267. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of payroll and self-employment taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARR, Mr. JONES, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MICA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. VELA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YODER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SALMON, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. MENG, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HANNA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TURNER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 3268. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3269. A bill to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3270. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt Indian tribes from compensatory mitigation requirements in connection with certain discharges of dredged or fill material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3271. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to allow preservation leasing as a form of compensatory mitigation for discharges of dredged or fill material affecting State or Indian land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. POCAN):

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the upgrading of Malaysia on the 2015 Trafficking In Persons report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BLUM, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DENT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the 25th anniversary of the date of enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H. Res. 385. A resolution declaring the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives vacant; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 386. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the availability of high-quality child care for working parents should be increased; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 387. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. HANNA):

H. Res. 389. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to lower the threshold at which the gross budgetary effect of a piece of legislation requires the cost estimates provided for the legislation to incorporate macroeconomic variables resulting from the legislation, and to require the cost estimates provided for appropriation bills and joint resolutions to incorporate such variables; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DENT, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. FATTAH):

H. Res. 390. A resolution recognizing July 28, 2015, as ''World Hepatitis Day''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 391. A resolution expressing support for designation of August 22, 2015, as national ''Chuck Brown Day'' and honoring his contributions to music and to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HUNTER introduced a bill (H.R. 3272) for the relief of Myles Newlove; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 3234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Consitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 3236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (related to laying and collecting Taxes, and providing for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes), and Clause 7 (related to establishment of Post Offices and Post Roads).

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 3238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 3239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United Sates, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 3240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 3241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 3242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and cluase 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for the carrying out of the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to the Medicare program under Title 18 of the Social Security Act.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 3245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 states that: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, and to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

Article 1, Section 9 states that: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations by Law.''

These two clauses provide Congress with the ''power of the purse.'' Congress has the Constitutional authority regarding authorizing and appropriating Federal spending on Federal government contracts.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, this legislation is authorized by Congress' power to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 3247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 7 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 3249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Property Regulation, Federal

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 3251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and power for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and power for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 3254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare Clause)—the Congress shall have Power to law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the Common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)—the Congress shall have Power . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 3255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 3256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8, 18 To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 3258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 3262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 3268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 3272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which provides Congress the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 93: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 132: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 169: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 188: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 220: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 223: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 228: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 244: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 275: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 303: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 320: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 333: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 348: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 366: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 407: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 425: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 456: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 478: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 525: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 556: Mr. WALZ and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 578: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 592: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 624: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 699: Ms. BASS and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 702: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 757: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 765: Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 785: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 793: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 800: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 816: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 836: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 842: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 845: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 868: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 875: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 902: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 916: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. KEATING, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 940: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 961: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 969: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 994: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 997: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1061: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1062: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1086: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1100: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1133: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1150: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1188: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1199: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1210: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1217: Mr. DONOVAN and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1220: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1270: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1286: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1301: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1312: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1340: Mr. KATKO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1347: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1354: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1371: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1384: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1391: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1401: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1434: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1439: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1475: Ms. ESTY and Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 1479: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1490: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1505: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1552: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1553: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1559: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1603: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1608: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1610: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 1624: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1671: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1686: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1706: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1718: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1728: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1737: Mr. PITTENGER and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1748: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1786: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1814: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1854: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1877: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1899: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1902: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1904: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1905: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1934: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2017: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2050: Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. JOYCE, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2058: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2061: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 2067: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2071: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2072: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2096: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2101: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2102: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2132: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2156: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 2180: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2216: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2217: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2241: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2254: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2258: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2259: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 2285: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2287: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2315: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2327: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2336: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2342: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 2369: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2400: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2404: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2410: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2412: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2450: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2460: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2494: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2510: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2514: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 2521: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2535: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2536: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2602: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2622: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2624: Mr. HASTINGS and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2638: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2646: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENT, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 2653: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2661: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2675: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2680: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2689: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2698: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 2711: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2713: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 2715: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2721: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2739: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 2742: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2752: Mr. DOLD, Mr. KIND, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2769: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 2775: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2799: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2802: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 2817: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2820: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HUDSON, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2823: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2849: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2863: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2873: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2875: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2892: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2894: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2896: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2903: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2922: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 2942: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2944: Mr. GUINTA and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2948: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2972: Mrs. BEATTY and Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2978: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2999: Mr. COSTA and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3011: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3029: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3037: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 3040: Mr. NEAL and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3041: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3052: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 3064: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3068: Mr. NOLAN and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3095: Mr. YOHO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3106: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3110: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 3115: Mr. WALKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. JONES, Mr. PALMER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIGELL, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 3120: Mr. TROTT, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3126: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 3129: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3132: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3134: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3136: Mr. RUSSELL.
H.R. 3137: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3139: Mr. KLINE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3150: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3151: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 3155: Mr. POLIS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3156: Mr. POLIS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. MOORE, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 3158: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3163: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3165: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3183: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 3184: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3185: Mr. KIND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3188: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 3189: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3190: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3193: Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3197: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3209: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3221: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. NEAL.
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.J. Res. 59: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. WOODALL.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H. Res. 15: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FARR.
H. Res. 24: Mr. NORCROSS.
H. Res. 28: Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 56: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H. Res. 110: Mr. COOPER.
H. Res. 130: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 230: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. Res. 263: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 265: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 289: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 290: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 294: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H. Res. 318: Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 327: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. VEASEY.
H. Res. 339: Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 348: Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 354: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Res. 367: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 368: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 374: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H. Res. 378: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H. Res. 383: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROSS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. VEASEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 or rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. BENISHEK

My amendment to be offered to H.R. 1994, the VA Accountability Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 3236, the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.R. 3236 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 3236 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. MILLER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Veterans Affairs in H.R. 3236 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. PRICE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 3236, the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3236, the ''Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

H.R. 3236, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 3236, the ''Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 3236 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2015 No. 120

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Most gracious God, we rejoice in the visible manifestation of Your love. You save us from ourselves, opening to us paths of deliverance from narcissistic detours. When we go astray, You see and save us. You came to our world to free us from sin's shackles, providing us with the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Great and marvelous is Your love.

Lord, permit our Senators this day to reflect Your love. Use them to bring Your light and truth to our Nation and world. May they do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with You. Inspire them to dwell so fully in the mystery of Your heavenly love that they will love others as You have first loved them.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. today to allow for the weekly conference meetings; further, that the time during the recess count postcloture on the McConnell amendment No. 2266, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate continues to move closer and closer to passage of a bipartisan, multiyear highway bill. The legislation we advanced again last night is fiscally responsible. It will not raise taxes by a penny. It will give State and local governments the kind of stability they need to plan longer term projects for America's roads and bridges.

The bill couldn't have advanced as far as it has already without a lot of very hard work from a lot of dedicated Members. I want to thank each of them. Doing the right thing for the American people has meant taking some bruises. But the American people sent us here to do some challenging things. They deserve our best efforts on their behalf. I am proud to see the Senate continue along this difficult but promising road.

Success was never assured at the beginning of this process. It wasn't assured even yesterday, and we are not done yet. The important thing is that the Senate is now on the verge of passing a multiyear highway bill. The Senate is now positioned to pass another important piece of legislation for the American people. With cooperation, the Senate may still be able to consider more germane ideas to improve the bill even further. But the bottom line is this: If Republicans and Democrats resolve to keep working hard for the American people, we will get this done.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

BLACK WOMEN'S EQUAL PAY DAY

Mr. REID. Madam President, in the western part of the United States, it is now 8:05 in the morning. I am sure as one of these young girls is rushing to go out to school—let's assume she is an African-American girl—she is telling her mother, her dad or her teacher what she wants to be when she grows up. Maybe she wants to be a veterinarian, a teacher, a nurse, maybe even President of the United States or maybe run some company.

The little girl is going to be shocked if her parents said: You can do it—any of those jobs—but remember that you will have to work twice as hard—at least twice as hard—to earn the same amount of money that your male colleagues do or your brother does or Billy, the neighbor, does. How would that little girl respond? She would probably exclaim: That is not fair. She would be right. It isn't fair. It is an injustice.

Earlier this spring—April 14 to be exact—we recognized Equal Pay Day, marking how far into this year the average woman has to work to earn what a man, for the exact same job, earned last year. This pay disparity between men and women doing the same work is known as the wage gap. On average, an American woman makes 77 cents for every dollar that their male colleague makes for doing the exact same work. As bad as that is, the wage gap is even much worse if you are a woman of color.

Today is Black Women's Equal Pay Day, a day that symbolizes how far into 2015 African-American women must work to earn what their male counterparts earned in 2014. What this means is she worked all of last year and now up until this day to basically

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

Printed on recycled paper.

earn the same that her male counterpart did.

Let's think about that for just a second. A woman must work a full year plus an additional 6 months and 28 days just to make what her male coworkers made in 1 year. That is 208 days more than a man must work for the exact same salary.

The average African-American woman working full time year-round will make 64 cents for every dollar that her White male counterpart makes. It is unconscionable that in the 21st century we have not resolved this income disparity.

For millions of African-American women struggling to make ends meet to put food on the table, the wage gap puts the American dream out of reach. To give these women a fair shot—an equal shot—at prosperity, Congress must take action.

We have to ensure that all women, African American and otherwise, are empowered to ensure that they are receiving equal pay for equal work. But that is not all. We should raise the minimum wage.

I could do a quiz in this room, and I think everyone would miss it by quite a long mark, of how many Black women are earning minimum wage, what percentage of Black women are earning minimum wage in this country. Of 100 percent of people earning the minimum wage, what percentage is Black women? Almost 25 percent. Black women are almost 25 percent of everyone drawing the minimum wage. To be exact, it is a little over 23 percent.

An increase in the Federal minimum wage would mean more money for their families. It would be maybe to buy groceries or for an extra pair of shoes for their children—or a pair of shoes for their children—or maybe to help with their education in some way, and importantly, for more time to spend at home.

No woman should make less money than a man doing the same exact work. African-American women deserve better. So do my daughters and my granddaughters. That is why I remain committed to ensuring that American women receive equal pay for equal work.

I encourage all Republicans, especially the leader, to take up Senator MURRAY's Paycheck Fairness Act, which would help close the wage disparity for African-American women.

That may be a tall order to expect from today's Senate Republicans. After all, five times in 5 years, Republicans have blocked equal pay for women. How? By filibustering. Five times in 5 years Republicans have told their very own sisters, daughters, and wives that they are not interested in fixing this income disparity. It is unfair. I can't understand it.

Who here can explain the concept of pay inequality to their daughter or granddaughter without shuddering? How do you tell a little girl—a little girl with big dreams—that in America today her life's work will not be compensated like a man's. It is not right. It is not fair.

Today, as we recognize Black Women's Equal Pay Day, I hope my Republican colleagues will finally understand that it is unfair to continue the way we are, and we should finally come to our senses. I hope that the Republican leader will make the necessary moves to allow us to address this injustice that hurts millions of American families. Twenty-three percent of people drawing the minimum wage are African-American women. All women deserve equal pay for equal work.

Would the Chair be good enough to tell the Senate what the business of the day is.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 22, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 22) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

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

McConnell amendment No. 2421 (to amendment No. 2266), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell (for Inhofe) amendment No. 2533 (to amendment No. 2421), relating to Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

McConnell amendment No. 2417 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2266), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2418 (to amendment No. 2417), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the business before the Senate is the construction of highways and bridges and the operation of mass transit and buses across America. How important is that to our economy? I know in my home State it is critically important, but I think it is important across the Nation.

Our infrastructure, our roads, and bridges are critical for business to operate profitably and for people to have good-paying jobs. We all know the tragedies that occur when bridges collapse or are closed, and we know that thousands across this country need repair.

When it comes to mass transit, come on down to the Loop in Chicago in the morning and stand with me and watch the folks streaming out of the train stations and off the CTA and off the buses, headed to work every day. It is essential to the economy of Chicago and Illinois, the State I represent.

The fact is that on Friday the authorization to build these highways and bridges and maintain mass transit and buses expires. It is the 33rd short-term extension of the highway trust fund—the 33rd. There was a time when we would pass with regularity and predictability a 5- or 6-year highway bill on a bipartisan basis, and we are anxious to do it.

There was a time when Members of the House and Senate knew the needs back home and knew that the Federal Government played a critical role in filling those needs, and so they voted for the highway trust fund reauthorization.

In my State of Illinois, 80 percent of the highway construction is paid for by the Federal Government. When the Federal Government stops paying, folks stop working. You have seen it; haven't you—the potholes, the highways that aren't finished? You wonder why in the heck did they put all those blockades up and slow down the traffic and nobody is working.

The problem has to do with the way we are currently funding our highway program. We are doing it in bits and pieces. My colleague and friend from California, Senator BOXER, draws a pretty interesting analogy. She said that if you were setting out to buy a home and went to the bank, and the bank said that, of course, we will offer you a mortgage, and here is a 60-day mortgage to buy your home, you would say: Wait a minute; I am not going to make an investment such as buying a home if I can only get a loan for 60 days. That is what has happened to the highway trust fund. The expiration of this temporary authorization on Friday is the end of a 60-day mortgage which we have offered to America to build highways.

Well, several Members of the Senate decided to do something unique—not totally unique but unusual, let's say—to try to find a bipartisan compromise that can move this country forward, try to break through some of the rhetoric and debate on the highway trust fund and find something that works.

I wish to especially salute Senator BARBARA BOXER of California for leading this effort on the Democratic side and joining with Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, the Republican majority leader, and Senator INHOFE from Oklahoma, who is the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

This is indeed an odd couple, BARBARA BOXER and MITCH MCCONNELL, but they have come up with a plan—a compromise—to solve a problem.

When I go home to Illinois, what I hear over and over from the people I represent is, Senator, when are you folks in Washington going to stop squabbling? When are you going to stop fighting? Can you basically sit down and reach an agreement to solve a

problem we face? That is what Senator BOXER and Senator MCCONNELL have done, and I have joined in the effort. Here is what they are proposing: Instead of a 60-day extension of the trust fund, it would be a 3-year extension. Six years of authorization but 3 years where the money is on the table. I wish it was longer, but at this point I will jump at that. It has been more than 10 years since we have had a highway bill that long. So it is for 3 years. There is a modest growth each year in spending. I wish it was more. It ultimately is going to give the resources back to the States and localities so they can start building the infrastructure America needs to be successful and to compete.

We have worked long and hard on it. It is controversial. It has divided caucuses. There are 46 Democrats in the Senate and 21 of us voted last night to move forward on this bill. So even within our ranks, there is a difference of opinion. I am glad the Senator from California is here to keep me on my toes. She said 22 Democrats last night voted to move forward. I wish all of them were on board, but some of them have their own legitimate concerns for not being there.

The point I am getting to is that when it came to the necessary vote, we needed 60; we had 62. I have to check with Senator BOXER to make sure I am correct. There were 62 votes to move forward and 22 were Democrats. We stepped up and made the difference to help move this process forward.

So here we are. We are close to the finish line. We are not quite there. Because of the procedures of the Senate, we can't do it as quickly as we would like because we have to follow the rules. The rules tell us we are likely to get this wrapped up perhaps tomorrow—I hope as soon as tomorrow—and then we say thank goodness. With a Friday deadline, we will get something done this week before we go home for the August recess. I would say from the Senate point of view, that is exactly right. It means I can say to not only the mayors back home but also to the Governor, the contractors, the workers: OK. Here are the resources to move forward for 3 years. I can also say we have done what we were sent to do, to solve a problem and to do it on a bipartisan basis.

There is a problem. The problem we have is that Senate action alone is not enough. We need the House of Representatives to take the same action. There was an announcement yesterday from a Congressman from California that the House is not going to take up this measure. They want to go home. They want to start their August recess earlier than any other August recess has been started in 10 years. They want to leave. The Republican majority has decided they don't want to take up this bill; they just want to leave, and that is truly unfortunate.

This is our chance to solve a problem for America on a bipartisan basis. This is our chance to invest in our country and put people to work building roads and bridges and expanding mass transit, buying the buses we need to serve our communities. This is our chance. Yet what we hear from the Republican side in the House of Representatives is, Sorry, we are going home. We will see you in September.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Rhode Island for a question.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The Senator from Illinois has just said the House is planning to bug out this week before the Friday deadline when the highway trust fund collapses for the August recess.

May I ask the Senator from Illinois, through the Chair, the following question: Is it even August? Isn't it July 28 today?

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to take judicial notice that according to the Calendar of Business, it is still July; Tuesday, July 28, 2015.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. In the past, have we not worked into the early week or weeks of August before taking the so-called August recess?

Mr. DURBIN. For the past 10 years, the August recess has started in August. The House of Representatives wishes to start it in July.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. And Friday is when the funding for our highways comes to an end. It appears to be the intention of the House to have gotten out of Dodge by then in order to, I guess, dodge any consequence for not having met us on bipartisan terms with a bipartisan 6-year bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Apparently, they need a rest and they want to go home for that purpose, but I wish they would stay and finish this business before they go.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Of course. I yield to the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I would observe, after just walking in, that we are talking about the actions that have not been taken formally but that several Members of the House have talked about—we are going to bail out of here.

My feeling is this—and I am asking a question through the Chair if the Senator from Illinois would agree with my observation. One of the reasons I think those statements have been made in the House is because they never believed we were going to be able pass a 6-year highway reauthorization bill in the Senate.

Now, once that realization is there—and I am going to make an appeal to whoever is trying to string out this debate to shorten the time so we can have the vote that is pending right now take place and get on with the last and final vote, so we would actually have that ready while the House is still in session. They could very well take it up at that time.

Now, if the individuals have placed themselves in a corner so that is not going to happen, I don't know. But is it worth a try? That is my question.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, through the Chair, let me respond to my colleague from Oklahoma, to first thank him for his bipartisan leadership on the committee. He and Senator BOXER are an outstanding example of bipartisanship when it comes to this issue. They have produced a 6-year authorization, and though I may not agree with some of the particulars, I thank him for that leadership on his side on a bipartisan basis.

As far as the efforts of the Senator from Oklahoma to speed up the vote in the Senate so we can catch our House colleagues before they leave, I would support it completely, but the Senator from Oklahoma and I both know that any single Senator can divert and stop that effort. I will support the Senator in bringing this forward as quickly as possible.

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate that. The only other question I have is the second part that I will ask. There is time to do this. I am going to personally make every effort—and I think Senator BOXER shares my anxiety over getting this bill into a position so we can vote.

All we have to do is move this up so we are not going to be voting at the expiring time of 4 o'clock in the morning, when that could just as easily be tonight, and that would give us time to allow the House to look at it and perhaps come up with a better judgment than they have expressed so far.

Mr. DURBIN. I would just say through the Chair to the Senator from Oklahoma, we have to appeal to the better angels of our colleagues' nature, and a cooperative effort would be somewhat miraculous but worth a try. I am happy to support him in that effort.

Let me just close and yield the floor to whoever would like to speak. This is a chance to do what America expects us to do. Why were we sent here? Why did we get elected? I am proud to represent Illinois, but I was sent to solve problems, make life better, and create an economy that is growing.

There is nothing more bipartisan and more important than the infrastructure of this country. If people wonder about that, go visit China and look at what is going on there. There are building cranes in every direction. Highway and train routes are being built in every direction because they are preparing their Chinese economy for the 21st century. Is America? I don't think so. What we are doing is passing short-term extensions of the highway trust fund. We cannot patch our way to prosperity. We cannot, on a short-term basis, have a long-term plan to build America's economy. Because of the hard work on both sides of the aisle, compromises being made, we are at a point where we can have a 3-year highway bill, and it is time for us to do it, no excuses.

I support what the Senator from Oklahoma said: Let's accelerate this in the Senate, if we can, and then pray that our colleagues in the House decide to hang around long enough to take up this bill, which I believe would be a worthy alternative to another short-term extension.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, will the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. INHOFE. Would the Senator join me in reaching out to try to see if we can get unanimous consent to go ahead and move forward? I know what we are doing is more significant than other things that are going on. If they don't like the bill for some reason, that is one thing, but bring it forward so this can be done. I am inclined to hope we could encourage any of those who are just killing time right now to join us in doing this.

It is my intention to go ahead and make that request, and I will ask if the Senator from Illinois would join me in that effort.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, through the Chair, I would say to my colleague from Oklahoma, let's sit down and put this UC together. Then, the Senator from Oklahoma can take it, as we do by custom, to his cloakroom and I will take it to mine and let's see if we can get this moving forward. I wish to protect the rights of Members, but I think many of them would like to join us in accelerating this process so there is activity on the floor which is productive. I am happy to work with the Senator from Oklahoma.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, let me thank the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oklahoma for their efforts on the floor today. I think this continued progress toward a bipartisan 6-year deal to make sure our highways and bridges are funded and repaired is a very important piece of the work.

I wish to join the Senator from Illinois in saluting the efforts of my ranking member, Senator BOXER, who has worked so hard through the Environment and Public Works Committee to get to a place where we now have a Senate bipartisan compromise for a 6-year bill, with 3 years fully funded, and the prospect for all of our State departments of transportation to be able to take on big projects, knowing that funding is out there.

We are taking up this conversation while our own American Society of Civil Engineers gives our American roads the grade of a D. I don't know about the Presiding Officer, but if my kids came home with a D, I would not be amused and pleased about that. So when our own engineers tell us our roads are a D and our Federal highway program has limped along, 2 months, 6 months—these tiny, little steps forward—and now we have a chance to put a serious slug of money on the table so our departments of transportation can do the work our roads so desperately need, why not go forward with that? Across this country, Americans pay more than $500 a year in car repairs as a result of our terrible roads—so $500 out of their pockets getting their wheels realigned or their tires repaired because they have been banged by potholes and bad roads hurting their vehicles. There is a real pocketbook consequence for Americans if we fail to act.

We have a bipartisan compromise. We should push it forward. What the House is doing is not helpful. I hope, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, my chairman on the Environment and Public Works Committee said, they come up with a better judgment than they have expressed so far. I think that under these circumstances, bugging out and starting the August recess before this problem is solved—indeed, before it is even August—is a pretty serious misjudgment.

So let's hope we can keep after this. We do have strong support for getting this done. Whether it is the American Association of General Contractors, whether it is the National Association of Manufacturers, whether it is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, there are a lot of organizations that customarily support the Republican side that want to get this done. I hope they will be having conversations with Speaker BOEHNER and with Majority Leader MCCARTHY to ask them to have better judgment about what to do in this circumstance, other than to bug out for an August recess before it is even August and leave Americans high and dry without a bipartisan 6-year bill that is being fashioned in the Senate right now.

Again, I wish to express my appreciation to my Ranking Member BARBARA BOXER, who has worked so hard to bring us to this point and our chairman, Senator INHOFE.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise to speak in favor of the DRIVE Act. I was a supporter of this bill from the first vote we had in the last week. There were some changes made immediately that I thought were important. I think this long-term bill is incredibly important to our country's future. Time and again, we have had these short-term extensions, and that is what the House of Representatives is talking about again.

We have an opportunity here. Americans, as we know, can't fix a road in 2 months. In a State such as Minnesota, where we have two seasons, one road construction season and one winter, citizens cannot plan ahead and our State cannot plan ahead when we continue to have these short-term extensions. They also want to do bigger things and better things for transportation in our State, and this funding and this bill will allow them to do that, instead of this Mickey Mouse short-term extension time after time after time.

As we have heard from my colleagues, ranking member Senator BOXER, our chairman, Senator INHOFE, Senator DURBIN, and Senator WHITEHOUSE today, I think it is incredibly important that we move forward with this bill.

This Senator came to this issue in a very tragic way; that is, when a bridge fell down in the middle of a summer day. The anniversary of this bridge collapse is coming up in just a few days. It was a beautiful summer day, rush hour, and there were tons of traffic going over one of the most heavily traveled bridges in our State. This wasn't just a bridge; this was an eight-lane highway. It was something you wouldn't even notice as a bridge because there were so many cars on it. It was the I–35W bridge.

On that day, I was in Washington. I remember trying to call some people in Minnesota. The cell phone services wouldn't work, and I was wondering what was wrong with the cell phone service. What I found about 5 minutes later is that people were calling, panicked about their loved ones because tens of thousands of people were traveling near that bridge that day. In fact, when that bridge collapsed, tragically, 13 people died and dozens of cars were submerged.

Heroes who came to the front that day didn't run away from that bridge. They ran toward it. No one will forget the off-duty firefighter Shanna Hanson, who was going in and out, in and out on a rope tethered to the side of the bridge, trying to get people, trying to find people in the murky water. The fact that 13 people died—tragic as it was—was something of a miracle, given how many people were injured. Over 100 people were injured in the collapse.

A schoolbus sat precariously on the edge of the bridge. A Tasty truckdriver literally veered out so the schoolbus wouldn't go over the edge and ended up tragically dying himself when the truck caught on fire. The schoolbus was labeled the ''miracle bus'' because youth workers on the bus had the presence of mind to take these little kids who were on the bus going out for a summer outing and get them out the back and to safety. That happened. All of that happened on August 1.

As I said that day, a bridge just shouldn't fall down in the middle of America—not an eight-lane highway, not a bridge which is literally 8 blocks from my house and which I drive on every day with my family, with my daughter. That is the bridge that fell down.

So what did we do in Minnesota? In 13 months, we rebuilt that bridge. On a bipartisan basis, just like you see with this bill with the DRIVE Act, we worked together across the aisle. We got the Federal funding, and we rebuilt that bridge, but that is not where the story ends.

Because of what happened, because of the design defect that caused that bridge to fall, in addition to two other issues NHTSA found, which are that there weren't adequate inspections and they also found there were problems with construction guides because there was construction work going on—but the bottom cause was a design defect.

If we had adequate highway funding, adequate inspections, and we were able to go back in and look at bridges, as we did after the fact in Minnesota, and found that others had the same defect and that they had to be replaced—our State put more money into infrastructure, which helped us—I should add for my colleagues in this Chamber that it was one of the major reasons CNBC rated Minnesota as one of the best States to do business in the country, the best State to do business in, followed by Texas, Georgia, and Colorado. Two of the major factors they looked at were the quality of life and infrastructure.

After this collapse occurred, we invested, and that is what this bill is about. It is about making a safer America. As Senator WHITEHOUSE just outlined, our country is getting D's for infrastructure. It is about a safer America. It is about reducing congestion, but it is also about our economy, as shown by what has happened in Minnesota since the bridge collapse. It is about building our economy. When we are building our economy based on exports, we have to have a way to get goods to market. The way you do that is to upgrade railways and upgrade locks and dams, as we did in an earlier bill last year when we updated highways and we updated bridges.

I am very excited about this bill. I love the fact that this leads us to a 21st century transportation system. I love the fact that we were able to get my distracted driving provisions in there, with the help of Senator THUNE, Senator NELSON, and I had worked on them with Senator HOEVEN.

Distracted driving is a major safety risk in this country that we are finally going to be able to find a way to get the money out to the States so it is not just sitting and piling up and going nowhere, so States can start educating people about distracted driving.

There is the work in the bill on graduated driving that I worked on so hard, on licenses as well as drunk driving. There are a lot of good measures in this bill.

Mostly this bill is about the long term. It is about looking at the long-term economy and looking at the long-term safety issues, instead of just putting on a bandaid every 2 months, every 3 months, every 6 months. This is an opportunity that can't be missed.

I ask my colleagues for their strong support. We have strong support for this as well as the Ex-Im Bank. I ask my colleagues across the way in the House to support this bill, do the right thing, and come up with a long-term solution.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a question from the chairman?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask the Senator, How many people were killed in that bridge collapse?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. There were 13 people killed that day.

Mr. INHOFE. Is the Senator aware that around the same time that happened, in my State of Oklahoma, we were in the process of the last long-term bill in 2005. A mother with three children was driving below a bridge in Oklahoma City. Some concrete dropped off and killed the mother. We corrected that in the 2005 bill.

But the question I would ask you is, Why do we wait until people die before this happens? I have a list of bridges that are in need of attention, and later today I will read it for the third time. We can avoid things such as this from happening, but if we don't do something, if we are not going to do it, then large projects cannot be done with short-term extensions. My question is, Why do we wait until death is at our door?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I appreciate that question from the Senator from Oklahoma. I thank the chairman for his work on this bill, for his chairmanship on the committee, and his willingness to work across the aisle on this bill.

I would say this is a major problem. If we do just a short-term extension, then maybe a project gets funded here and there, but we don't do the long-term maintenance, which is never as glamorous as building new projects.

This is about long-term maintenance and work that needs to be done on our existing roads and bridges as well as exciting new opportunities. But when we don't have that kind of clear funding source for our States to see that we have a window, as the Presiding Officer knows with her leadership in the State of Nebraska, you just can't do projects in a State when the funding is not going to be there 3 months later. One is not able to invest in the maintenance and long-term work that needs to be done, and that is why this Senator thanks the chairman and the ranking member, Senator BOXER, for her incredible work on this bill as well because this is about long-term funding for planning, for safety, and also for our economy.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend because she has been such a leader. I was listening to every word she said, as well as Senator INHOFE talking about the mother who was killed because of a bridge collapse. This touches our hearts as family members. Yes, as Senators, but as family members we know those families will never be the same—the family, the children of that mother, the families of those who are grieving the loss of their relatives.

I ask my friend, who was so early on a supporter, is she aware that seven States have either canceled projects or completely shut down their highway and transit spending? Is she aware of that?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Yes, I am.

Mrs. BOXER. I wanted to say that I have a chart here that shows the States that have either canceled or delayed highway projects. These projects are valued at over $1.6 billion. Think about the jobs and the businesses that are suffering. They are in Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Montana, Tennessee, Utah, and Wyoming.

I have a further question. I know my friend has heard me say this. Is my friend aware that the Associated General Contractors of America came out with a new study? They were just in the New York Times stating that because of our, I will use the word ''dithering''—because we haven't come up with the long-term bill, which we are now attempting to do—25 States have lost construction jobs just in the last month. Is my friend aware of this study?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Yes, I have heard of that study, and I think it mimics what we have seen in other studies. If we don't plan ahead, people will start cutting off the work.

Mrs. BOXER. I will just say before I yield that the States that lost construction jobs last month, according to the general contractors, are Alaska, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. I wanted to read those off.

I will talk about that later, but I wish to thank my friend because the point—when she talked about what happened on this bridge, my friend didn't have to read one word of any statement. This was a heartbreaking memory she will always have. We all go through this in our time here, when there are earthquakes, floods, fires, and bridge collapses.

I would ask my friend this last question: Does the Senator think this is important enough that the House should stay an extra week or even a few days to take up our bill, pass it or if they don't like it, amend it, send it back, and let's get this done for the American people.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I say to Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE, I think that is why we are here today, to talk about the fact that we have come together across party lines with people from completely different political ideologies to agree that we need a long-term fix to our transportation problem.

As the Senator mentioned the people, I think sometimes people think about transportation as bricks and mortar or something very esoteric, but it is not; it is about the people who use the system. Senator INHOFE talked about the

people who died in the bridge collapse in his State. There is a memorial for the 13 people who died in our State. I would suggest, if you ever come to the Twin Cities, come and look at it because it shows—as Senator INHOFE knows—everyone uses the roads and bridges. These people came from vastly different backgrounds. They were young people. There was a man who died. He and his wife had just decided they wanted to have a baby. Of all things, after he died, she decided to adopt children by herself, and she decided to adopt them from Haiti. Then the tragedy happened in Haiti, and we actually helped her get these children home. These are people who worked all kinds of different jobs. Some were coming home from work, some were students, some were moms busy in their car. Those are the people who died. They were America. America uses our bridges and roads and trains. We have to remember this is about the people who work construction, this is about the people who use the roads and bridges, and this is about our economy moving forward.

Sometimes we get so into facts and figures and what one House does and what the other House does that we forget why we are spending money on our bridges and our roads and what this means for our future economy.

I thank the leaders of this bill for what they have done, their willingness to take a lot of heat for working across the aisle, for making sure that what we are using to pay for this bill are things that make sense for our country and continue to allow us to move forward, and also for making changes to the bill when other Members had problems with it. That is why they are gaining so much momentum, and I am sure our friends over in the House are looking at this bill. They have examined the pay-fors—they have now had weeks to do that—and they have also looked at the safety provisions and other things in the bill.

So at some point they are going to have the ability to decide if they are for this bill or against it or, as Senator BOXER mentioned, if they want to make some changes. But the key is that we have a good base bill which has brought people together from across the country, from different ideologies, which they can use and look at. If they just want to do another one of these short-term fixes—it is never going to get us where we need to be so we don't have another one of these bridges collapse on August 1, in the middle of a summer day. That happened in this country in this century. It will happen again if we keep this up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, before the Senator leaves the floor, I would like to thank her again. What I want to say to her is something she has said to me over and over; that is, the importance of finding common ground when we can. We all know we cannot give up our principles, but we have to search for common ground.

And everyone knows—and Senator INHOFE and I kind of joke about it—we could not be different in terms of our ideology. We really could not. But on this one, on this piece, the need to have a strong infrastructure, we are as one, as progressives, as conservatives.

Frankly, I think everyone in the Senate and in the House should come together around the principle that you cannot have a strong economy if you cannot move goods. That is why my friend Senator INHOFE put together a great new freight title in our bill this time, part of the formula. It is hugely important. If we cannot move goods, if we cannot move people, we are going to fall behind.

Clearly, when bridges collapse, there is devastation. I have shown this particular bridge collapse, along with the one on which Senator KLOBUCHAR was so eloquent. This is a bridge in my great State. We have 40 million people. We take in about 40 to 50 percent of all the imports into our Nation; they go into trucks and trains and planes. They use our roads, and they go across the country to deliver goods to everyone.

Well, the bridge that collapsed in California a few days ago—maybe a week or two ago now—was deemed to be obsolete because it was built for very light traffic. It is the bridge between California and Arizona. There was very little traffic at the time it was built. Now we have a huge amount of traffic. This bridge collapsed. Thank the Lord no one died, so I can stand up here and say that.

This, to me, is the poster child of the work we are doing together. This is the poster child. There is a list of bridges—there are more than 60,000 deficient bridges in America. This is America. They are deficient—some worse than others, but they are deficient.

I have listed just a few here—just a few: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin. This is just a handful—a couple of handfuls of the 60,000-plus bridges that are deficient.

Senator INHOFE, in your State we have listed as an example the I–40 bridge over Crooked Oak Creek. As I was saying yesterday, when I was a country supervisor a very long time ago, we found out as supervisors—and we were a very bipartisan group—that our civic center was at risk of collapse in an earthquake. In those years, we did not know that much about how to reinforce. It was just coming to light. It is a Frank Lloyd Wright building, a gorgeous building, a historic building. We were told that if we did not fix it, there was a possibility that we could be held personally liable if something happened.

Clearly, no one here is going to be personally held liable if a bridge collapses, but morally we need to understand that now that we know we have 60,000-plus bridges in bad condition and that 50 percent of our roads are not up to par, we have an obligation to fix it. It is very clear that we must do so.

I am proud that almost half of the Democratic caucus has come together with a larger percentage of the Republican caucus to put together a transportation bill. I am proud of that. It is on the road to passage. Last night, at a crucial moment late in the evening, we got 62 votes. That was not an easy thing to do because, as the Presiding Officer knows, there were things she wanted in that bill, and there were more things I wanted. I wanted things out of the bill and other things added. Each one of us, of course—we are people who are passionate about these issues. We would have written the bill differently. I would say that anyone in America, having the chance, would write it differently. But the art of compromise is something we should not be afraid of. You are not compromising your principles; you are seeing where you can find a sweet spot. I believe we did that.

I am urging the House not to leave on their summer break and to stay and work on this bill. We have done a lot of the heavy lifting. We have done a lot of the heavy compromising. They can do more. They can take out things they do not like, add things they want. We can sit down in a conference. We can get this done.

My opinion: They should take it and pass it. When a bill has 62 votes here, that is pretty darn good. If they want to tweak it, they can do it. But I think they need to stay.

I served proudly with my friend Senator INHOFE in the House. I served for 10 years. It has been 10 years since the House has had this long of a break. They have not left before August for the August recess. I think they should stay. They should stay.

You know, the average American, when they are about to go on their summer break, the boss says: Clean up your desk, please. Finish your work, please. Don't just pile everything on one side of the table, please. Take care of it.

The House ought to finish its work. Take up our bill, amend it, send it back, and we will get it done. Most of the work is done. Most Americans have to tie up loose ends before they take a long break. I might add, I think it is a 5-week break—a 5-week break. Do your work. Maybe you can only go on a 4-week break. That would still be twice the time most Americans get. Do your work.

When I say bridges are in poor condition, that is not hyperbole, that is fact. This is not some study put out by a

Democrat or a Republican; it is put out by the engineers. Our infrastructure is rated—I believe it is a D overall. If our child came home and said ''Mom, I have a D,'' we would not be happy. Well, taxpayers are not happy that our infrastructure is rated a D.

So I ask the House: Please stay and do your job. Roll up your sleeves. We will work with you. We can resolve these things. You have had time to look at our bill.

I will close with just two more points. I want to give the highlights of our Transportation bill on which we worked so hard across party lines—Senator INHOFE; myself; the Banking Committee, chairman and ranking; the Commerce Committee, chairman and ranking; the Finance Committee, which paid for this bill.

Some people are voting against it because they do not like the way it is paid for. They say it is better to find some long-term answer in international tax reform. Personally, I think that is a great idea, but you have time to pay for the last 3 years in that fashion. We have paid for 3 years; this bill is 6 years. Pay for the last 3 years.

As for me, I am a lonely voice here. There are about five of us who say: A penny a month for 10 months on the gas tax. We don't have the votes. So what do I do? Go in my corner and cry? I don't have the votes. No, we have to put a bill together. So this is a $50 billion-a-year bill for 6 years. Three years are paid for. Every State gets more formula funding for both highways and transit. There are two new programs: a formula freight program that my friend Senator INHOFE, working with Republicans and Democrats, put together; and a new grant program for major projects called the AMP Program. Senator WHITEHOUSE worked across the aisle for that program. All of our States are eligible.

It includes the McCaskill bill. It is the McCaskill-Schumer bill that says rental car companies cannot lease out cars that are under recall. I think this is important because we see a lot of the problems with the Takata air bags.

Because Senator NELSON has worked so hard on that, we have tripled NHTSA fines. We have used that money in the bill to help put positive train control on the commuter rails. This is important. People are dying because we do not have positive train control.

Is the bill the perfect bill on safety? In my view, it is not. In somebody else's view it is. It is a compromise. But I think, overall, it is solid. Every State will see an increase in their highway dollars, in their transit dollars.

In closing, I wish to thank Senators on both sides of the aisle, including the Presiding Officer because we did work together. We did a good job. It was hard to do. I know my friend had one provision she wanted. She had to scale it back. It is hard to do that. I had a program I wanted. It got scaled back. We all have to give and take, but that is what the people expect of us. Whether they are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, it does not matter—they want us to get something done.

I am proud of the Senate. We are not done yet. We still need some more votes on this, so everyone stay tuned. But if the House will stay an extra few days and take up our bill, we can get this done for the American people. We can save businesses, we can save jobs, we can keep this recovery going, and we can feel proud that we fixed our bridges, that we fixed our highways, and that we did the work we are supposed to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, well, I am going to have to disagree with my partner over here on one thing; that is, the insistence that the House stay. In my opinion, they are not going to stay. That is done. But this can still be done with their targeted adjournment date for them. The way that can happen is for us to right now—we are waiting out the vote. If nobody yields backs—it is on the Inhofe substitute. That is what we are doing right now. That vote can take place at 5 o'clock in the morning. If you moved that up—and right now we are asking unanimous consent to do that. If we are able to do that, that could happen this afternoon. That means we could have the next step, which would be to move to the bill. That could be done while they are still here.

What I do not want to happen is to have them—you know, we are successful and done with our bill and then send it over to the House and they are gone. So I think we can still do it while the House is still here.

I have to say—and I am not sure the ranking member of my committee, Senator BOXER, agrees with this, but I think they never believed we would be able to get the bill done. That being the case, they staked out early and said they—for any number of reasons, they are going to be gone. Well, we can do it. All we have to do is to move this up and to get time yielded back. We can do the same thing then on final passage. We could have the bill over there in good enough time—Wednesday; that is tomorrow—that they could still act on the bill. That would be my goal on this because I think that is the only way.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. INHOFE. I will yield.

Mrs. BOXER. I would love to get this done in 5 minutes. So let me be clear about where I stand. But has my friend received confirmation from Speaker BOEHNER that he would take up the bill tomorrow? My understanding is that they moved up their—this is what I heard. I can't swear to it, I don't know exactly, but what I heard is they are actually moving up their adjournment from Thursday to Wednesday so they can escape from having to take up our bill.

Does my friend believe that if we could get this bill done, they would stay 24 hours and deal with our bill?

Mr. INHOFE. Reclaiming my time, I don't know what they would do, how long they would stay. If we don't finish it until they already are gone, then we know that.

Mrs. BOXER. OK.

Mr. INHOFE. But I still think that can be done. There is this urgency. We have worked long and hard. People say they haven't had time to get into this thing. We passed our bill. They have had 5 or 6 weeks to absorb this. And this argument that we have a 6-year bill with only 3 years of funding—this is kind of a phony argument because we have a valve that doesn't exist anywhere else that if we go through and start a 6-year bill, that would allow us to get into the major projects which the Senator from Minnesota was talking about and which the Senator and I have been talking about that you cannot get into with short-term extensions.

Mrs. BOXER. That is right.

(Mr. CRUZ assumed the Chair.)

Mr. INHOFE. We all understand that. So we can start those projects. Given 3 years, I can assure you that we would have the opportunity to find offsets that would be acceptable. We were operating under the gun before. This would take that away. We can go ahead and accept the fact that we have 3 years funded.

For those individuals—and I am speaking now of my colleagues on this side of the aisle—who are conservative who have had the argument that we will then have to borrow money in order to finish the 6 years.

We can really have it both ways. We start the projects, and then there will be enough pressure on and we will be able to do—incidentally, I have to keep reminding my friends that there is a conservative position, and that is to pass this bill.

You know, I get so tired of people—there are a lot of people out there who actually voted for the $800 billion—way back at the beginning of the Obama administration—the $800 billion stimulus bill that didn't stimulate. We tried to put an amendment on there. I know the Senator from California and I cosponsored amendments. They were all rejected.

Then along came the $700 billion bailout, and a lot of my Republican friends voted for that.

Now they complain that the money isn't there. Well, the money can be there. And if it hadn't been for those two things, we wouldn't be having this conversation today. But the money can be there. We need time to let that happen. Certainly, as we pass this bill, start the major projects that are going on, then we will be in a position to do that. The key to making that happen, to allowing that to happen—I am not going to give up because the House

hasn't left yet. They say they are going to leave tomorrow afternoon. Well, if we go ahead and yield back enough time to get this vote this afternoon, we could do the same thing on the final vote.

By the way, those individuals who want to have amendments, you can still have germane amendments that would not be treated as an amendment, but we would consider putting those into the managers' amendment. If that happens, that would become part of the vote we would be voting on tomorrow. To allow that to happen, we have to go ahead and yield back time so that we can have this vote take place and start working on those amendments that are germane to see which of those we are going to be in a position to consider.

Anyway, that is what I am hoping will happen. I think there is an opportunity.

Again, people who make statements—and I have a lot of friends in the House. I spent 8 years in the House. These individuals who are speaking now—one of them made kind of an off-the-cuff statement about, you know, we are just not going to consider it. Well, I really believe most of them over there felt we weren't going to be successful in passing a bill. So it is still possible we can do that. We do have the time left, and we know what we have to do to do that.

Let me talk a little bit about the sense of urgency.

First, I appreciate the fact that this conversation took place. The Senator from Minnesota had some pretty graphic pictures of what happened that took the lives of 13 people, a bridge falling down.

The DRIVE Act contains some other key provisions outside of prioritizing bridge safety and stability.

Today, the National Highway System carries more than 55 percent of the Nation's highway traffic and 97 percent of the truck freight traffic.

We have never had a freight provision. This is my sixth bill that I have worked on—actually going all the way back to the House days—and we have never had a freight provision to take care of this problem.

Of the 4 million miles of public road, the National Highway System represents 5.5 percent of the Nation's most heavily traveled miles of road. Americans depend upon a well-maintained National Highway System that provides critical connections between urban and rural communities. American businesses pay an estimated $27 billion a year in extra freight transportation costs due to the poor condition of public roads.

Look at it. Look at that. How many lanes are there on this one? There are six lanes, all of them stopped. What happens when they stop? The engines keep going. The air is polluted. Gasoline costs a lot of money, and the freight cannot go through. Well, that is why we have this.

Recognizing that it is the foundation of the Nation's economy and the key to the Nation's ability to compete in the global economy, it is essential that we focus efforts to improve freight movement on the National Highway System. Incidentally, if we don't pass this bill and if we go back to extensions, that ain't going to happen. It can't happen.

I always have to pause to remind my conservative friends—and I can say this because I have had the ranking of the most conservative Member probably more than anybody else has—the Constitution tells us what we are supposed to be doing. We are doing a lot of things the Constitution never contemplated. It says in article I, section 8 that we in the House and the Senate are supposed to be defending America and roads and bridges. That is what we are supposed to be doing. So I would just say I have to remind people that the conservative position in the Constitution is to go ahead and do what we are trying to do with the DRIVE Act today.

The DRIVE Act includes two new programs to help the States deliver projects that promote the safe movement of consumer goods and products.

The first new program is the National Freight Program. That is what we are talking about right now.

That is what is bogged down in traffic right here.

It is distributed by a formula that will provide funds to all States to enhance the movement of goods, reduce costs, and improve the performances of businesses. The program would expand flexibility for both rural and urban areas.

A lot of the reason this hasn't been handled before is that States send in their priorities. You know, one of the few things in government that do work is what we are going through right now. When we set up a formula, we take into consideration what the people at home want, what the people in my State of Oklahoma think is the most important thing in terms of roads, bridges, highways, and maintenance. There are some liberals here in Washington who think there has never been a good decision unless it came out of Washington. But we always emphasize what they consider to be the greatest concern within their States.

The reason that freight doesn't often get the high priority it should is because a lot of the freight moves in and out of a State and the States don't evaluate that as an economic benefit. That is shortsighted because States on either side provide that kind of traffic, and it does add to the economy of the State, it is just not direct the way the rest of the projects are.

So we have this type of congestion taking place.

Secondly, it will improve efforts to identify projects with a high return on investment through State freight plans and State advisory committees.

The second new program is the Assistance for Major Projects Program, which creates a competitive grant program to provide funds for major projects of high importance to a community, a region, or to the Nation. The program includes a set-aside for rural areas and it ensures an equitable geographic distribution of the funds. The State of Oklahoma is a rural State, so that is very important.

One thing you cannot do with the short-term extensions—keep in mind, the last time we had a long-term bill, the reauthorization bill, was 2005. By the time 2009 got here, we were working on just the short-term extensions—33 short-term extensions. So you can't do those major projects that have to be done sooner or later in our country.

In Chicago, IL, the I–290 and the I–90/I–94 intersection is the intersection we have been looking at with the congestion. It is the No. 1 worst freight bottleneck in the United States. The average speed slows down to 29 miles an hour. Morning and evening rush hour speeds have been known to drop below 20 miles an hour. It carries about 300,000 vehicles a day. That is the Chicago I–29.

Houston, TX, the I–45 at U.S. 59—and certainly the occupier of the chair is fully aware of this and I am sure has been bogged down in traffic many times on the Texas I–45 at U.S. 59 exchange. Houston, TX, is the home of 5 of the top 20 freight bottlenecks in the Nation. Texas is home to 9 of the top 25 freight bottlenecks. Freight bottlenecks cost the freight industry in Texas $671 million annually and 8.8 million hours of delay.

This is what we are looking at, looking at Houston. It happens that I was stopped there going there one time. That is why I always fly down to South Texas rather than drive—to avoid that.

So I–45 at the intersection is ranked third in the Nation by the congestion index. It is the same I–45 at 610 North that is ranked 15. There is an average speed slowdown to 39 miles per hour, and there they are, out there wasting valuable time.

Fort Lee, NJ. The I–95 you are looking at right now connects Fort Lee, NJ, to New York City. It is the second worst freight bottleneck by congestion index in the Nation. The average speed slows to 29 miles an hour. Rush hour speeds in the morning and evening slow down to about 15 miles an hour.

The nearby I–95 Cross-Bronx Expressway is the most congested corridor in the country. By the way, anyone from here in Washington who is going up to anyplace along the coast, Connecticut on up North, has to go through that, and I have had to do that. I had an occasion just the other day to give a commencement talk up at the Coast Guard Academy. To get up there, I had to go all the way across that bridge, and it almost made me late. So that is one that is well known.

The George Washington Bridge is the world's busiest motor vehicle bridge, carrying over 106 million cars a year.

Anyway, that is what we have right now. We have a freight program to alleviate this type of congestion and increase America's ability to conduct commerce on our highways.

We have another talk that we have given several times where we go over all of the bridges. The Senator from Minnesota was talking about the tragedy of the bridges. But if you look and you see, it is not just confined to the east coast. If you look and you see, in my State of Oklahoma, in the northeastern section, we have more deficient bridges—probably ranked No. 3 in the Nation, I would say—and those bridges are not going to be addressed until we have a chance to do it.

Simply look at this Eisenhower quote, a republican president who understood the need for federal investment in our military and our highways. I always like this because I chair the Environment and Public Works Committee and have been ranking member of the Senate Armed Forces committee. I think it is deplorable, what President Obama has done to our military. I call it the disarming of America.

Yet the guy who started this whole thing—I don't think even the Chair is aware of the fact that the reason Eisenhower started this way back in 1956 was to defend our Nation. He said: As it is right now, we don't have any type of a system where you can take goods and services and move them across either coast to be sent out in the defense of this country.

So I am hoping that we all realize the need to reauthorize this long-term bill. Right now, we are in the middle of not doing anything, not getting done, but it is a 30-hour delay. If we can just move that up so that instead of voting on that at 5 o'clock in the morning, we can vote on it this afternoon—which would be just as easy to do, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that we be able to do that—then we could move on and do the same thing as we move toward the bill.

Now, if that happens, for those individuals—and I would hope the staff is listening to this—who have germane amendments, we can't take up amendments after passage. This is going to pass. We know this is going to pass, but is it going to pass this afternoon or is it going to pass tomorrow morning? If so, we then would not be in a position to do anything if the House has already adjourned.

If this happens, if Members will bring amendments down, we will consider germane amendments. We still have the managers' amendment we will be able to put these in, and so we will consider these. So there is an opportunity for that to take place, and I wouldn't want anyone voting to deny this opportunity to finish this bill and let the House at least look at it, thinking they will not be able to get their amendments in.

We haven't had an opportunity to get amendments in for a long time. I always hasten to say this because how long has it been now. It has been 6 weeks since we passed this out of our committee and it passed unanimously—every Democrat and every Republican. I have to say the Republicans on the committee I chair are among the most conservative Republicans and the Democrats are among the most liberal Democrats. That is a holdover from when the Democrats had control of the Senate, and the Environment and Public Works Committee was chaired by my colleague, who refers to herself as a very proud progressive, which means liberal, and I am a very proud conservative. So we all have this in common.

Just to have this opportunity to have this up so we can consider it, we would have to move this up and get this vote today instead of tonight. So I am hoping that will still be the case. We are making our case on that. Again, that would allow us to get this done in a way—or at least to let the House look at this and see whether it is an option they may want to pursue. I know several have painted themselves into a corner, but nonetheless we could do this if we can hurry this up.

I know there are other speakers on the floor, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senator from Oklahoma for his great work on this legislation. He has been a fierce advocate for transportation funding, for doing highway bills on more than a short-term basis. As he has mentioned numerous times, since 2009 we have had 33 short-term extensions—patches, if you will—which make it very difficult to run a highway program.

The Senator from Oklahoma has been, as I said, a fierce and persistent advocate that one of the responsibilities we have around here is to make sure we are building the infrastructure in this country that keeps our economy competitive, that allows people and freight to move in an efficient way and to ensure our economy is strong and vibrant.

I can tell you, as someone who represents a rural State in the middle of the country, the supply chain we have between our highways and bridges, our railroads, our ports, is critically important for us to get our products, the things we raise and grow in South Dakota, to the marketplace. Agriculture is our No. 1 industry. It drives our economy. It is incredibly dependent upon transportation. So a strong, vibrant, robust economy depends upon transportation.

Obviously, we want to have a system that is safe, and that is one of the issues I want to speak to with regard to this bill as well. I appreciate the great work Senator INHOFE and his team, working with Senator BOXER, have done on this bill.

We are going to continue to debate this. I hope we can bring it to a close. As the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out, if we did that, we would have an opportunity to at least put it before the House and give them a chance to act on it, whether they choose to or not. I would certainly hope the House of Representatives would take a hard look at this bill and consider taking it up and moving it because there has been a lot of work that has gone into it. We have a deadline ahead of us, and if we don't do this, we are going to be stuck with yet another—the 34th—short-term extension, which just kicks the can down the road and makes it more difficult for those who are in the position of having to make decisions about planning and designing our infrastructure in this country to do that.

Obviously, there are a lot of people and a lot of jobs that depend upon the decisions that come out of Washington with regard to this bill. So I, too, encourage our colleagues in the Senate to move as quickly as we can to complete action on the Senate bill and to allow the House of Representatives to take a chance at considering it and perhaps getting this issue resolved and a long-term bill in place.

These bills are nothing new in the Senate. The bill before us today is notable because it is the first Transportation bill, as I mentioned, in almost a decade to provide more than 2 years of funding for our Nation's infrastructure needs. Since 2009, Congress has passed more than 33 short-term funding extensions. That is an average of approximately five funding extensions a year. That is not a good way to manage our Nation's infrastructure and it wastes an incredible amount of money.

Around the country, hundreds of thousands of people and hundreds of thousands of jobs depend on funding contained in transportation bills. When Congress fails to provide the necessary certainty about the way transportation funding is going to be allocated, States and local governments are left without the certainty they need to authorize projects to make long-term plans for transportation infrastructure. That means essential construction projects get deferred, necessary repairs may not get made, and the jobs that depend on transportation are put in jeopardy.

My home State of South Dakota has been forced to defer important construction projects thanks to the lack of funding certainty. No individual or business would start building a house or an office building if it could only promise a contractor 3 months of funding. In the same way, Congress can't expect a State to begin construction of a new bridge or highway without the certainty that their project is going to be fully funded.

The highway bill before us—the DRIVE Act—reauthorizes transportation programs for 6 years and provides 3 years of guaranteed funding. All 3 years of funding have been paid for without raising the gas tax and without adding a dime to the deficit. This bill will give States and local governments the certainty they need to plan

for and commit to key infrastructure projects.

The bill will also help to strengthen our Nation's transportation system by increasing transparency in the allocation of transportation dollars, streamlining the permitting and environmental review processes and cutting redtape.

Mr. President, over the past few years of Democratic control, the public has grown increasingly skeptical of Congress being able to function. When Republicans took the majority in January, we promised the American people we would get the Senate working again, and we have been delivering on that promise.

This Transportation bill is another major legislative achievement and the result of hard work by several committees that put together key provisions to spur important infrastructure investment and safety improvements. Republicans and Democrats alike got to make their voices heard in this process, and the resulting bill is stronger because of it.

As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I had the opportunity to work on the commerce section of the bill. Our focus was on enhancing the safety of our Nation's cars, trucks, and railroads, and the bill we produced makes key reforms that will enhance transport safety around the country.

Over the past year, the commerce committee has spent a lot of time focused on motor vehicle safety efforts. Last year was a record year for auto problems, with more than 63 million vehicles recalled.

Two of the defects that have spurred recent auto recalls—the faulty General Motors ignition switch and the defective airbag inflators from Takata—are responsible for numerous unnecessary deaths and injuries, at least 8 reported deaths in the case of Takata and more than 100 deaths in the case of General Motors. Indications point to the Takata recalls as being among the largest and most complex set of auto-related recalls in our Nation's history, with more than 30 million cars affected.

Given the seriousness of these recalls, when it came time to draft the highway bill, one of our priorities in the commerce committee was addressing auto safety issues and promoting greater consumer awareness and corporate responsibility. The commerce section of the DRIVE Act now triples the civil penalties the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration can impose on automakers for a series of related safety violations—from a cap of $35 million to a cap of $105 million—which should provide a stronger deterrent against auto safety violations such as those that occurred in the case of the faulty ignition switches at General Motors.

Our portion of the bill also improves notification methods to ensure that consumers are made aware of recalls.

In the wake of the recall over the GM ignition switch defect, the inspector general at the Department of Transportation published a scathing report identifying serious lapses of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, or NHTSA, the government agency responsible for overseeing safety in our Nation's cars and trucks.

The concerns raised included questions about the agency's ability to properly identify and investigate safety problems—a concern that is further underscored, I might add, by the circumstances surrounding the Takata recalls.

In addition to targeting violations by automakers, our portion of the highway bill also addresses the lapses at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration identified in the inspector general's report.

In its typical fashion, the Obama administration claimed NHTSA's problems could be solved by simply throwing more money at the agency, but based on the expert testimony from the inspector general, it is clear money alone is not going to solve the problem. We need to ensure that the agency fixes what is broken before we provide a significant increase in funding authorization with taxpayer dollars.

Our bill makes additional funding increases for NHTSA's vehicle safety efforts contingent on that agency's implementation of reforms called for by the inspector general, ensuring that this agency will be in a better position to address vehicle safety problems in the future.

I appreciate that NHTSA's current administration and Administrator have pledged to implement all of these recommendations.

Another big focus of the commerce committee this year has been rail safety. Nearly half of the commerce section of the DRIVE Act is made up of a bipartisan rail safety bill put together by the Republican junior Senator from Mississippi and the Democratic junior Senator from New Jersey. Their work on important rail and Amtrak reform was almost ready for a committee markup at the beginning of May, but after the tragic train derailment in Philadelphia, these two Senators opted to delay the markup and then added even more safety provisions to the bill they crafted.

Their bill, which passed the committee with unanimous support from committee members of both parties, include provisions to strengthen our Nation's rail infrastructure and smooths the way for the implementation of new safety technologies.

Our transportation infrastructure keeps our economy and our Nation going. Our Nation's farmers depend on our rail system to move their crops to the market. Manufacturers rely on our Interstate Highway System to distribute their goods to stores across the United States. All of us—all of us—depend on our Nation's roads and bridges to get around every single day. For too long, transportation has been the subject of short-term legislation that leaves those responsible for building and for maintaining our Nation's transportation system without the certainty and the predictability they need to keep our roads and highways thriving.

I am proud of the bill we have on the floor before us. I hope we can pass this legislation as soon as possible and work with the House to develop a final bill that will allow us to fund our Nation's transportation priorities on a long-term basis. We can't afford to continue this path we have been on of passing short-term extensions—33 already in the last 5 years, more than 5 a year—and all the uncertainty that comes with that. That jeopardizes jobs across this country that are related to construction of these projects. It jeopardizes the planning and engineering and design work that our departments of transportation across the country do, and it puts at risk all of the transportation infrastructure that moves the freight, that moves people across this country, which our economy depends on.

So I simply want to say that as a Member who represents a rural State, South Dakota—where we have 77,000 square miles, home to 800,000 people—we depend heavily on roads and bridges to get to and from our destinations. We have people who drive long distances to work. We have people who come into our State every single year.

This time of the year we will have a million or so people descend upon a little town in South Dakota called Sturgis, which will be the place where the annual motorcycle rally is hosted. We have people who come by the thousands to our State every single year to visit the Black Hills and Mount Rushmore. We depend upon a good, viable, robust transportation system.

As I mentioned earlier, we are an agricultural economy which drives the jobs in our State that keeps our Main Streets going. That agricultural economy depends upon getting those things we raise and grow to the marketplace. That means good highways, railroads, ports—all the things that are essential to make sure our agricultural producers can get the things they raise and grow to the places and destinations they need to get to.

This is truly important work we are doing. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his hard work. I certainly hope we can push this across the finish line soon, so we will be able to present it to the House of Representatives, notwithstanding the statements that have been made there. Perhaps they can look at this body of work and think, as we do, that this gives us an opportunity to put something on the books, the longest term bill we have had literally now in 10 years, and do something important for our economy and for jobs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, I appreciate the comments made by the Senator from South Dakota, emphasizing what can't be done on short terms. I think we have been talking about that all morning.

Last week, 100 mayors from across the Nation wrote to the Senate leaders urging for a long-term transportation bill. They said, ''If the status quo continues, deficient transportation infrastructure will cost American businesses $430 billion by 2020.''

Then there are the 31 construction and transportation groups that sent a harsh reminder to Congress that ''past extensions have not led to a lasting solution to the Highway Trust Fund's repeated revenue shortfalls.''

I remember because I have been around here for a while, and I have been through six of these transportation reauthorization bills. In the interim, we always end up with short-term extensions. People don't realize we can't do major projects with short-term extensions.

Now, I hear the argument sometimes that in this one we have a 6-year bill, but we are paying for only 3 years. That is fine. Make the argument. But there is something unique in the transportation system, which is that in the event we get through halfway—even though it is a 6-year bill—and the funds are not available to the existing shortages of what we have added, then all projects stop. Not a penny can be spent. This isn't true anyplace else in our government, and I think people have to realize that if we are going to do it.

When the Senator from Minnesota was talking and showing these very graphic pictures of the bridge that collapsed killing 13 people, that really sends something home. We can't wait until that happens before we do the responsible thing.

I have to remind my conservative friends it is our constitutional duty. When we were sworn into office, we swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution in article I, section 8 tells us what we are supposed to be doing: We are supposed to be defending America, including our bridges and roads. That is what we are supposed to be doing.

There is a way. I hope the people who—unless they just don't want to take care of these big, serious problems and want to continue with the short-term extensions, there is a way we can do this. We will be asking for unanimous consent to go ahead and make a vote on what we are voting on right now and considering. If all time has to expire, it would be 5 a.m. tomorrow on the Inhofe substitute for the bill. That means we then wouldn't get around to having this bill passed until Thursday, and Thursday would be after the House is gone. So it is over. That is it. This would be a very easy thing to do.

Again, I am going to remind people that while we don't have the chance for amendments after this vote takes place, we can still have the manager's amendment, where I personally will consider every one of the amendments that comes forth. I am hoping that will happen.

That is what we are faced with right now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, this Friday, July 31, the authorization for the highway trust fund will expire and the fund itself will be nearly out of money. That means that unless Congress acts, projects in New Hampshire and across the country will grind to an abrupt halt. In the face of this, the House has passed yet another short-term, stopgap bill. The Senate is now debating and amending a long-term highway bill.

My clear preference is for a long-term bill. I think it would be a terrible mistake to pass yet another short-term extension without at the same time taking action on a long-term bill like the Senate is currently doing. Only passing another short-term extension—which would be the 34th since 2008—without taking steps toward a multiyear bill would be kicking the can down the road, and in this case the road is overwhelmed by traffic, badly in need of modernization, and filled with patches and potholes. If you have driven around on the roads in the District of Columbia, sometimes you wonder where you are because they are so bad, so filled with potholes. For a country that seeks to remain competitive in the 21st century, as we do in America, this is totally dysfunctional and destructive.

There are few more basic and necessary functions of government than providing for modernized highways, bridges, and other transportation infrastructure. Yet in Congress we have been grossly neglecting this responsibility. China spends about 9 percent of gross domestic product on infrastructure. Brazil spends about 8 percent. Even in Europe they are spending about 4 percent. But infrastructure spending in the United States has fallen to just 2 percent of GDP.

Our highways and bridges face an $800 billion backlog of investment needs, including nearly half a trillion dollars in critical repair work. Americans spend a staggering 5.5 billion hours stuck in traffic each year. Yet in early May we saw a budget pass out of this Congress supported by the majority party that slashed Federal funding for transportation by 40 percent over the next decade.

I am especially concerned about disrepair and decay among our Nation's bridges. That is why I filed an amendment which is a bill I have introduced in previous Congresses called the SAFE Bridges Act. The Federal Highway Administration has identified more than 145,000—145,000—structurally deficient or functionally obsolete bridges. That is more than 20 percent of all the bridges in the United States. In New Hampshire it is actually a higher percentage.

In May, I went with the mayor and city manager of Concord—New Hampshire's State capital—to inspect the rusted-out and now-closed Sewalls Falls Bridge, which is one of the three critical bridges in Concord across the Merrimack River. I worked very hard with the city—our office did—to get necessary approvals from the U.S. Department of Transportation to replace this bridge. In fact, it is a replacement project that started back in 1994. The city of Concord lined up all the permits and approvals—and then nothing. Because of uncertainty about Federal funding for the project, it was stopped dead in its tracks.

My amendment, the SAFE Bridges Act, would authorize an additional $2 billion annually for the next 3 years to enable States to repair and replace their structurally deficient or functionally obsolete bridges. States would get funding based on their share of deficient bridges nationwide, and the additional funding is fully paid for by closing a corporate tax loophole.

As the Senate continues to debate the Transportation bill, I hope we do get an opportunity to vote on relevant amendments like my SAFE Bridges Act.

The neglect of our transportation infrastructure is creating congestion and gridlock on our roads. It is hurting our economy and our global competitiveness. It is also killing jobs—especially in the construction trades, where employment has yet to recover from the great recession.

According to a Duke University study, providing Federal funding to meet the U.S. Department of Transportation's infrastructure requests would create nearly 2.5 million new jobs. So our investment in this industry, which is one of the slowest recovering from the recession, would create millions of new jobs.

Several months ago, I joined in a bipartisan group of eight Senators who had previously served as Governors—Senators KING, ROUNDS, KAINE, HOEVEN, WARNER, CARPER, MANCHIN, and myself. We sent a letter to our Senate colleagues urging that we commit to fully funding national infrastructure priorities and that we put a stop to the dysfunctional short-term fixes that have become routine in recent years.

I know the Presiding Officer appreciates that it was a visionary Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, who championed the Interstate Highway System in this country. The National Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1956—I think it is critical to think about the title of that bill which was not just about commerce, but it was also about defense. It was about the security of our country. It ensured dedicated Federal funding to build a network that today encompasses more than 46,000 miles of roadways. That system has transformed our economy and created countless millions of jobs, but it is now six decades old. Its dedicated funding mechanism, the highway trust fund, is chronically underfunded and just days from becoming insolvent. It is time for Congress to come together on a bipartisan basis to break the cycle of patchwork fixes.

The bill before us is not perfect. There are a number of provisions included that I don't agree with, if I had been writing the bill, but it is a compromise measure, and it was ably negotiated by the leadership of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator INHOFE and Senator BOXER, along with numerous others in this body.

We have the opportunity to pass a 6-year authorization bill with 3 years of funding. Yet what is happening in the House today? The House is passing another short-term extension. They are getting ready to leave town. They are not even going to stay and take up the long-term bill that is going to come out of the Senate. They are going to give us another short-term bill that is going to leave States such as New Hampshire up in the air, with thousands of people who are not sure if they are going to have a job next week when the money runs out, who aren't sure what the future is going to hold, companies that can't plan because they don't know if we have a long-term highway funding bill.

It is now time for Congress to pass a fully funded, multiyear highway bill that will allow governments at all levels to plan long-term capital investment projects and to build a 21st-century transportation system that meets the needs of our 21st-century economy.

I hope that we in the Senate will be able to pass this bill and that our House colleagues will recognize they need to stay here and get this work done.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

KEYSTONE PIPELINE AND OIL SANCTIONS ON IRAN

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am here to speak about energy, both lower cost energy and who is going to supply it.

One might say: Why today? Well, because sources tell me that after almost 7 years, President Obama is going to turn down the Keystone Pipeline project—7 years. This is an application that was filed by the TransCanada company in September 2008. So here we are in year 6, and in September it will be 7 years that the application has been pending. The administration has still not made a decision—defeat through delay. So the question is, Why then is he going to turn down the project now? It is because he will wait until Congress is out of session in August. Then he will turn down the project while Congress is not in session to have less pushback, less criticism, of his decision if he makes it under the radar. That timing is understandable because he is making a political decision rather than a decision based on the merits.

As we know, Congress overwhelmingly supports the project. The House overwhelmingly passed approval of the Keystone Pipeline project. In the Senate, we had 62 votes in favor of the measure. We were actually missing some of our Members or we would have had 63, but there was strong overwhelming bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate. We sent the bill to the President and he vetoed it, but he still has not made a decision. He vetoed it saying it was up to him to make a decision, not the Congress. Congress went on record overwhelmingly in support of the project. Congress approved the project, but he vetoed the bill.

It is the President's decision to make. Now we hear he is going to make it and turn down the project, but the Congress overwhelmingly supports it. The States on the Keystone Pipeline route overwhelmingly support it. There are six States on the route and every single State has approved the project: Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. They all approved the project. Congress supports it, the States support it, but most importantly the American people support it. In poll after poll, the American people have overwhelmingly shown support for the project—65 to 70 percent—strong, overwhelming support for the project.

Why do they support it? This is what it is all about: the merits of the project. They support it on the merits because it means more energy for this country that is produced in this country, in Canada, in my home State of North Dakota, and in Montana. There are 830,000 barrels of oil a day produced in Canada and the United States that can be refined in our refineries and can be used right here, rather than getting it from some other country such as OPEC, Russia, Venezuela, you name it. It is energy we produce here at home. First and foremost, Americans support it because they want our energy produced at home. They want us to be energy secure. It is about jobs. It is about jobs.

This is a multibillion-dollar investment that creates good construction jobs. It is about economic growth, growing our economy here at home, working with our closest friend and ally, Canada. It is also about national security through energy security—not having to depend on the Middle East or OPEC for our energy. It doesn't cost the Federal Government a penny—not a penny. This is, as I say, a multibillion-dollar project that is completely built with private investment that would generate hundreds of millions of dollars in local, State, and Federal tax revenue. It would not cost the Federal Government one penny, generating hundreds of millions of dollars in cash revenues at the local, State, and Federal levels.

But maybe the greatest irony of all is this: At the same time the President is making it harder to produce energy here at home in our country and get energy from our closest friend and ally Canada, he wants to make it easier to produce oil in Iran. Think about that. Right now the President is pressing Congress to approve an agreement with Iran that would remove the sanctions on oil production and exports in Iran. Under the proposed agreement that the President has submitted to this Congress, he includes releasing the U.S. sanctions put in place by Congress that limit and restrict Iran's ability to produce and export oil. These include energy sanctions that limit Iran's sale of crude oil, which was specifically passed by Congress. Also, he wants to remove the sanctions on investment in Iran's oil, gas, petrochemical, and automotive sectors—again, sanctions passed by Congress. He wants to remove sanctions on the energy sector equipment and gasoline sanctions that were passed by Congress. In essence, what the President is doing is allowing Iran to export its oil, he is allowing investment to help them produce more oil, and he is allowing the export to Iran of technology that will help them produce more oil and gas. At the same time, by turning down Keystone, the President is making it harder for us to produce and transport oil and gas in our country and work with our strongest ally, Canada. So what is the net effect of that? The net effect of that is it helps put OPEC back in the driver's seat.

If you don't believe me, let's just take a look at the numbers. The numbers don't lie. Prior to 2012, before we put the Kirk-Menendez congressional sanctions in place as part of the National Defense Authorization Act at the end of 2011, during that year, at that time in 2011, Iran was producing 2.6 million barrels of oil a day. By 2013,

after the Kirk-Menendez sanctions had been in effect, Iran was down to exporting only 1.1 million barrels a day. Iran had gone from 2.6 million barrels a day down to 1.1 million barrels a day of oil they were producing, exporting, and getting paid for. We cut that by more than half.

My State of North Dakota alone produces 1.2 million barrels a day. That is more than Iran is exporting right now, but if all these sanctions come off, Iran gets to go back up to that 2.6 million and beyond. One million barrels at $50 a barrel is $50 million a day. One can see this means hundreds of millions and billions of dollars to Iran. This is certainly something to think about, going from 2.6 million barrels a day and having put sanctions in place, knocking it down to 1.1 million barrels—and that is with exceptions the President has allowed to the sanctions. That is without the sanctions being fully implemented. It shows that the sanctions are very effective. It also shows that if we release them, Iran will get incredible amounts of money—not only dollars that have been held from them, but dollars they are going to generate every day from increased oil production.

So the President wants us to relieve these sanctions at the same time he, in essence, impedes our oil and our growth in energy development in this country.

The simple question I have is, How does that make sense? How does that make sense? How do we get into a situation where we are enabling Iran to produce more oil, but the U.S. produces less? That makes no sense, but that is the impact of the President's decision.

The President will make an argument that is based on environmental factors. He will say he is making that decision for environmental reasons. He doesn't want the oil produced in Canada. He usually just doesn't talk about the light sweet crude that is produced in the Bakken area of North Dakota and Montana, which is the lightest, sweetest crude I know of. He tries to make the argument that he doesn't like oil that is produced in Canada for environmental reasons.

Remember I said this has been pending now for almost 7 years. We are in year 6. In the President's own Department of State, the environmental impact statement says the Keystone will have no significant environmental impact. It will be interesting to see when Congress is out of session—in August when the President turns this down, trying to get under the radar—what he has to say about how he is going to address the State Department's clear environmental impact statement, finding no significant environmental impact, but we will see what it is. At the same time, the President will work to convince Americans that all sanctions should be lifted from Iran so they can produce more oil and bring more money into their country.

There is an old saying. Essentially it goes like this: Those who fail to heed the lessons of history are destined to repeat them. President Obama is not breaking our dependence on foreign oil, he is reinstating it. The President is not strengthening our energy future, he is weakening it, and I urge him to reconsider.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, every day it seems as though Americans are hearing more and more news about how badly ObamaCare is failing. Some of the latest headlines have had to do with just how expensive health insurance is going to be next year under the President's health care law. The price increases that are being reported are truly staggering. Insurance companies are planning to raise rates 20 percent, 30 percent, even 40 percent on some of their plans, and they say it is because of the health care law.

The New York Times had an article just a couple of weeks ago. It quoted one lead advocate in the State of Oregon saying specifically that some people may ''start wondering if insurance is affordable, or if it's worth the money.''

Well, a lot of Americans have been wondering if the entire health care law is actually worth the money. Now, some Democrats have said that these outrageous price increases will not affect everyone. Well, they sure affect a lot of people. You know, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that the increases will not be as large as they are going to be, if you are willing to switch plans every year or if you accept less access to doctors or even less access to medications.

Well, the argument makes the same mistake that President Obama made from the beginning about the health care law, and it confuses coverage with actual care. In Connecticut, some insurance companies say they have come up with ways to slow down the increase in their premiums. What they are doing is they are actually cutting access to care. One company decided that it could save some money by reducing the use of specialty drugs. So some people who have this insurance may not be getting the drugs they used to get.

Another company in Connecticut decided that it could charge a little less by limiting the number of doctors that the patients could see. Instead of raising rates by 12.5 percent next year as they had planned, they said the company will now just be raising rates 11.5 percent. That is the kind of situation that hard-working families are facing—higher premiums, less access to care.

These narrow networks of hospitals and doctors are not just hurting people in Connecticut. They are turning up in ObamaCare plans all across the country. There was a study that came out this month. It found that plans offered through ObamaCare insurance exchanges across the country covered 34 percent fewer doctors than the average plan sold outside the exchanges.

Now, it is even worse for some specialists. According to the report, exchange plans include 42 percent fewer oncology and cardiac specialists. That is cancer doctors. That is heart doctors. So if you have cancer or if you have a heart condition, there is a much lower chance that your doctor is covered by your ObamaCare insurance.

People are paying outrageously high premiums, copays, and deductibles, and they are left with insurance coverage that may not cover their care. So a lot of people have decided they just cannot afford the Affordable Care Act. They would rather pay a tax penalty to the IRS than spend hard-earned money on this limited and expensive ObamaCare insurance. According to the IRS, last year 7.5 million hard-working taxpayers paid that tax penalty. That is 1 out of 17 taxpayers. Another 12 million people could not afford ObamaCare insurance or did not want it, and they filed a form saying they should not have to pay the penalty at all because it was unaffordable. There were only 6 million people who actually signed up for ObamaCare exchange plans last year. Almost 20 million people rejected ObamaCare because it was too expensive and it was not right for them and their families.

Now, President Obama has said repeatedly that the health care law is working—he said even better than he expected. Is this what he is talking about—even better than he expected? More Americans are rejecting ObamaCare than are signing up for it on the Federal exchange. Is that better than the President expected? Does President Obama think that the Federal insurance exchange is working better than he expected?

There were headlines about this recently as well and how Washington has failed to protect taxpayer dollars. The Government Accountability Office set up a test of healthcare.gov, the President's Web site, the one that failed so miserably. What they did is they created 12 fraudulent applications in order to see if they could actually get health insurance subsidies using fraudulent applications, and 11 of those 12 phony applications were approved last year. Now, here we are a year later. It turns out that the Washington bureaucrats—you cannot believe it—reviewed these policies and renewed the taxpayer-funded subsidies for all 11 of these phony applicants. Some of them even

got higher subsidies this year than they did last year.

So what does the Government Accountability Office say about it? Well, the chief investigator looked at it. He said: There still appears to be no system in place—no system in place—to catch missing or fabricated documentation. It is incredible and it is disturbing, and it is no surprise that taxpayers are offended.

Finally, we are also seeing more news about one of the taxes that the Democrats included in their health care law. There was a headline in the New York Times last Wednesday: ''Concern Grows on Health Tax.'' That was on Wednesday, July 22, first page of the business section. ''Concern Grows on Health Tax.'' Now, this is about the new 40-percent tax on so-called Cadillac health insurance plans. These are the plans that employers offer to their workers. These are the plans that Washington says are too generous.

The article tells the story of Kurt Gallow, who works at a paper mill in Longview, WA. When you follow over, it says: Concern grows over excise tax's effect on health care plans. There are a number of people working and talking at this location in Longview, WA. But the story of Kurt is also about his wife, Brenda. She has diabetes. The article says that Kurt and Brenda are ''worrying about his company's proposed new health care plan, which would require workers to pay as much as $6,000 toward their family's medical bills.''

Now, that is a huge amount of money for anyone. But it is a huge amount of money for some of these very hard-working families. Now, these are changes that their employer has to make because of the President's health care law. You know what. This is not even an ObamaCare plan. This is not something they are buying through the exchange. These are people who get their insurance through work. Now, President Obama said that if you get your insurance through your job, ''nothing in this plan will require you or your employer to change the coverage or the doctor you have.''

Well, millions of Americans across the country are finding out that was just one more expensive broken promise made by the President. ObamaCare continues to be a complicated and costly mess. Republicans have offered good ideas about how to lower health care costs, how to improve access, and how to help Americans lead healthier lives. We all have ideas that will get rid of some of the ridiculous Washington-imposed mandates that are driving up costs and forcing so many Americans to go without insurance and certainly without care.

Six years ago, the American people were unhappy with health care in this country. They did not think the solution was higher prices, less access to care, and higher taxes as well. The American people are not satisfied with these constant headlines about all of the problems with the President's health care law.

Congress should not be satisfied with the current state of health care in this country either or with the disastrous side effects of the President's health care law. It is time for the President to admit the health care law is causing pain and problems all across the country. It is time to start anew, to give people the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we all know the Chamber is engaged in the passage of a multiyear highway bill—not just highways, but this deals with mass transit, transportation infrastructure in general. To me, the most important thing about what we are doing is the fact we are not going to do another temporary patch—which we have done, I am told, 33 times—but we actually are going to pass a 3-year highway bill.

To me, the best news, I would say to the Presiding Officer, is now it looks as if we have the House thoroughly engaged, so it is not just a question of this bill or nothing. Perhaps, if experience is any guide, we can come up with something even better by collaborating with our House colleagues.

I wanted to come to the floor and talk a little bit about the impact of this bill on my State, the State of Texas, because we are a fast-growing State. We have about 27 million people there now. People are moving from around the country to Texas because our economy is growing. Last year, our economy grew at the rate of 5.2 percent. To compare that to the Nation, last year the Nation's economy grew at 2.2 percent. What does that mean? That means there are a lot more jobs and a lot more opportunities, so people are literally voting with their feet, leaving the States where there are limited opportunities and coming to States such as Texas where there are more opportunities. But that means more congestion, more traffic, and more challenges when it comes to our roadways, our rural freight routes, and it means challenges for our economy.

Many States, of course, would be delighted to have the problems we are having because, frankly, people are moving away from many States, not to many States. I know the Presiding Officer's State of Oklahoma is experiencing economic growth and job growth too because we share a common interest and sector of our economy, the energy economy, which the rest of the country would do well to learn from the examples in Oklahoma and Texas as part of our economic success story.

As others have mentioned, one of the chief reasons this bill has so much enthusiasm behind it is because it gives freedom and flexibility to the States to plan for infrastructure needs in the future. It perhaps should go without saying, but a 6-month patch, if we were to kick this over until December, doesn't give anybody any certainty to plan these long-term infrastructure projects which take literally not months but years.

As I said, for a State such as Texas that is growing rapidly—by some estimates 600 people a day are moving to the State—improving our roadways and bridges is vitally important for the continued growth of our economy and increased prosperity for our people, and we have the practical challenge of handling a growing number of cars and trucks on our roads. One way this bill gives added freedom and flexibility to the States is through a provision that would help Texas and other border States meet their growing infrastructure needs, particularly at the southern border, with improvements that are not only necessary to get us and goods from point A to point B, but to keep us safe as well.

Frequently, when we talk about the border, we talk about border security. That is a very important consideration and, frankly, we have not committed the Federal resources we should to border security to make sure we know who is coming into the country and why they are here. Of course, we know that recently, even in the news, people have continued to penetrate our border, even those with criminal records, causing havoc and, indeed, committing crimes against innocent people such as occurred recently in the terrible incident that happened in San Francisco.

Our border, border infrastructure, and border security are the front lines of our defense, to keep our people safe, to regulate who comes into the country, and to make sure that only legitimate people can enter.

The question is—as one law professor recently testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, when it comes to immigration, there is really only one question: Are you going to have controlled immigration or uncontrolled immigration? It is basically that simple.

I am on the floor to talk about transportation and the importance of this bill in terms of the border infrastructure when it comes to trade and commerce, but as I mentioned, it also is an important frontline when it comes to the safety and security of the American people.

We are fortunate in Texas to be the top exporting State in the Nation. That is one of the reasons our economy has grown faster than the rest of the country. The agricultural products that are grown there, the livestock that is raised, and the manufactured goods that are made are exported to markets all around the world, which creates good jobs, well-paying jobs at home.

It also takes good infrastructure to move more than $100 billion in exported goods from Texas to Mexico each year, supporting hundreds of thousands of jobs in Texas alone. It is estimated, when you look at the Nation as a whole, that binational trade between Mexico and the United States supports as many as 6 million American jobs. That is something we frequently overlook when we talk about our relationship with our neighbor south of the border and immigration, and that is there are many benefits to legal trade, traffic, controlled legal immigration, and, indeed, as I mentioned, $100 billion of exported goods from Texas to Mexico each year supporting hundreds of thousands of jobs.

In this bill, by allowing Texas and other border States more flexibility in long-term planning of border projects, consumers and workers can benefit as goods are shipped more efficiently back and forth. Our border infrastructure is essential to moving massive amounts of trade, which travel through our ports of entry every day. For Texas and the United States to remain competitive, the border region must have the quality infrastructure to truck, train, and ship billions of dollars' worth of goods efficiently and safely.

Doing nothing to invest in transportation at the border is not a viable option. A recent report from the Texas State Legislature found that $116 million in U.S. economic output is lost or forfeited every single minute. The trucks sit idle at the border with Mexico. They are literally frozen in place because they are bottlenecked because of archaic, antiquated infrastructure and lack of appropriate staffing at the border.

Infrastructure on the border also plays another important role, preventing things such as illicit drugs and merchandise from entering the country. In many respects, as I said, our border crossings, the technology employed there, and the professionals who work there—they are the first line of defense against bad actors who want to get into the country illegally or get contraband goods through our ports.

In Texas, better roads and bridges at the border region mean better economic opportunity and quality of life for our growing border communities. Fortunately, the border infrastructure provision in this highway bill would give the Governor in Texas and all other border States the freedom to assess the biggest transportation problems facing those States and would also provide essential tools to address them.

By dedicating funds to invest in border infrastructure projects at the discretion of State Governors, we can make sure our States have the resources they need to enhance trade and travel and to keep us safe at the same time.

This is not, of course, a new notion. Throughout my time in the Senate, I have worked with folks in Texas and elsewhere, people on both sides of the aisle and on both ends of the Capitol, to try to find ways to facilitate greater levels of legitimate commerce and travel at our Nation's ports of entry and throughout the border region.

I am thankful for making this progress in this legislation. I commend my Texas colleagues—Congressmen WILL HURD and HENRY CUELLAR, among others—for working with us and for introducing similar legislation on border infrastructure in their Chamber. Hopefully, as we now move from a Senate bill to a House bill that can then be reconciled in a conference committee, these important improvements will be retained and be part of a conference report.

The bottom line is that quality infrastructure and making sure our border is safe and effective is a bipartisan, bicameral issue, and one that clearly unites people in my State and across the border region of our southern States.

I am thankful to see this provision included, and I hope it gets passed soon to give our States the opportunity to dedicate even more necessary resources to the border.

This provision is an important example of the overall theme of this bill, giving the States a reliable way forward to plan for their long-term infrastructure needs. More than anything else, I believe this legislation is an investment in our future and the next generation.

I thank all of our colleagues for working with us to get this bill moving forward. We have an important vote tomorrow morning, and then we have another final passage vote, I believe, on Thursday. In the meantime, the House is going to send us a 3-month bill, which will give us the necessary time for the House then to consider their own transportation bill and then to get us to a conference where we can reconcile the differences.

As the Presiding Officer and I have discussed before in the past, if that is any indication, that will give us even greater ability to influence the ultimate outcome in a way that improves this product in a bicameral and bipartisan sort of way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, in recent weeks, the American people have learned the shocking story of the barbaric practices Planned Parenthood uses to terminate life and to harvest organs of innocent human life. In a video released earlier this month that has gone viral—as it should have—the senior director of medical research at Planned Parenthood explained the process by which she harvests aborted body parts to be provided for medical research. I quote her:

> We've been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, so I'm not gonna crush that part, I'm gonna basically crush below, I'm gonna crush above, and I'm gonna to see if I can get it all intact.

Additional videos have been released—I am told more are to come—with Planned Parenthood officials discussing the organ harvesting of fetuses. Unborn children. Beating hearts on the sonogram, on the screen. Human beings.

Despite the stunning impact and outrage of millions of Americans, Planned Parenthood's response to the release of these videos is this: Blame the messenger or the videographer, but let's not address the practice of harvesting aborted body parts.

Ross Douthat writes for the New York Times. I urge every Senator to read his July 25, 2015, column, entitled ''Looking Away From Abortion.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, July 25, 2015]

LOOKING AWAY FROM ABORTION

(By Ross Douthat)

In an essay in his 1976 collection, ''Mortal Lessons,'' the physician Richard Selzer describes a strange suburban scene. People go outside in the morning in his neighborhood, after the garbage trucks have passed, and find ''a foreignness upon the pavement,'' a softness underfoot.

Looking down, Selzer first thinks he sees oversize baby birds, then rubber baby dolls, until the realization comes that the street is littered with the tiny, naked, all-too-human bodies of aborted fetuses.

Later, the local hospital director speaks to Selzer, trying to impose order on the grisly scene. It was an accident, of course: The tiny corpses were accidentally ''mixed up with the other debris'' instead of being incinerated or interred. ''It is not an everyday occurrence. Once in a lifetime, he says.''

And Selzer tries to nod along: ''Now you see. It is orderly. It is sensible. The world is not mad. This is still a civilized society . . .

''But just this once, you know it isn't. You saw, and you know.''

Resolute abortion rights supporters would dismiss that claim of knowledge. Death and viscera are never pretty, they would say, but something can be disgusting without being barbaric. Just because it's awful to discover fetuses underfoot doesn't mean the unborn have a right to life.

And it's precisely this argument that's been marshaled lately in response to a new reminder of the fleshly realities of abortion: The conversations, videotaped covertly by pro-life activists posing as fetal organ buyers, in which officials from Planned Parenthood cheerfully discuss the procedures for extracting those organs intact during an abortion and the prices they command.

It may be disturbing to hear those procedures described: ''. . . we've been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, so I'm not gonna crush that part, I'm gonna basically crush below, I'm gonna crush above, and I'm gonna see if I can get it all intact.''

It may be unseemly to hear a Planned Parenthood official haggle over pricing for those organs: ''Let me just figure out what others are getting, and if this is in the ballpark, then it's fine, if it's still low, then we can bump it up. I want a Lamborghini.''

But in the end, Planned Parenthood's defenders insist, listening to an abortionist discuss manipulating the ''calvarium'' (that is, the dying fetus's skull) so that it emerges research-ready from the womb is fundamentally no different than listening to a doctor discuss heart surgery or organ transplants. It's unsettling, yes, but just because it's gross doesn't prove it's wrong.

Which is true, but in this case not really true enough. Because real knowledge isn't purely theoretical; it's the fruit of experience, recognition, imagination, life itself.

And the problem these videos create for Planned Parenthood isn't just a generalized queasiness at surgery and blood.

It's a very specific disgust, informed by reason and experience—the reasoning that notes that it's precisely a fetus's humanity that makes its organs valuable, and the experience of recognizing one's own children, on the ultrasound monitor and after, as something more than just ''products of conception'' or tissue for the knife.

That's why Planned Parenthood's apologists have fallen back on complaints about ''deceptive editing'' (though full videos were released in both cases), or else simply asked people to look away. And it's why many of my colleagues in the press seem uncomfortable reporting on the actual content of the videos.

Because dwelling on that content gets you uncomfortably close to Selzer's tipping point—that moment when you start pondering the possibility that an institution at the heart of respectable liberal society is dedicated to a practice that deserves to be called barbarism.

That's a hard thing to accept. It's part of why so many people hover in the conflicted borderlands of the pro-choice side. They don't like abortion, they think its critics have a point . . . but to actively join our side would require passing too comprehensive a judgment on their coalition, their country, their friends, their very selves.

This reluctance is a human universal. It's why white Southerners long preferred Lost Cause mythology to slaveholding realities. It's why patriotic Americans rarely want to dwell too long on My Lai or Manzanar or Nagasaki. It's why, like many conservatives, I was loath to engage with the reality of torture in Bush-era interrogation programs.

But the reluctance to look closely doesn't change the truth of what there is to see. Those were dead human beings on Richard Selzer's street 40 years ago, and these are dead human beings being discussed on video today: Human beings that the nice, idealistic medical personnel at Planned Parenthood have spent their careers crushing, evacuating, and carving up for parts.

The pro-life sting was sweeping; there are reportedly 10 videos to go. You can turn away. But there will be plenty of chances to look, to see, to know.

Mr. COATS. I will share a couple of excerpts from his piece.

Writing in the New York Times, Ross Douthat says:

And the problem these videos create for Planned Parenthood isn't just a generalized queasiness at surgery and blood. It's a very specific disgust, informed by reason and experience—the reasoning that notes that it's precisely a fetus's humanity that makes its organs valuable, and the experience of recognizing one's own children, on the ultrasound monitor and after, as something more than just ''products of conception'' or tissue for the knife.

For those who defend the role of Planned Parenthood, Douthat writes that reflecting on the content of these videos ''gets you uncomfortably close to . . . that moment when you start pondering the possibility that an institution at the heart of respectable liberal society is dedicated to a practice that deserves to be called barbarism.''

I wish to repeat that again. He writes about the barbarity of what has taken place here and the videos of the response of Planned Parenthood—the description of what actually is happening to a child on the way to birth, seen in the ultrasound, hearing the beating of the heart, and then talking about the methods used so that certain parts of that body are not crushed and so that other parts of the body can be harvested for other purposes and sold—sold for money. That this is part of what Planned Parenthood is all about is just stunning.

Douthat said that even though people want to ignore it, even though they want to talk about it and blame the videographer—that he took things out of context—how can you take what is said and happened out of context and provide any rationale or justification for what is being done?

He said: But surely that is the moment when you start to ponder the possibility that an institution at the heart of respectable liberal society is actually dedicated to a practice that deserves to be called barbarism. That is a hard thing to accept, he said.

But, as difficult as that is, Douthat states that we must acknowledge that what is being discussed in these videos is human beings, and the nice, idealistic medical personnel at Planned Parenthood have spent their careers crushing, evacuating, and carving up that human life for parts to be sold on the market.

It is important that this body let Planned Parenthood know the American people do not support these inhumane practices. Congress should debate this issue. It should vote. It should vote soon. It should not leave here for our August recess until we send a clear message to Planned Parenthood that this is totally unacceptable, that the taxpayers of America will not fund with 1 cent of their tax dollars this barbaric practice, provided through an agency that pretends to be offering sound health care advice to pregnant mothers. Every Senator should have the opportunity to affirm that life is sacred and a precious gift, and it must be protected.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to give my analysis of the last year of Supreme Court decisions. There is a misconception that our Supreme Court is conservative, but in the term that just ended, the Supreme Court upheld a key provision of ObamaCare. It read the plain language of that ObamaCare statute that provided that health insurance subsidies apply only to exchanges established by the States and said that they are available on exchanges created by the Federal Government.

It ruled that fair housing discrimination cases can be brought even where there is no intent to discriminate. A harmful impact, then, is enough to bring a case.

It found that same-sex marriages are constitutionally required.

It expanded the reach of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act and made it easier to win cases under that law.

The Court decided that racial gerrymandering cases under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act must consider the effect on individual districts regardless of minority voting in the State as a whole. The Court said as well that in those cases, courts must look beyond the numbers when deciding whether minority voters have been packed into districts to dilute their influence on elections.

In fact, the Court reflected a very liberal bent in the last term. More worrisome, its liberalism derives not from the Constitution but the policy preferences of the Justices. Application of longstanding political science models shows that this year's Supreme Court rulings were the most liberal since the Warren Court years of the 1960s. As a UCLA professor stated, ''Shockingly, the Supreme Court may have been more liberal than the Obama Administration this term.''

The liberal Justices and the conservative Justices on the Supreme Court judge differently, and that is what I want to show to my colleagues. The conservative Justices acted as umpires, for the most part. They considered the facts and the law and decided the cases as they understood the Constitution. The liberal Justices prevailed so frequently because Justice Kennedy, Chief Justice Roberts, and—at least one time—Justice Thomas each voted with the liberals in at least two close, significant cases. As a University of Michigan professor commented, ''The chief justice really does take restraint seriously. At times, that is going to put a justice in contraposition to what his ideological preferences might be.''

By contrast, looking at the other end of the spectrum, there are no close cases in which even a single liberal Justice voted with conservative Justices to make a majority. Only two of the major cases were decided 5 to 4 in a conservative direction.

The New York Times identified the 10 most important cases of the term. The Washington Post selected 13 cases.

Whichever list is consulted, liberal results predominated. In each of the cases, the four liberal Justices voted as a bloc for a—as you might expect—liberal result. I want to show why this isn't a coincidence. The liberal Justices act like players on the same team. Liberal Justices have actually admitted that they strategize in advance to vote as a bloc in support of liberal outcomes. Justice Ginsburg stated this last year: ''We have made a concerted effort to speak with one voice in important cases.'' I fear that this attitude and the votes of these Justices give rise to an appearance that their loyalties are to each other and to their preferred principles and policies rather than to the Constitution. Certainly, it is easier to make cases come out the way you want than to carefully consider the facts, precedent, text, and the arguments of the parties before reaching a decision that might run counter to your preferred outcome. And for those Justices, it is easier to do so if you know you have four votes in your pocket before you begin the task.

We accept the important role the Supreme Court plays in our constitutional system. The Constitution trumps the inconsistent policy choices of the American people enacted through their elected representatives. That is what we call the rule of law. But when Justices strike down laws based not on the Constitution but on their own policy preferences, that is the rule of judges. The Court in that instance acts as a superlegislature. Those rulings should, therefore, be questioned. At my town meeting Saturday in Iowa, they were being questioned. The Justices' personal policy views are entitled to no more respect than the policy views of the American people.

When Supreme Court nominees come before the Judiciary Committee for confirmation, they know better than to say they will enforce their own views. They don't say the Constitution is a living document with a meaning that changes over time. They know they wouldn't be confirmed if that is what they said. Instead, they say the text controls or if the text is unclear, the structure and the original intent of the Founders govern. They say constitutional interpretation is not about politics or good policy; they tell us it is ''law all the way down.'' But when they get on the bench, all bets seem to be off.

For instance, the text of the Constitution allows the government to deprive people of life if due process of law is provided. It makes references to capital—or death penalty—cases. It is therefore clear that the death penalty is constitutional. There may be some valid questions on when the death penalty would be legal. Nonetheless, last month Justice Breyer and another Justice wrote that they think it is very likely that the death penalty is unconstitutional in all cases—in other words, just throw out the words of the Constitution. That ought to be extremely disturbing to all of us. It is essentially a revival of the Warren Court, where the Justices' personal views trump the Constitution.

The Court also ruled this year on same-sex marriage. I support traditional marriage, as a sizable percentage of the American people still do. However, I do respect people of different views. The Constitution says nothing about whether same-sex marriage is required. That is for the people to decide through the democratic process. When the Supreme Court ruled otherwise, that prompted a significant portion of the populace to believe that the Justices were reading their own view into the Constitution. The decision was based on a doctrine called ''substantive due process.'' Substantive due process is really nothing more than an open invitation to Justices to read their own policy views into the Constitution.

This year, the Court ruled that the word ''liberty'' includes the right to define and express identity, individual autonomy, and dignity. Where do you find those words in the Constitution? In the past, the Court had narrowly construed substantive due process to protect only those rights established in light of objective history and their deep roots in society. The majority effectively then overturned those rules.

The Court now thinks the meaning of the clause does not turn on the text or the intentions of the Framers. Rather, the Court ruled that the meaning of due process changes as ''we''—the Justices—apply, as they would say, ''new insight'' that derives from, in their words, a ''better informed understanding of how constitutional imperatives define a liberty that remains urgent in our own era.''

In the view of the slim majority, the role of the Court is to make, in their words, ''new dimensions of freedom . . . apparent to new generations.''

This is the language of the doctrine of the living Constitution. It is the Justices, then, amending the Constitution without Congress and the States voting to do so. It is another Earl Warren deciding cases by asking what is just and what is fair, and that is in his mind and not what the Constitution and the laws require.

It is not law at all, never mind ''law all the way down.''

While the decision permits those who hold the traditional view of marriage to discuss their views, it said nothing about the real constitutional right to freely exercise religion—with the emphasis upon ''exercise.''

Another of the Court's liberal decisions gave short shrift to another right protected by the Constitution: free speech. That decision treated as government speech what is actually private speech. It is an important distinction in the real world. Government must treat private speech neutrally. It cannot play favorites, but the government can discriminate against viewpoints it does not like when the speech is the government's speech. It can fund speech that discourages use of illegal drugs, for instance, without funding speech that encourages drug use.

As a result of the First Amendment ruling, the government may be able to deny many kinds of government benefits to those who dare to express views with which the government disagrees. This then would be an ominous development for everyone.

Specifically, the government may be able to deny tax exemptions and charitable deductions based on the free expression of the groups involved. That would make a scandal such as the IRS's denial of tax-exempt status to organizations based on their presumptive conservative policy stands constitutionally permissible.

Substantive due process has been used for the last 50 years only to invent new liberal constitutional rights. Conservatives have not used substantive due process to invent new conservative constitutional rights. In creating new such rights, liberal Justices never are hesitant to overturn conservative precedents, but those same Justices consider the liberal substantive due process precedents to be sacrosanct under stare decisis. In other words, they are effectively saying ''what is mine is mine and what is yours is negotiable.''

Conservatives issue legal rulings that produce liberal policy effects, but liberal Justices will not issue legal rulings that are conservative. So as I am trying to show to my colleagues, each side plays by different rules.

Is it any wonder that so many people in this country think the game is not on the level? A recent CNN poll—a media organization that no one would say is rightwing—found that 37 percent of those surveyed think the Court is too liberal. Only 20 percent characterized it as being too conservative. I am concerned about how that backlash could manifest itself.

Even if Justices abuse their power of judicial review by substituting their policy views for the Constitution, we need judicial independence to safeguard the actual Constitution. We should not do anything to undermine judicial independence, but if the Court does not give the public the confidence that the meaning of ''liberty'' in the due process clause means something other than the policy preferences of five Justices, the consequences could be serious for our constitutional order.

The Supreme Court, similar to a river flooding its banks, is not staying within its proper channel. I strongly encourage all Justices of the Court to exercise the self-restraint the Constitution demands and that its Framers anticipated.

Ultimately, that will be the only way the courts will retain their necessary powers to preserve the Constitution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, while I would normally be coming down at this time to talk about the Transportation reauthorization bill, which is one of the most significant bills we will be considering—there are problems right now in getting it done before the House leaves, but we are going to make every effort to have it done by the end of this week. I think that is very important because, for all of the reasons we talked about, we can't continue to do part-time extensions that don't allow us to get to any of the real problems we have. However, that is not why I came to the floor this afternoon. I am here this afternoon to speak on a different topic.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1877 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators MCCAIN and ROUNDS be added as cosponsors to the S. 1877.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, right now we are in kind of a waiting period. We have made a request. It seems that request is being denied because it takes unanimous consent to come up with language that will allow us to waive time.

The time that is pending right now on the Inhofe amendment will not expire for 30 hours. Precloture will not expire until 5 a.m. tomorrow, so it looks like that will make it too late to get our bill passed prior to the time the House goes home.

This could always change. I think a lot of people are taking this position because they didn't think we would be able to pass the bill. I think we are going to pass it. I think we can pass it very likely on Thursday, and so even if the House is gone, we will be preparing to go in and handle that bill when we all come back after the recess.

I just want to mention this because I think it is very important for people to understand that we are going to be using this. We have gone through a lot of work on the bill.

The highway reauthorization bill was passed unanimously out of the committee I chaired, the Environment and Public Works Committee. Every Republican and Democrat voted for it. So it is one of the few bipartisan efforts to take place in a body that is often criticized for not getting anything done. This will be a major bill. It will become a reality.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, thank you. To the chair of the committee, congratulations, Mr. INHOFE, on the progress made so far with regard to the highway bill, indicating that we will pass something on Thursday and send it over to the House. It is important we address this issue. It is important we put people back to work. We have crumbling roads and bridges.

I hope everybody in this Chamber agrees that we need a highway bill and, specifically, we need one as long-term as possible in order to give people predictability and certainty to be able to plan projects and to be able to deal with what is an increasing problem in our country, which is a lack of funds in infrastructure.

I hear it back home in Ohio. What I am hearing is: Give us certainty. Let us know what the plan is. Congress, in doing these short-term extensions, is not creating a plan.

If we end up with a short-term extension because the House and Senate can't agree, then I hope we will make a commitment when we do that to say: OK. After whatever that short-term period is—I have heard the rumor of 3 months—that at that point we will come up with a long-term proposal together.

I happen to think one way we could find a longer term proposal is to have international tax reform. We should do it anyway. We should do it whether or not the highway trust fund is connected to it. There are ways to reform the Tax Code so companies that are overseas, that have revenues overseas, that won't bring them back now because our tax rates are so high might be willing to bring them back at a lower rate. If they bring those funds back and are taxed on those funds, there might be an opportunity to provide some funding for long-term solutions to the highway trust fund, perhaps in conjunction with some of the other pay-fors that are part of the bill we are talking about. International tax reform is necessary in and of itself. I didn't come to the floor to talk about that, although tomorrow we do have a hearing in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations on this very issue.

I will tell my colleagues and those who are listening, if we do not reform our Tax Code, update our currently noncompetitive Tax Code, we are going to see more and more jobs and investment going overseas. It is that simple.

We already see it. Last year, in dollar terms, there were twice as many foreign acquisitions of U.S. companies than there were the year before. Think about that. These are big companies with big names. One name you might know is Burger King, another is Budweiser. Another one that is thinking about it is Monsanto. These are big companies.

A lot of companies have already decided they are not going to stay in the United States because our Tax Code is so bad. It puts them at such a disadvantage vis-á-vis their competitors around the world that they can't survive. They have to become foreign entities in order to be competitive. We have to fix that. It is Washington that is creating the problem. Many criticize these companies. I say if there is any blame to show, it is right here in Washington, DC, by allowing the Tax Code that was written in the 1960s to continue when every other one of our competitors around the world has reformed their tax codes and lowered their rates. This is something we can and should do. There is bipartisan consensus around this—maybe not in the details but in a framework.

Senator SCHUMER, on the other side of the aisle, and I put together a report on this recently. We spent 3 or 4 months working on this, but it is a combination of a lot of different hearings and projects that have been undertaken over the last several years on this. We know what we have to do. We know we have to go to a competitive international system that allows us to be able to say to our workers in America: We are going to give you the tools to compete and win. We are not going to allow you to continue to have to compete with one hand tied behind your back, which is what is happening right now. The beneficiaries of this would be the American economy but specifically the American worker.

The folks in the boardrooms are going to be fine one way or the other. When you have these foreign acquisitions of U.S. companies or you have these so-called inversions where companies go overseas, the major executives in the company do just fine. The stock usually goes up. What happens is you lose workforce, you lose jobs here in America, salaries don't go up—they stay flat—and that is who is taking the brunt of this. So we have to fix that system, and I think we can do it perhaps in the next few months as part of this highway trust fund. That would be, I hope, an incentive to do it. Again, we should do it anyway, even if there is no highway trust fund need for us to find additional sources of funding.

In the meantime, I applaud the chairman and others who included in the highway trust fund legislation we are currently looking at. This is the legislation the chairman says we are likely to vote on Thursday. Included in that are a couple of other provisions that are quite helpful.

The one I want to talk about is with regard to regulations and permitting. When you think about it, we are struggling to find enough money to put into the highway trust fund to extend it as long as possible, right? Everybody is concerned about the fact that we have roads and bridges and can't put enough people back to work. One solution to this is to go to the taxpayers and say: We need more funding from the Federal tax base to go into this. That is what is happening, frankly. Another one is to say is there a better way to build these roads and bridges to save money so every tax dollar goes further, so we are telling the American people we are not only funding infrastructure, but we are

doing it in the most cost-effective, efficient way. That is not happening now. One reason it is not happening now is because it is so darn hard to permit something, so hard to get the green light to go ahead and start construction on something.

I hear this all the time back home. I hear it with regard to commercial buildings, I hear it with regard to energy projects, and I hear it with regard to roads and bridges. You have so many hoops you have to go through, many of which are Federal, some of which are local, some of which are State—many of which are Federal, that it adds costs to the project. It adds delay to the project, and it makes it so you are always worried about a litigation risk because people can go back years after the project is completed and say: Aha. I am going to file a lawsuit because you didn't follow all of these Federal regulations and rules quite the way you should have. That adds cost that we should not be incurring.

Instead, as we pass this highway bill, we are going to pass something that is called permitting reform. The Federal permitting system is being reformed in this underlying bill. My colleagues ought to know about that. I am going to make a plea that regardless of what happens, whether it is a 6-year bill, which I think would be great, again adding predictability and certainty, or whether it is 3 years, which maybe we are going to pass on Thursday, or whether it is 3 months, which is what some are saying—the rumor is perhaps the House will send it back to the Senate—whatever the extension period is, let's include this legislation to make it easier to green-light a project to have America get back into the business of building things, not just roads and bridges—although it will help on this bill—but also other projects: energy projects, construction projects, commercial buildings, and so on.

Let me give you a really frightening statistic. There is a group that does an international assessment every year of all the countries in the world. It asks: How easy is it to do business in various countries? They compare the countries. One of the countries of course in the mix is us, the United States of America. You would hope we would be at the top of the list—the best place to invest—that we would be the country, since we are a capitalist free enterprise country where we value ingenuity and want to move forward with projects and get things done, that we would be at the top of the list. We are not. We are now No. 41 in the world in terms of the ease to get a construction permit to build something—No. 41 in the world.

Capital is global these days. It moves around the world, and certainly around the country, but around the world. So you go to a big city overseas, let's say London. You see all sorts of cranes. Why? Because actually in that city it is easier to build something than it is here in the United States. That is crazy. We should have a system here in the United States where you have to go for the proper regulations, you have to be sure you are building something that is safe and environmentally sound, but that it is easy to do it. You can do it quickly. We are now 41st in the world.

This drives investment out of the United States and puts that investment in other countries. This is why this legislation is so important. Again, for the roads and bridges it is important, but also in general to put people back to work.

Here is something interesting about this legislation. We have worked on this for almost 4 years—about 3.5 years now. My cosponsor is CLAIRE MCCASKILL, who is a Democrat, so we have a Republican and a Democrat doing this together. Over time we have been able to build support, slowly but surely, to the point that we now have a good group of bipartisan cosponsors, pretty evenly balanced between Republicans and Democrats, but we also have some support from the outside that is unusually balanced.

We have the Chamber of Commerce supporting this in the business community. That might be expected. A lot of them are interested in how to build something and build it more quickly, but we also have the AFL–CIO building trades council strongly in support of this. I appreciate that. Because they get it. This is about work and specifically about construction jobs. A lot of those jobs went away during the financial crisis of 2007, 2008, and 2009. They have been slow to come back. Unemployment is still relatively high among construction workers. Frankly, a lot of them have moved on to something else because they have not had jobs.

The AFL–CIO building trades council and the business community are together on this. They are working with us together to ensure that we can get this done in the highway bill and to move forward with not just something that will help on roads and bridges, but it will help on all kinds of projects.

I heard about this in the context of energy. When I first got elected, a company came to me. It is called American Municipal Power, AMP. AMP does small energy projects all over our State and some other States. They came to me and said: You know, Rob, we have been trying to put a powerplant on the Ohio River. Now, you might think that normally would be a coal plant or a gas plant, or even a nuclear plant—there are all those along the Ohio River. They said: No, we are actually trying to put a hydro plant. The Ohio River is not a particularly natural place for hydro, you would not think, but it turns out there is a nice flow in the Ohio River. It is a big river.

They had this great idea at the locks of the Ohio River to add a municipal powerplant, hydroplant, but they said: We cannot get through all of these Federal hoops. There are up to 35 different Federal licenses and permits you now have to get to do an energy project. Think about that. You have to get 35 different Federal licenses and permits in order to start construction and to move forward with an energy project.

That is what they found in the Ohio River. They came to me and said: What can you do to help? We started to look at it and figured out: My gosh. The right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing. You have so many agencies involved, so many different interests involved, whether it is the Army Corps of Engineers, the USGS, whether it is EPA, whether it is again State and local regulations. I am just talking about the Federal side when I talk about the 35 permits and regulations.

What American Municipal Power wanted was to be able to get something done in a predictable way and have somebody be accountable. We liked that idea, so we moved forward with this legislation providing more accountability.

We also heard from Baard Energy. Baard had plans to build a $6 billion synthetic fuels plant in Wellsville, OH. This was a coal-to-liquid plant that would not only convert coal into clean diesel and jet fuel, it would also have created, we were told, up to 2,500 jobs. This is in a part of Eastern Ohio where these jobs are so valuable, so precious.

They couldn't do it at the end of the day because the permitting delays and the lawsuits they got so interfered with the project that their capital left. It wasn't patient enough to wait around for all the delays, all the potential lawsuits, all the problems. So, again, from them we learned: Well, let's have accountability, one agency responsible, but also let's look at this issue of not just lack of accountability, but the fact that these lawsuits continue to slow these projects down and make it more difficult to move forward.

Our legislation addresses all of these issues. It does so in a very thoughtful and, I think, reasonable way, in a way that is common sense. We have got support on both sides of the aisle. First of all, it strengthens coordination and deadline setting. We talked about having some accountability. One agency is now accountable, so instead of agencies being able to go: Well, you know, we are fine, but how about this other agency? Not our fault, their fault, pointing fingers. Now you have got one agency that is in charge.

Deadline setting. This creates an interagency council to best identify what the best practices are, but also set deadlines for reviews. Right now with no deadlines, the things often go on and on and on, in approvals of important infrastructure projects.

It also strengthens cooperation between the State and local permitting authorities, another problem. As I said earlier, there are local and State issues as well, and we try to avoid duplication and the delay that comes from that.

Second, the legislation facilitates greater transparency and greater public participation in the permitting

process. It creates what we call an online dashboard where you can look at the dashboard—whether you are a company that is involved in this or whether you are a member of the public who is interested in this—you can look on that dashboard and see this is where the permit is. OK. It is at that agency. Well, why? You can see whether it has completed its review. And where are we on this?

It encourages not just the ability to track agency progress, which I think will have a very important effect—sunlight is the best disinfectant sometimes in bringing this out; making the transparency better is a good idea, but it also brings more input from stakeholders.

We also require in our legislation that the agencies accept comments from stakeholders early in the approval process. Why? Because another problem we found was that often the concerns come very late in the process, so you have an investment, you have workers working on this. All of a sudden a concern comes in, it stops everything, slows it down, and makes it very inefficient.

Instead we are saying: OK. Comments, they are very important, but let's accept those comments earlier in the process. Let's identify these important public concerns from the very start. Then finally, it institutes a set of litigation reforms that I think is very important. One I will mention, which I think is probably going to be surprising to a lot of people: Right now there is a statute of limitations on lawsuits that runs 6 years. This is after the environmental review, the NEPA review—6 years. Think about that. We limit that 6 years to 2 years. I would have liked to limit it even further to be frank.

In our original legislation we tried to limit it even further, but this again is a consensus-building project. We want to be sure we kept the bipartisan support, we kept support on the outside, including from groups like the Natural Resources Defense Council that have worked with us on this.

So we have accountability, transparency, litigation reforms, with the whole goal of saying: Let's take, in the case of these construction projects, the roads and bridges, the Federal dollars, and let's let them work in a more efficient way so every dollar goes further, so we can get these roads and bridges going, so we are not paying so much for delays and redtape, so we are not paying so much more for lawsuits, so we can actually get this thing moving. That is in this legislation.

I hope my colleagues who, like me, go back home and hear about regulatory reform and the need for us to streamline the process will strongly support this part of the legislation, even if they cannot support all of the legislation. I hope they will continue to push this Senate and the House of Representatives to pass this permitting reform legislation.

If we do that and it lands on the President's desk, I believe he will sign it. I believe that because we have worked with him closely and because frankly it will have such strong bipartisan support. It is the right thing to do. It enables us to say to the people we represent: You know what. We are not just asking for some more money for roads and bridges, which is important and will create more jobs and make our economy more efficient—we need to do that. The crumbling infrastructure is real.

It is also an opportunity for us to do it in a more efficient way. The President's job council, at the end of 2011, issued a report. You might remember that. President Obama selected Jeffrey Immelt, who is a very widely respected executive—GE CEO—to chair the jobs council. He came up with a bunch of recommendations, many of which I think were very constructive.

One was about this very issue. This is what they said. They said we ought to reform the permitting process because we should, as the President said, ''do everything we can to make it easier for folks to bring products to market, and to start and expand new businesses, and to grow and hire new workers.'' That was the President.

Sean McGarvey is the president of the North America's Building Trades Union. We talked about the AFL–CIO building trades union. This is what Sean McGarvey has said: ''If there was ever an issue that could be considered a no-brainer for Congress, the Federal Permitting Improvement Act is it.''

I agree with Sean. This is a no-brainer. Let's get it done as part of the legislation we are going to pass this week. I believe we will pass it. If we do not pass the highway bill this week, let's ensure that we include the permitting reforms in whatever we do pass.

Again, whether it is a 3-month extension or a 6-year extension, we should be sure that we are removing unnecessary delays, bureaucratic hurdles, so that more Americans who are looking for a job can find a job, and so that tax dollars can go further. I want to thank CLAIRE MCCASKILL, the Senator from Missouri, who has been the cosponsor of this over the last few years. Sometimes it has not been easy working through this. She has taken some arrows, but it is the right thing to do. It is meaningful legislation that will actually help move our economy in the right direction and help us to be able to repair more of these roads and bridges because we will be doing it more efficiently.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the highway bill. I understand there will be a cloture vote tomorrow and then potentially, if that is achieved, final passage the day after. I want to say again that I appreciate the efforts of so many in various areas, that my comments today are not intended to be directed at any individual or either side of the aisle.

I was elected in 2006 and I came in during 2007, so I have been here roughly 8½ years. One of the reasons I ran for office was to deal with our Nation's fiscal issues. I was so concerned about the direction in which our country was going. As you know, just about every military leader we have will tell you that the greatest threat to our Nation's national security is us, those of us here in Congress, and the way we deal with our fiscal issues.

The simplest fiscal issue I know of to solve is the highway bill because it is simple math. It is not like Medicare, where all these actuarial issues have to be dealt with and you have to make assumptions about the impact on care and all those kinds of things. The highway bill is just simple math. It is so easy. There is money that comes in and there is money that goes out.

I think everybody in this body knows the highway bill was set up based on a user fee program where people who are using the highways pay for that through user fees and then the money would be there in a trust fund—a real trust fund—where, in fact, the money would go out. So we would have a system in our country where we would pay for our highways and other infrastructure in that regard. As a matter of fact, the State of Tennessee has zero road debt because that is exactly the way they handle their State portion.

I know a lot has been said about this Presidential race and what is driving some of the interesting anomalies that are occurring right now. People are saying: Well, certain candidates are receiving a lot of attention because of the anger people in America have toward Washington. I would just say that this bill—this is an outline of it—should be exhibit A as to why people in America are angry at Washington. Both sides of the aisle, both ends of the Capitol, this is exhibit A.

Again, I understand this was a combined effort with lots of people, but let me point out a few things.

No. 1, we have had five general fund transfers—in other words, taking money out of our general fund and sending it over to the highway trust fund. That has totaled $60 billion since 2008.

We have these wonderful young interns who come up here to learn about Washington. They come up here to experience Washington. They have read in their history books and other places—in civics—about this being the greatest deliberative body in the world. I would think that in most cases they probably look up to people here on the floor. Some of them may aspire to

someday actually serve in the Senate. But what they are going to be witnessing should this bill become law is 100 folks in this room—not all of them but a number of people in this room—voting to basically steal money from them.

They are stealing money from you so that all of us can look good to our constituents and pass a highway bill. So we are going to steal money from you so that we don't have to deal with this issue. It is called generational theft.

So to the pages and to the people you have been working with for so long, just know—and I don't know any other way to describe this. Let me explain. This is a 3-year bill we are going to pay for over 10 years. One hundred percent of the spending, in other words, takes place between the years 2016 and 2018—100 percent of the spending—but 69 percent of the offsets, the money coming in, actually comes in—you heard me say 2016 to 2018—between 2022 and 2025. So that would be like your mother or father going to the grocery store and buying groceries and saying: Well, I am not going to pay for this today; I will pay for this in 7 or 8 or 9 years down the road. Every time they went to the grocery store, they did that. You can imagine how your household finances would operate if that is what they did. If this bill becomes law, that is what the people in this body will be doing to you. It is generational theft.

We use these tricky accounting rules around here where if we pay for something over 10 years even though we spend the money in 1 year, we count that, believe it or not, as paid for.

It is even worse on something like a highway trust bill. See, this is something where money is supposed to come in at the same rate money is going out. You can expect some aberrations on when money comes in and when money goes out on other kinds of programs—you can expect that—but not on the highway trust fund.

This is the kind of math, by the way, each of you probably knew about in the third or fourth grade, where you could figure out how much money is coming in and how much money is going out. But on both sides of the Capitol and on both sides of the aisle, since 2008, instead of dealing with this issue—which, by the way, means you have to make some tough choices. You could spend less money in the trust fund. That would be a way to make it add up. You could devolve some of the responsibilities back to States. By the way, so many roads are now becoming roads the Federal system pays for, there might be a good argument for that. There is a good argument for that. Or you could just increase revenues and make sure those who are driving on the roads in our country today pay more to do it. But that is not what is going to happen. We are going to pull a trick on the American people. And here I get back to that anger issue and the reason so many people are upset with Washington. Again, this is exhibit A.

As a matter of fact, only 9 percent of the money coming in over this 10-year period comes in during the period of time we are spending on the highway bill. Can you believe that? Yet we say it is paid for.

Let me tell you what else we are doing. This is fascinating to me. Congress, in its brilliance, has created a system where only Fannie and Freddie—remember the two behemoths that had $5 trillion in housing mortgages in our country, the big giants that failed back in 2008? What we have done in this bill—I am not going to do it, but if people vote for this bill, what they will be agreeing to do is to extend the guarantee fee on mortgages out, by the way, the last couple of years of this bill, so, again, money comes in way beyond the time we spend it.

So let's say you guys go to college. I know many of you will. When you get out, you decide to buy a home. Let me tell you how we, in our wisdom, have decided to pay for our highways. We are going to make you pay more for your mortgage. You are not going to know that, by the way; we are going to hide it in your mortgage.

See, we want to make sure the American people don't really know how we are paying for these things. We try to hide these things from folks so that when we run for reelection, we don't create any ire amongst the public.

This one is hard for me to believe. Now, I can understand some people in this body supporting this, those who support Fannie and Freddie continuing on forever, because what we are really doing is now the Federal Government, in order to pay for our roads, is relying on Fannie and Freddie. So how could you do away with them? Think about it.

We have had so many people in this body talk big about winding down Fannie and Freddie and about how they are a threat to our Nation. I have actually written a bill to try to deal with that and had a lot of support from people on both sides of the aisle. We all talk big, but let me tell you what we are going to do. To pay for the highways, we are going to continue the policy of making sure that every time somebody gets a mortgage, they pay a little more for that mortgage—the entire time, by the way, that mortgage is in place. That generates about $2 billion. Of course, the American people won't know or see that, and so that, of course, makes it very popular.

Let me talk about another one. This is fascinating to me. The Federal Reserve System has been paying a dividend to member banks that invest in their regional Feds. Since 1930, that dividend rate has been 6 percent. I don't know if that is the right number.

By the way, some people are confusing this with a monetary policy issue, which is the amount that is being paid on the reserve. That is not what this is. This is something which has been in place since the 1930s. We never had a hearing on it, by the way, and I have no idea what we should be paying, OK? I have no idea. But just out of the blue, to generate $17 billion—without a hearing; never been a hearing; as a matter of fact, I would say most people in this body have never heard of this issue—to pay for our roads and again make sure we stay in great stead with our constituents back home so we don't have to make any tough choices, we are going to change that from 6 to 1.5 percent. That generates $17 billion. But, again, it keeps us from having to deal with this issue head on. By the way, a lot of that money comes in way beyond the period of time we are spending the money on the roadways.

This is the one that gets me. I love this one. I love this one. We are going to sell 101 million barrels of oil from something called the Strategic Petroleum Reserve from 2018 to 2025. We have a big Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is in our national security interests. As a matter of fact, I would say that if President Obama were to propose this particular pay-for, most everyone on our side of the aisle would just raise unbelievable—I need to choose my words—would be very upset. It would be dead on arrival because what it does is it weakens our national security.

We have the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. In a time of crisis, we want to make sure the people in America have access to this Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

This is so grave. We are generating $9 billion, by the way, in the years 2018 through 2025—again, beyond the time of even paying for this highway measure. So again, it is generational theft—selling assets down the road to pay for things today. It generates $9 billion, and half of the sales occur in 2024 and 2025. So it is kicking the can down the road.

For America, please, please, be upset about this. Please, please, be angry about this.

Let me tell you what we are doing. We all make investments and pay attention to the markets a little bit. We hope we can save some money. Oil is selling today at under $50 a barrel. But let me tell you at what we have decided we are going to sell this oil. We are just going to make it up—at $89 a barrel. Think about that.

Congress in its wisdom has decided we are going to sell 101 million barrels of oil. We are so bright and we can anticipate the future so well that we know, by golly, that when we sell this oil between 2018 and 2025, it is going to be at $89 a barrel, even though it is under $50 a barrel today. But we know that because we represent America. We have been elected to the Senate.

So that is how we are generating it. By the way, if during that period of time oil happens to be selling at $74 a barrel, we break even. If it sells for anything under that, it is less. But by the way, there is $9 billion of made-up money just because we have decided

that is what the price of oil is going to be at that time.

I just have to say that this is one of the most irresponsible pieces of legislation I have seen come this far in the Senate. Let me say this one more time. This has to be one of the most irresponsible pieces of legislation that I have seen make it this far in the Senate.

I am very disappointed with where we are. I am not directing that at anybody. People on both sides of the aisle are involved in getting it where it is today. People on both sides of the building have used these types of gimmicks and tricks to basically involve ourselves in abject generational theft, keeping us from making tough decisions today. They are not even tough, to be honest—just using our God-given common sense, the same thing that most Americans get up every day and have to deal with.

I have been so uplifted in my home State and by my home town of Chattanooga to watch how ordinary citizens with huge patriotism and large amounts of common sense have dealt with the tremendous tragedy in our hometown. I have just been overwhelmed by it. I wish all of America could see the response of people who wake up every day carrying out their ordinary duties, husbands and wives and sons and daughters. They care about our Nation. They care about its future. They care about our military. They care about people who protect us. I wish that somehow people could see that. I know people see it in all of their hometowns around the country. I know people see this greatness. Yet in this bill, I don't see any common sense. How could we pay for our highways utilizing this type of pay-for?

So I rise to say that I don't support this piece of legislation. I think that has been made clear. I hope that as people analyze the pay-fors—which, again, in my opinion could not be more ridiculous on something like a highway bill—this bill will go down, and we will figure out a way to deal with this in a more productive way. Again, the right way to deal with this, if you have a trust fund, is to have fees that come in and the same amount that go out.

I think in this minor conversation here, these pages probably get that. I think America gets that. I hope, again, this bill does not pass. I hope it does not become law, and I hope we can gather and figure out another way of dealing with this in a responsible way that doesn't use gimmicks, as this certainly uses.

I don't know how anybody could say: By the way, the Senate has assumed that in the years 2024 and 2025, oil will sell at $89 a barrel. Now, if the Senate was that good at giving financial advice—certainly, if we look at our balance sheets and the deficits we have been running, people would know that is anything but the truth.

The fact is that this bill should not become law and should not be supported. I intend to vote against it. I intend to encourage others to vote against it. I hope that at some point in my tenure here we will actually begin to deal with our fiscal issues head on, in a direct way that solves them for the long term and really doesn't sweep them under the rug for this generation, unfortunately, to have to clean up our mess.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, in poll after poll, the American people have told this Congress that it is time to wake up to the ever-growing threat from carbon pollution. Two-thirds of Americans support the Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Power Plan to cut emissions from powerplants and invest in energy efficiency and renewable energy. Even a majority of Republicans support action to reduce carbon pollution. But we do nothing.

So here I am again, for the 108th time, for a speech of which the Presiding Officer has become something of a frequent flyer, to urge that we listen to our constituents and do the job that we were sent here to do.

Sadly, Congress is stuck in the grip of the big polluters and their unlimited, unreported campaign spending. After the dreadful Citizens United Supreme Court decision of 2010, two things happened. One, corporate political spending poured into secretive unaccountable groups that now wield untold influence in our elections. Two, Republicans—particularly Republican voices in Congress—fell silent on carbon pollution and climate change. It was a stopper.

So despite the wishes of the American people and despite an overwhelming scientific consensus, the majority in the Senate has no plan whatsoever to address the catastrophic changes we see in our oceans and our atmosphere, in our farms and our forests.

Many of the Republican candidates for President, for fear of offending their fossil fuel billionaire donors, ignore not only the clear tide of public opinion and not only the warnings of our scientific and national security officials but ignore the climate disruptions in their own home States. They ignore the homegrown climate research of their own State's scientists and universities.

Earlier this year I came to the floor with my colleague and friend, Senator BALDWIN of Wisconsin, to consider the effects of carbon pollution in her Badger State. Senator BALDWIN is a fierce defender of Wisconsin families and businesses and is fighting to protect Wisconsin's climate, from the Great Lakes to the legendary dairy farms.

Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker, on the other hand, has gone another way. He has gone right down the fossil fuel industry rabbit hole. He pulled the plug on scientific and environmental functions in State government and he attacks environmental programs in the Federal Government.

Let's look at the facts in Wisconsin. According to the scientists at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, weather stations around Wisconsin measure that average temperatures in Wisconsin increased by about 1.1 degrees Fahrenheit between 1950 and 2006. During the same period, Wisconsin got wetter as well as warmer. Annual average precipitation in Wisconsin increased by almost 3 inches—again, measured.

As more and more carbon pollution piles up in the atmosphere, researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison estimate and project that by midcentury Wisconsin could warm by 4 to 9 degrees Fahrenheit. By the end of the century, the climate in Wisconsin may look more like that of present-day Missouri or Oklahoma, raising the prospect of dramatic shifts in the Wisconsin economy and way of life.

These changes would not be kind to Wisconsin's iconic badger. The Upper Midwest and Great Lakes Landscape Conservation Cooperative lists the Wisconsin badger as one of the region's species at risk from climate change. It has no apparent effect on Governor Walker, however.

There was the Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts. The Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts was formed in 2007 by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and the University of Wisconsin Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies. The scientists and public officials in this program are studying how climate change will affect Wisconsin's wildlife, water resources, and public health, and important Wisconsin industries such as forestry, agriculture, and shipping and tourism on the Great Lakes.

Climate change threatens pillars of the Wisconsin economy. The initiative's agricultural working group reports that higher summer temperatures and increasing drought will create significant stress on livestock, even touching Wisconsin's famed cheese industry. Victor Cabrera, an assistant professor in the University of Wisconsin-Madison Dairy Science Department, says that this heat stress interferes with both fertility and milk production. Dairy cows could give as much as 10 percent less milk. Professor Cabrera in Wisconsin is not alone. He is not alone. The U.S. Department of Agriculture predicts that by 2030 climate change will cost the U.S. dairy sector between $79 million and $199 million per year in lost production. Does Governor Walker care? Apparently not, but

the University of Wisconsin does. So it is leading a USDA-funded effort to identify practices that minimize greenhouse gases from milk production and make dairies more resilient to Wisconsin's changing climate. Some Wisconsin dairy farmers, for instance, are burning excess methane in enormous manure digesters to generate their own renewable electricity.

It is not just the farmers. Wisconsin has sportsmen. Wisconsin's sportsmen treasure Wisconsin's 10,000 miles of trout streams—some of the best trout fishing in the country. Trout Unlimited found that fishing in the Driftless Area of southwest Wisconsin and parts of Illinois, Minnesota, and Iowa adds over $1 billion per year to the surrounding economy. But the cold-water fish such as the brook trout are highly sensitive to temperature increases in streams.

Under the worst cases analyzed by the researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, ''brook trout are projected to be completely lost from Wisconsin streams.'' Even the best case scenarios see losses of as much as 44 percent of the Wisconsin brookies' current range by midcentury. That is Wisconsin's own Department of Natural Resources. Other cold water species such as the brown trout are not much better off than the brookies.

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources is not alone. It is not alone. The American Fly Fishing Trade Association said this in a recent public statement:

> Climate change is no longer a potential threat; it demands our attention now. . . . We call on our elected officials to put partisan politics aside and work quickly to enact federal policy to address the threats presented by global climate change.

On to Wisconsin's loggers, Wisconsin has a significant logging industry, and the loggers are having trouble getting to the timber when hard, frozen winter ground becomes too thawed and too soggy to hold up logging equipment. According to a study out of the University of Wisconsin, that frozen period for loggers to work has decreased by 2 to 3 weeks since 1948, shortening the working window for loggers before their gear bogs down.

In every corner of the State, Wisconsin's own scientists are seeing dramatic climate changes. Wisconsin's businesses and communities are already taking a hard hit. How does their Governor respond? You can probably see this coming: ''I am not a scientist''—the classic denier dodge.

Governor Walker, we know you are not a scientist, but it is OK because you have some of the top scientists right there at your own University of Wisconsin. You have teams of scientists working for you at your State agencies right in Wisconsin.

But do we expect that Scott Walker will listen to a scientist? No. No. He has a different plan—to eliminate more than 60 positions at the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, including dozens of scientific staff. That is one way to not have to listen to them.

Whom does Scott Walker listen to? Well, the Koch Brothers political network has said it plans on spending $900 million in the 2016 election cycle—$900 million. The President of one of the biggest Koch Brothers-backed organizations, Tim Phillips of a group called Americans for Prosperity, has threatened publicly that any Republican candidate in the 2016 Presidential campaign who supported climate action ''would be at a severe disadvantage in the Republican nomination process.'' So they are going to throw $900 million at the election, and they have a ''severe disadvantage'' threat floating around. Nice little campaign you got here; be a shame if it was severely disadvantaged.

Well, it did not take Governor Walker long to sign that same Americans for Prosperity organization's no climate tax pledge—what do you know—vowing to oppose any legislation on climate change without an equivalent amount of tax cuts. It is amazing what waving around $900 million will do.

Whom else does Scott Walker listen to? Well, the majority leader recently called on all Governors to rebel against the EPA's Clean Power Plan. So far, only six took up the majority leader's call. One of them is—guess who—Scott Walker. In December he wrote to the EPA that their plan would be ''a blow to Wisconsin residents and business owners.'' In January he announced that he was planning to sue the Agency instead.

Maybe Governor Walker would think differently if he listened to Wisconsin's business owners. Lori Compas, executive director of the Wisconsin Business Alliance, endorsed the EPA's Clean Power Plan proposal as a boon, a benefit to the Wisconsin economy. Here is what she said:

> Encouraging renewable energy development will result in business growth, job creation, cleaner air, and a quicker path to energy independence.

That is what she wrote.

I will continue. She said:

> Our society does not have to decide whether our policies should favor jobs or the environment. We should look for opportunities for us to promote jobs and the environment and the Clean Power Plan is a great way to do that.

That is the Wisconsin Business Alliance speaking. Those Wisconsin businesses are not alone. They are not alone. Yesterday 13 of the largest corporations in America joined in President Obama's American Business Act on Climate Pledge, committing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, invest in renewable energy sources, and promote sustainable practices across their respective markets and up their supply chains. These are some pretty big-time nameplate Americans companies: Alcoa, Apple, Bank of America, Berkshire Hathaway Energy, Cargill, Coca-Cola, General Motors, Goldman Sachs, Google, Microsoft, PepsiCo, UPS, and Walmart. That is a pretty broad spectrum of America's corporate hierarchy. Is it the Republican majority's position that they are all also in on the hoax?

The Republican majority has accused NASA's scientists, whose just flew a craft by Pluto and who are driving a rover around on the surface of Mars, of being in on a hoax; that climate change is a hoax and that NASA scientists are in on it. Is Walmart in on the hoax too? Do the Senators from Arkansas want to go home and tell the Walmart executives that they are in on a hoax? Do the Senators from Georgia want to go home and tell the CEO of Coca-Cola that they are in on a hoax? I don't think so. It is an untenable argument.

We have to move on. These leaders of American commerce declare, in a voice that Republicans should listen to:

> We recognize that delaying action on climate change will be costly in economic and human terms, while accelerating the transition to a low-carbon economy will produce multiple benefits with regard to sustainable economic growth, public health, resilience to natural disasters and the health of the global environment.

That is quite a crowd who signed off on that statement. More will come because other companies, such as VF Industries and Mars and Unilever, agree with them.

Our good Earth is sending us a clear message. The message our good Earth is sending us is that carbon pollution is driving unprecedented change. It is showing the change happening in the Earth around us. Voters too are sending us a clear message. They are speaking up to say that climate change is a problem and they want their leaders to take action and that it is time we got our heads out of the sand.

Unfortunately, there is a problem. The big polluters have a powerful political megaphone. They do not hesitate to use it. They back it up with big, dark money campaign spending that is distorting our democracy in disgraceful ways.

The result is that, like so many Republican candidates for the Presidency, Scott Walker of Wisconsin has no plan, will not listen to his home State scientists at his home State university, and ignores what his loggers and trout fishermen and businesses are all seeing and saying. But, oh my, does he listen to the big polluters.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business,

with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL THOMAS L'ESPERANCE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to recognize and commend Colonel Thomas L'Esperance for his noteworthy career with the Vermont State Police, which will conclude next month with his retirement. One of the strongest voices in Vermont law enforcement for the past 28 years, Colonel L'Esperance has dutifully served the public and sought to protect his fellow Vermonters as an invaluable member and leader in Vermont. He rose through the ranks of the Vermont State Police after beginning his career as a detective trooper with the Brattleboro barracks in 1987, and has since assumed new and challenging roles within the force. He has contributed to Vermont's public safety and helped to combat crime by serving as a detective trooper, the Southern Vermont Drug Task Force field supervisor, director of the Bureau of Criminal Investigations, and, since 2009, as the director of the Vermont State Police. Colonel L'Esperance has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues throughout his career for his unwavering dedication and ability to empathize with those whom he serves and protects.

In recent years, Vermont has faced immeasurable challenges in combating the cycle of heroin and opioid abuse. In 2014, I called on Colonel L'Esperance to testify at a Senate Judiciary Committee field hearing in Rutland, VT, about this very challenge. Colonel L'Esperance graciously and with expertise provided testimony on the harmful effects of addiction in the State of Vermont, and on the challenges facing Vermont's law enforcement community in combating such abuse. His testimony was exemplary, not only because of his firsthand experience with this critical policing and public health issue, but also because of the colonel's personal commitment to eliminating this destructive epidemic from our State. I thank Colonel L'Esperance for his powerful testimony and for the great work he has done throughout his career in fighting criminal activity in our State.

While his retirement from the position of Vermont State Police director will be a loss for the force and for the State of Vermont, I am confident that Colonel L'Esperance will bring the same level of excellence to the next chapter of his career. Colonel L'Esperance will no doubt continue to serve others with integrity and with the highest regard for the public's safety. I am proud of Colonel L'Esperance for his exceptional work with the Vermont State Police, and I am grateful for all of his efforts in improving the safety and wellbeing of Vermonters.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate is being asked to approve the Intelligence authorization bill for fiscal year 2016 by unanimous consent. When this bill was reported by the Senate Intelligence Committee, I and other colleagues noted that it contained one provision that required further debate.

This provision, section 603, would require Internet and communications companies to make reports to the government if they become aware of ''terrorist activity.'' Over the past 3 weeks a number of Internet companies have raised very valid concerns about this provision. In particular, they note that this provision is quite vague, and does not specify how these companies should know what is and is not terrorist activity.

The Internet Association, which is comprised of dozens of leading technology companies, has warned that uncertainty about the meaning of this vague language will create ''an impossible compliance problem'' and lead to ''massive reporting of items that are not likely to be of material concern to public safety.'' That is obviously something that I think every Senator wants to avoid. Internet companies should not be subject to broad requirements to police the speech of their users.

There is no question that tracking terrorist activity and preventing online terrorist recruitment should be top priorities for law enforcement and intelligence agencies. And leading technology companies certainly have a role to play here. The Director of the FBI testified this month that technology companies are ''pretty good about telling us'' when they see something of serious concern. But I haven't yet heard any law enforcement or intelligence agencies suggest that this provision will actually help catch terrorists, and I take the concerns that have been raised about its breadth and vagueness seriously.

For these reasons, I object to this unanimous consent request. I look forward to working with my colleagues to revise or remove this provision so that the rest of the bill can proceed forward.

RECOGNIZING PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER AND TAIWAN

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize an exceptional President and a true friend to the United States who cherishes that President's memory. Those of us from the great State of Kansas are justly proud of Dwight David Eisenhower, fondly known as ''Ike'' to his Abilene neighbors. The Republic of China, Taiwan, calls him a loyal friend.

In 1911, Eisenhower left his boyhood home in Kansas for the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. During World War II, Eisenhower was in charge of plans in the Pacific War and commanding general of the Army's European Theater. On June 6, 1944, General Eisenhower led the D-day invasion on the beaches of Normandy and liberated Europe. During this time, Taiwan stood as our ally in Asia, with the Flying Tigers in the Doolittle Raid and along the Burma Road. In 1951, President Truman asked Eisenhower to become the first Supreme Allied Commander in Europe. After a long and decorated military career, America's voters said, ''I like Ike,'' by overwhelmingly electing him as the 34th President of the United States in 1952.

Today, it is my privilege to serve as Chairman of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Because this memorial honors a Kansan, a war hero, and a President the world admires, our good friend and partner, the government and people of the Republic of China, has generously made a gift to ensure the memory of Dwight D. Eisenhower is preserved for generations to come.

It is fortunate for all that our Taiwanese friends have not forgotten President Eisenhower's staunch support for their security and his strong commitment to the U.S.-Taiwan relationship. In 1960, President Eisenhower made the first official U.S. visit to Taipei to meet with President Chiang Kai-shek. As Taiwan's Representative to the United States, Dr. Shen has told me, ''President Eisenhower holds a very special place in the hearts of the people of Taiwan.''

It was Eisenhower who signed the Sino-American Mutual Defense Treaty in 1954. The next year, on the occasion of the passage of the Formosa Resolution by the Congress, President Eisenhower further pledged to ''protect the territories in the Western Pacific under the jurisdiction of the Republic of China.'' It was also Eisenhower who dispatched the U.S. Seventh Fleet to patrol the Taiwan Strait in the 1950s, thus assuring that the people of Taiwan would remain secure from any external military threat. Deservedly, a significant portion of President Eisenhower's foreign policy legacy is maintaining peace and security in the Taiwan Strait.

In honoring a great general and President, Taiwan has demonstrated an unbroken bond of friendship, dating back to World War II. That enduring friendship is yet another key element of President Eisenhower's legacy.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS VISIT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, today I honor the veterans of Honor Flight Northern Colorado that have made their 14th trip to Washington, DC to visit the memorials that stand in our Nation's Capital. This group includes veterans from various wars and generations, but all are linked by their service to our country.

Ten years ago, the Honor Flight was created to fly veterans that had served in World War II to Washington, DC so they could visit their memorial located in our Nation's Capital. Now, the

Honor Flight welcomes veterans from all over the country to fly to Washington, DC, free of charge, to visit the memorials of the wars these heroic veterans fought. Of the 123 veterans on the most recent Honor Flight, 25 served in World War II, 59 served in Korea, and 39 served in Vietnam.

Few words are sufficient to show the gratitude and respect we all have for the courageous men and women who have fought for our country. They have preserved our rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We stand here today to honor those who have risked their lives to protect the United States of America.

Please join me in honoring Earnest Adams, Paul Babish, Oliver Bashor, Russell Brady, Martin Bunker, Arthur Crosthwait, Michael DeJiacomo, N Kenneth Furlong, Francis Gallagher, Roland Garner, Harold Hubbard, Erling Johnson, Howard Johnston, William Karr, John Kennedy, Herbert Leis, Charles Linhart, Russell MacCachran, Ray Madsen, Harriet Martin, Fred McClory, David Meier, Ronald Smith, Donald Stonebraker, Leo Weaver, Charles Archibeque, Donald Anderson, William Bacon, Bobby Barker, Louis Barrientos, Virgil Beck, Jack Benham, Alfred Benson Jr., James Birdsell, George Blake, Thomas Bornhoft, Robert Brezee, Alfred Brophy, Ralph Carlson, Charles Campion, Lewis Carder, Richard Cella, Marinus Christensen, Kenneth Clements, Earnest Cummins, Robert Davenport, Donald Deboodt, Kenneth Doty, Joseph Eckert, James Hagihara, Norman Harpole, Richard Hecker, Bobby Jones, Roy Kipfinger Jr., Richard Korth, John Lebsack, Robert Lionberger, Donald Matula, Paul McDill, Lawrence McGlone, Raymond Miller, Clifford Morey, Richard Orton, Placido Pando, William Peebles, Lupe Rodriguez, Evaristo Sanchez, Michael Schaughency, James Schofield, Earl Simmons, Frederick Smith, Ralph Spellman, James Stallard, James Stewart, William Strunk, Wilbur Tritthardt, Henry Trujillo, Melvin Veldhuizen, Allan Walcker, Orlin Williams, Charles Wood Jr., Donald Wuertz, Clarke Wykert, Rudolph Younger, Larry Arndt, Bruce Axelrod, Marvin Bartholomew, Jim Biggs, Alexander Bless, Clyde Brewer II, Randy Brooks, Lanny Clary, Guy Coombes, Robert Cowan, Robert Chapman, Waldo Decker, David DeJiacomo, Terry Diedrich, Kenneth Gareis, Bonifacio Hernandez, Larry Huddle, David Jovola, Donald Ketels, Clarke Lambert, Gary Lebsack, Dewey Mattly, Lorrie McLaughlin, Calvin Melcher, Irving Morales, Bryan Morgan, Richard Orton, Norman Peterson, James Porth, James Ray, Stephen Ray, Dave Sloan, Lawrence Stoddard, Harley Sullivan, Michael Torgerson, Andrew Valdez, Gregory Walent, Daryl Wiest, and Terry Wright.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO SHANE BINGER

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Shane Binger, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Shane is a graduate of Hitchcock-Tulare High School in Tulare, SD. Currently, Shane is attending South Dakota State University, where he is majoring in business economics. Shane is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Shane Binger for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO SHELBY FERSTL

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Shelby Ferstl, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Shelby is a graduate of Tartan High School in Oakdale, Minnesota. Currently, Shelby is attending the University of Minnesota Duluth, where she is majoring in financial markets. Shelby is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Shelby Ferstl for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN GEMAR

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Stephen Gemar, an intern in my Aberdeen office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Stephen is a graduate of Mobridge-Pollock High School in Mobridge, SD. Currently, Stephen is attending the University of South Dakota, where he is majoring in political science. Stephen is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Stephen Gemar for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO BRADY GLISSENDORF

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Brady Glissendorf, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Brady is a graduate of St. Thomas More High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, Brady is attending the University of Notre Dame, where he is majoring in political science and economics. Brady is a dedicated worker who been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Brady Glissendorf for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO COLE GUSTAFSON

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Cole Gustafson, an intern in my Rapid City office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Cole is a graduate of Sheridan High School in Sheridan, Wyoming. Cole is a recent graduate of Black Hills State University, where he majored in political science, and will begin at the University of Wyoming College of Law in August 2015. Cole is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Cole Gustafson for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE HICKEY

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Katherine Hickey, an intern in my Sioux Falls office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Katherine is a graduate of Roosevelt High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, Katherine is attending Asbury University, where she is majoring in political science and sociology. Katherine is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Katherine Hickey for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO ERIC HURLEY

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Eric Hurley, an intern in my Aberdeen office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Eric is a graduate of Aberdeen Roncalli High School in Aberdeen, SD. Currently, Eric is attending the University of South Dakota, where he is majoring in business administration. Eric is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Eric Hurley for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT PETERSON

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Robert Peterson, an intern in

my Sioux Falls office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Robert is a graduate of Washington High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, Robert is attending the University of South Dakota, where he is majoring in history and political science. Robert is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Robert Peterson for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MATTHEW VANDER WOUDE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Matthew Vander Woude, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Matthew is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, Matthew is attending Pepperdine University, where he is majoring in economics. Matthew is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Matthew Vander Woude for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1482. An act to improve and reauthorize provisions relating to the application of the antitrust laws to the award of need-based educational aid.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 774. An act to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, and for other purposes.

H.R. 998. An act to establish the conditions under which the Secretary of Homeland Security may establish preclearance facilities, conduct preclearance operations, and provide customs services outside the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1607. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1634. An act to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1656. An act to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas.

H.R. 1831. An act to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2127. An act to direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to limit access to expedited airport security screening at an airport security checkpoint to participants of the PreCheck program and other known low-risk passengers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2206. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require recipients of State Homeland Security Grant Program funding to preserve and strengthen interoperable emergency communication capabilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2750. An act to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, streamline transportation security regulations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2770. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain maintenance of security-related technology at airports, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2843. An act to require certain improvements in the Transportation Security Administration's PreCheck expedited screening program, and for other purposes.

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

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the Monuments Men.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 4:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 1482. An act to improve and reauthorize provisions relating to the application of the antitrust laws to the award of need-based educational aid.

H.R. 876. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 774. An act to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 998. An act to establish the conditions under which the Secretary of Homeland Security may establish preclearance facilities, conduct preclearance operations, and provide customs services outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1607. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1634. An act to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1656. An act to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2127. An act to direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to limit access to expedited airport security screening at an airport security checkpoint to participants of the PreCheck program and other known low-risk passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2206. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require recipients of State Homeland Security Grant Program funding to preserve and strengthen interoperable emergency communications capabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2750. An act to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, streamline transportation security regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2770. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain maintenance of security-related technology at airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2843. An act to require certain improvements in the Transportation Security Administration's PreCheck expedited screening program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1881. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

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

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–2383. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Emerald Ash Borer; Quarantined Areas'' (Docket No. APHIS–2015–0028) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2384. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conservation Reserve Program'' (RIN0560–AI30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2385. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sedaxane; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9930–84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2386. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal years 2012 and 2013 Operation and Maintenance, Army, funds, and was assigned Army case number 15–01; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–2387. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2388. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards'' (RIN1557–AD84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2389. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing'' (RIN2501–AD33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2390. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2015–0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2391. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2013 Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Rule Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth In Lending Act (Regulation Z) and Amendments; Delay of Effective Date'' (RIN3170–AA46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2392. A communication from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Imposition of Special Measure against FBME Bank Ltd., formerly known as the Federal Bank of the Middle East Ltd., as a Financial Institution of Primary Money Laundering Concern'' (RIN1506–AB27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2393. A joint communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs and the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Potential for the Use of Energy Savings Performance Contracts to Reduce Energy Consumption and Provide Energy and Cost Savings in Non-Building Applications''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2394. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Oregon; Grants Pass Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan'' (FRL No. 9931–13–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2395. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon; Grants Pass Second 10-Year PM10 Limited Maintenance Plan'' (FRL No. 9931–16–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2396. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Electronic Reporting Consistent With the Cross Media Electronic Reporting Rule'' (FRL No. 9931–09–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2397. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for the State of Alabama: Cross-State Air Pollution Rule'' (FRL No. 9931–24–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2398. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia; 2011 Base Year Emissions Inventories for the Washington DC–MD–VA Nonattainment Area for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard'' (FRL No. 9930–96–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2399. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; MI, Belding; 2008 Lead Clean Data Determination'' (FRL No. 9930–81–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2400. A communication from the Executive Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2401. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates—August 2015'' (Rev. Rul. 2015–16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2402. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the Employee Plans Determination Letter Program'' (Announcement 2015–19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2403. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Claims for Credit or Refund'' ((RIN1545–BI36) (TD 9727)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2404. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled ''Annual Report of the Board of the Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds'' and the ''Annual Report of the Boards of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2405. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015–0077—2015–0079); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2406. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Progress Report on Understanding the Long-Term Health Effects of Living Organ Donation''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2407. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2012 Progress Report on Understanding the Long-Term Health Effects of Living Organ Donation''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2408. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Nurse Education, Practice, Quality and Retention Program'' for fiscal years 2013 and 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2409. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2013 Report on the Preventive Medicine and Public Health Training Grant and Integrative Medicine Programs''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2410. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the State Health Care Workforce Development (SHCWD) Grant Program''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2411. A communication from the Deputy Director, Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Developmental Disabilities Program'' (RIN0970–AB11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2412. A communication from the Executive Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2413. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Performance Standards for Ionizing Radiation Emitting Products; Fluoroscopic Equipment; Correction; Confirmation of Effective Date'' (Docket No. FDA–2015–N–0828) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2414. A communication from the Chair of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board Regulations'' (4 CFR Chapter II) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2415. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Jacksonville, FL; Savannah, GA; Hagerstown-Martinsburg-Chambersburg, MD; Richmond, VA; and Roanoke, VA, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas'' (RIN3206–AN15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2416. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of proposed legislation entitled ''Federal District Judgeship Act of 2015''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2417. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Debt Collection Recovery Activities of the Department of Justice for Civil Debts Referred for Collection Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2014''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2418. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Lifeline and Link Up Reform and Modernization, Telecommunications Carriers Eligible for Universal Service Support, Connect America Fund'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (FCC 15–71)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2419. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications'' (RIN0648–XD927) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2420. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions numbers 3, 4, 5, and 6'' (RIN0648–XD976) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2421. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology Omnibus Amendment'' (RIN0648–BE50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2422. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer'' (RIN0648–XD985) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2423. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closures for the Common Pool Fishery and Trip and Possession Limit Adjustment'' (RIN0648–XE006) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2424. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacknose Sharks and Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Sharks in the Atlantic Region'' (RIN0648–XD980) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2425. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2015 and 2016 Commercial Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean'' (RIN0648–XD972) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2426. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measures and Closure for South Atlantic Snowy Grouper'' (RIN0648–XE014) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2427. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Re-Opening of Commercial Sector for Atlantic Dolphin'' (RIN0648–XE017) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2428. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacknose Sharks and Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Sharks in the Gulf of Mexico Region'' (RIN0648–XD954) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2429. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update to National Fire Protection Association Standards, Incorporation by Reference'' (RIN2900–AO90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–2430. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Third Quarter of Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

POM–70. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to regulate airline baggage fees and processes for consumers as it relates to transportation of passenger luggage and passenger delays resulting from lost, damaged, or delayed luggage; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 207

Whereas, deregulation of the airline industry in the United States began more than three decades ago in 1978; and

Whereas, a consequence of deregulation was the elimination of federal control over many airline business practices, including pricing and domestic route selection; and

Whereas, though deregulation limits federal control of airline business practices generally, the federal government continues to legislate and enforce certain consumer protections for airline passengers; and

Whereas, the United States Congress largely determines the degree to which certain rights of airline passengers are codified in law or developed through regulatory rulemaking; and

Whereas, since deregulation, the primary means of competition amongst airlines has progressively centered on price, not service; and

Whereas, certain concerns for passengers of airlines include increasing baggage fees and passenger delays resulting from lost, damaged, or delayed passenger luggage; and

Whereas, the airline industry began to charge passengers a checked baggage fee per bag to curtail rising jet fuel costs and to supplement marginal revenue during times of economic decline; and

Whereas, as a result of increasing airline baggage fees charged by airlines for checked luggage, passengers are encouraged to increase the contents of carry-on luggage to avoid the extra cost of baggage fees; and

Whereas, increased carry-on luggage of boarding airline passengers may be correlated to the claims of lost, damaged, or delayed passenger luggage, because passengers are oftentimes asked to check carry-on luggage at the boarding gate, which may require passengers to wait for such luggage after deboarding an aircraft, or luggage and contents may become damaged during the process of fitting carry-on luggage onto boarded aircrafts; and

Whereas, although checked luggage may be lost, damaged, or delayed for a variety of reasons, baggage handling systems, airline negligence, and the act of luggage offloading to accommodate extra fuel have also been discussed as reasons for lost, damaged, or delayed passenger luggage; and

Whereas, the aforementioned concerns of airline passengers are issues of consumer protection for which the United States Congress has the constitutional power to address and determine fair and reasonable solutions through codified law or regulatory rulemaking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to regulate airline baggage fees and processes for consumers as it relates to transportation of passenger luggage and passenger delays resulting from lost, damaged, or delayed luggage; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–71. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to amend the employer shared responsibility provisions regarding employee health coverage under Section 4980H of the Internal Revenue Code, as enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, to eliminate penalties on school districts; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 87

Whereas, a highly contentious aspect of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), referred to hereafter as ''the ACA'', is its imposition of financial penalties on employers known as ''employer shared responsibility''; and

Whereas, the employer shared responsibility penalty applies to certain businesses with fifty or more full-time employees that either do not offer insurance or offer coverage which does not meet minimum standards set forth in the ACA; and

Whereas, after nearly four years of delays and regulatory uncertainty regarding application of the employer shared responsibility penalty following enactment of the ACA in March of 2010, the Internal Revenue Service, in its final regulations on the penalty issued in February of 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 8544 (February 22, 2014)), provided that there is no exclusion from the penalty for government entities; and

Whereas, for purposes of the penalty, a ''full-time employee'' is now defined as any employee working an average of more than thirty hours per week or one hundred thirty hours per month; and

Whereas, because many part-time and temporary school personnel count as ''full-time employees'' under the ACA, the school districts of this state now face crippling financial penalties, typically in the amount of two thousand dollars per employee who lacks health coverage, for not providing health coverage to personnel who traditionally have not been considered full-time employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to amend the employer shared responsibility provisions regarding employee health coverage under Section 4980H of the Internal Revenue Code, as enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, to eliminate penalties on school districts; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–72. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, urging the United States Congress and the New York State legislature to strengthen guidelines for the distribution of Medicaid services and to prevent Medicaid fraud, waste, and abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

POM–73. A communication from a citizen of the United States of Illinois memorializing the State of Illinois's petition to the United States Congress calling for a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1334. A bill to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Jonathan Elkind, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (International Affairs).

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1873. A bill to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COATS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1874. A bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1875. A bill to support enhanced accountability for United States assistance to Afghanistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1876. A bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1877. A bill to require the Attorney General to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate Planned Parenthood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1878. A bill to extend the pediatric priority review voucher program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 1879. A bill to improve processes in the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 1880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent veterans from being disqualified from contributing to health savings accounts by reason of receiving medical care for service-connected disabilities under programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COATS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SASSE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 1881. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America; read the first time.

By Mr. CARDIN (by request):

S.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution relating to the approval of the proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Res. 233. A resolution recognizing July 28, 2015, as ''World Hepatitis Day''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. REED, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Con. Res. 20. A concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the 25th anniversary of the date of enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 174

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 174, a bill to end offshore tax abuses, to preserve our national defense and protect American families and businesses from devastating cuts, and for other purposes.

S. 242

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 242, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, and for other purposes.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 271

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

S. 314

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

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 661

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the dependent care tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 683

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 683, a bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength or when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation places a lien against an insurance company's assets, and for other purposes.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 968

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 1000

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1000, a bill to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, and for other purposes.

S. 1073

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1073, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1086

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to establish an insurance policy advisory committee on international capital standards, and for other purposes.

S. 1089

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1089, a bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1345

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1345, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 1358

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1358, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era.

S. 1632

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1632, a bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram.

S. 1756

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1756, a bill to help small businesses take advantage of energy efficiency.

S. 1762

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1762, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase the penalties applicable to aliens who unlawfully reenter the United States after being removed.

S. 1812

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

S. 1818

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1818, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reform the rule making process of agencies.

S. 1820

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1820, a bill to require agencies to publish an advance notice of proposed rule making for major rules.

S. 1836

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1836, a bill to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

S. 1842

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1842, a bill to ensure State and local compliance with all Federal immigration detainers on aliens in custody and for other purposes.

S. 1844

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1844, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to provide for voluntary country of origin labeling for beef, pork, and chicken.

S. 1857

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1857, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

S. 1861

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1861, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Timothy Nugent, in recognition of his pioneering work on behalf of people with disabilities, including disabled veterans.

S. 1866

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1866, a bill to establish the veterans' business outreach center program, to improve the programs for veterans of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 189

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 189, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 25th anniversary of democracy in Mongolia.

S. RES. 232

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 232, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that August 30, 2015, be observed as ''1890 Land-Grant Institutions Quasquicentennial Recognition Day'' .

AMENDMENT NO. 2287

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2287 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2288

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of

amendment No. 2288 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2289

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2289 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2339

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2339 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2340

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2340 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2407

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2407 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2424

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2424 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2425

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2425 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2426

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2426 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2427

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2427 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2428

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2428 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2467

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2467 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2472

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2472 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2478

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2478 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2479 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2480

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2480 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2481

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2481 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2483

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2483 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 2488

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2488 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1877. A bill to require the Attorney General to appoint a special prosecutor to investigage Planned Parenthood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we have all been disturbed—just really outraged—about the things that have come from Planned Parenthood recently. We have seen the videos exposing their casual disregard of human life. It is unconscionable. It is very sad. We have known this for a long time. The junior Senator, Mr. LANKFORD, back when he was in the House of Representatives was introducing bills to defund Planned Parenthood, and that was before the most recent events that have happened.

The Center For Medical Progress spent 3 years investigating Planned Parenthood and produced at least three videos revealing what appears to be an intentional and illegal harvesting of body parts from aborted babies.

There are countries such as China that condone killing children, but our Nation should not be condoning the act of killing our own children or allowing these corrupt organizations to sell body parts for profit. There was a book that was written that I remember very well entitled ''Modernizing China'' by Anthony Kubek. This was 30 years ago, when there was still a separation between China and Taiwan. They talked about at that time having a limit on how many babies people could have. They would go in and find out that there was one more child than they should have had, and they would take that baby and kill it. Of course, the harvesting of body parts was taking place there. That was China. This is America. It is hard to believe this could be happening.

It is not about being pro-life or pro-choice anymore; it is about our country's moral conscience. If Planned Parenthood has either profited from selling aborted babies' organs or they have modified procedures used to conduct an abortion for the purposes of obtaining body parts, then they have broken the law.

In fact, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993 states that ''no alteration of the timing, method or procedures used to terminate the pregnancy [may be] made solely for the purposes of obtaining tissue.'' That includes arms, legs, kidneys, and body parts, but this is exactly what Planned Parenthood has admitted to doing in these videos.

The Federal law also states it is unlawful to sell human fetal tissue. Title 42 of the U.S. Code, section 289g–2(a) states: ''It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer any human fetal tissue for valuable consideration if the transfer affects interstate commerce.'' Again, it is illegal.

Based on the evidence in these videos, particularly with the Planned Parenthood employees haggling and negotiating over prices, joking about it, and using the income of the dead babies' body parts to buy a Lamborghini—some kind of automobile—it seems as if it is commonplace. There is a total disregard for the babies or what they were doing.

My colleague Senator ERNST of Iowa and I, along with others in the Senate, wrote to the Department of Health and Human Services requesting answers to these questions.

One thing that is important to note is that Planned Parenthood receives $1.4 million of taxpayers' money every day. It is unthinkable that they are being supported by the taxpayers in the United States, according to their 2013–2014 annual report. They received 528.4 million taxpayer dollars and then performed and profited from illegal and immoral actions taking the lives of innocent babies. This is so incredibly evil it is even hard to talk about.

We are talking about women being manipulated into putting their health on the line for a government-funded organization to profit from harvesting their child's body. Vulnerable women are being coerced into having abortions and delaying the abortions until the baby has grown to the age within the womb that they would have fully developed body parts in order to sell. This is what is happening today.

Planned Parenthood fights to keep mothers from seeing the human value of their babies with an ultrasound. They don't want the mother to hear the baby inside their womb with an ultrasound, but they will use the same technology to guide them to more valuable organs as they perform abortions for monetary gain. These actions deserve to be fully investigated. Crimes have been committed. It is our moral obligation to fully prosecute any violations of the law.

Today I have introduced legislation that would require the appointment of a special prosecutor to investigate and prosecute these atrocities. To pay for this, the legislation would rescind all moneys that have been appropriated to Planned Parenthood and provide the special prosecutor with as much of this money to conduct the investigation as is necessary.

We have to protect innocent lives. Now that this has opened the door to a reality that has been suspected for so many years, this Senator wants America and the world to know that endangering women's health and profiting from killing children is not acceptable.

The video just released today shows a lab technician placing and celebrating the monetary value of a baby's arms, legs, kidneys, and spinal cord as they pulled apart its body.

The bill is S. 1877. We have gotten a lot of calls about it. I didn't want to let this opportunity go by without coming to the floor and getting something started to do something to stop the barbaric acts we are seeing on behalf of Planned Parenthood.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 233—RECOGNIZING JULY 28, 2015, AS ''WORLD HEPATITIS DAY''

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 233

Whereas hepatitis B and hepatitis C, and the incidence of liver disease caused by these viruses, have become urgent problems of a global proportion;

Whereas an estimated 350,000,000 people worldwide live with chronic hepatitis B, and an estimated 780,000 people worldwide die each year due to hepatitis B;

Whereas an estimated 150,000,000 people worldwide are chronically infected with hepatitis C, and an estimated 500,000 people worldwide die each year due to a liver-related illness caused by hepatitis C;

Whereas an estimated 1,000,000 people worldwide die each year due to liver failure or primary liver cancer resulting from a chronic infection of hepatitis;

Whereas an estimated 5,300,000 people in the United States are infected with either hepatitis B or hepatitis C, including 1,400,000 people who are chronically infected with hepatitis B and 2,700,000 people who are chronically infected with hepatitis C;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this preamble as ''CDC'') estimated that there were 19,764 new hepatitis B infections and 29,718 new hepatitis C infections, respectively, in the United States in 2013;

Whereas the CDC has found significant increases in the transmission of new hepatitis cases in the United States since 2010, including a 151 percent increase between 2010 and

2013 in new transmissions of hepatitis C in the United States;

Whereas chronic viral hepatitis claims thousands of lives each year in the United States, with 19,368 deaths due to hepatitis C in the United States in 2013;

Whereas, in 2014, $4,500,000,000 in Medicare funds were spent on hepatitis C treatments;

Whereas a person who has become chronically infected with hepatitis B or hepatitis C may not have symptoms for up to 40 years after the initial infection occurred;

Whereas African Americans, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, Latinos, Native Americans, Alaska Natives, gay and bisexual men, and persons who inject drugs intravenously all have higher rates of chronic viral hepatitis infections in the United States than other groups of people;

Whereas Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders bear the greatest burden of hepatitis B related deaths in the United States;

Whereas hepatitis C is 10 times more infectious than human immunodeficiency virus (referred to in this preamble as ''HIV'');

Whereas hepatitis B is 50 to 100 times more infectious than HIV;

Whereas an estimated 25 percent of people who live in the United States and are infected with HIV are also infected with hepatitis C;

Whereas life expectancies for persons infected with HIV have increased with antiretroviral treatment, and liver disease, much of which is related to hepatitis B and hepatitis C infections, has become the most common cause of death among this population that is not related to acquired immune deficiency syndrome;

Whereas, despite the fact that chronic viral hepatitis is the most common bloodborne infection in the United States, 65 percent of people living with hepatitis B and an estimated 75 percent of people living with hepatitis C are unaware of their infection;

Whereas hepatitis B is preventable through vaccination, and both hepatitis B and hepatitis C are preventable with proper public health interventions, including programs that offer access to sterile injection equipment for people who inject drugs intravenously;

Whereas effective and safe treatment is available for people living with hepatitis B and hepatitis C, including new curative treatments for hepatitis C; and

Whereas the goals of ''World Hepatitis Day'' on July 28, 2015, are to—

(1) highlight the global nature of chronic viral hepatitis epidemics;

(2) recognize that hepatitis can be prevented and eliminated in part through a comprehensive public education and awareness campaign designed to identify those at risk for, and living with, hepatitis;

(3) inform patients about new treatments that are available for hepatitis; and

(4) help increase the length and quality of life for people diagnosed with chronic hepatitis B and hepatitis C infections: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes July 28, 2015, as ''World Hepatitis Day'';

(2) supports broad access to hepatitis B and hepatitis C treatments;

(3) supports raising awareness of the risks and consequences of undiagnosed chronic hepatitis B and hepatitis C infections; and

(4) calls for a robust governmental and public health response to protect the health of the approximately 5,000,000 people in the United States and 400,000,000 people worldwide who suffer from chronic viral hepatitis.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20—RECOGNIZING AND HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DATE OF ENACTMENT OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 20

Whereas, July 26, 2015, marks the 25th anniversary of the date of enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (referred to in this preamble as the ''ADA'');

Whereas the ADA has been one of the most significant and effective civil rights laws passed by Congress;

Whereas, prior to the date of enactment of the ADA, individuals with disabilities were too often denied the opportunity to fully participate in society due to intolerance, misunderstanding, ignorance, or unfair stereotypes;

Whereas the dedicated efforts of passionate and courageous disability rights advocates served to awaken Congress and the people of the United States to the discrimination and prejudice that individuals with disabilities face;

Whereas Congress worked in a bipartisan manner to craft legislation to make discrimination against individuals with disabilities illegal;

Whereas Congress passed the ADA, and President George Herbert Walker Bush signed the ADA into law on July 26, 1990;

Whereas the purpose of the ADA is to fulfill the goals of opportunity, independent living, integration, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities who live in the United States;

Whereas the ADA—

(1) prohibits employers from discriminating against qualified individuals with disabilities;

(2) requires that State and local governmental entities accommodate qualified individuals with disabilities;

(3) requires a place of public accommodation to take reasonable steps to ensure that the goods and services it provides are accessible to individuals with disabilities; and

(4) requires new trains and buses to be accessible to individuals with disabilities;

Whereas the ADA has played a historic role in allowing more than 55,000,000 individuals in the United States who have disabilities to better participate in society by removing barriers to employment, transportation, public services, telecommunications, and public accommodations;

Whereas the ADA has served as a model for disability rights in other countries;

Whereas every individual in the United States, not just those with disabilities, benefits from the accommodations that have become commonplace since the passage of the ADA, including curb cuts at street intersections, ramps for access to buildings, and other accommodations that provide access to public transportation, stadiums, telecommunications, voting machines, and websites;

Whereas, 25 years after the date of enactment of the ADA, it remains a crucial tool, as children and adults with disabilities still experience barriers that interfere with their full participation in mainstream life in the United States;

Whereas, 25 years after the date of enactment of the ADA, individuals in the United States who have disabilities are twice as likely to live in poverty than individuals without disabilities, and individuals with disabilities continue to experience high rates of unemployment and underemployment;

Whereas, 25 years after the date of enactment of the ADA and 16 years after the Supreme Court issued the decision in Olmstead v. L.C., many individuals with disabilities still live and work in segregated and institutional settings because of a lack of access to support services that would allow such individuals to live and work in their community;

Whereas, 25 years after the date of enactment of the ADA, the ADA remains a crucial tool for individuals with disabilities who experience barriers to accessability in telecommunications and information technologies; and

Whereas the United States has a responsibility to welcome back and create opportunities for the tens of thousands of working-age veterans who have been wounded in action or have suffered injuries or illnesses related to their service in the Global War on Terror: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes and honors the 25th anniversary of the date of enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990;

(2) salutes everyone whose efforts contributed to the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990;

(3) encourages everyone in the United States to celebrate the advancement of freedom and the expansion of opportunity made possible by the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; and

(4) pledges to continue to work on a bipartisan basis to support opportunity, independent living, economic self-sufficiency, and the full participation of individuals in the United States who have disabilities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2538. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 22, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2539. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 22, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2540. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 22, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2541. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 614, to provide access to and use of information by Federal agencies in order to reduce improper payments, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2538. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 22, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 757, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 35416. BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORTS.

Section 417(d) of the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 20103 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORTS.—The Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration shall—

''(A) maintain a copy of the most recent bridge inspection reports prepared in accordance with section (b)(5); and

''(B) provide copies of the reports described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate State and local government transportation officials, upon request.''.

SA 2539. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 22, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 767, line 13, strike ''(3)'' and insert the following:

(3) upon the request of each State, political subdivision of a State, or public agency responsible for emergency response or law enforcement, to require each applicable fusion center to provide advance notice for each high-hazard flammable train traveling through the jurisdiction of each State, political subdivision of a State, or public agency, which notice shall include the electronic train consist information described in paragraph (1)(A) for the high-hazard flammable train, and to the extent practicable, for requesting States, political subdivisions, or public agencies, to ensure that the fusion center shall provide at least 12 hours of advance notice for a high-hazard flammable train that will be traveling through the jurisdiction of the State, political subdivision of a State, or public agency, and include within the notice its best estimate of the time the train will enter the jurisdiction;

(4)

SA 2540. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 22, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division F, add the following:

TITLE LXIII—TRANSPORTATION EMPOWERMENT ACT

SEC. 63001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Transportation Empowerment Act''.

SEC. 63002. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the objective of the Federal highway program has been to facilitate the construction of a modern freeway system that promotes efficient interstate commerce by connecting all States;

(2) the objective described in paragraph (1) has been attained, and the Interstate System connecting all States is near completion;

(3) each State has the responsibility of providing an efficient transportation network for the residents of the State;

(4) each State has the means to build and operate a network of transportation systems, including highways, that best serves the needs of the State;

(5) each State is best capable of determining the needs of the State and acting on those needs;

(6) the Federal role in highway transportation has, over time, usurped the role of the States by taxing motor fuels used in the States and then distributing the proceeds to the States based on the perceptions of the Federal Government on what is best for the States;

(7) the Federal Government has used the Federal motor fuels tax revenues to force all States to take actions that are not necessarily appropriate for individual States;

(8) the Federal distribution, review, and enforcement process wastes billions of dollars on unproductive activities;

(9) Federal mandates that apply uniformly to all 50 States, regardless of the different circumstances of the States, cause the States to waste billions of hard-earned tax dollars on projects, programs, and activities that the States would not otherwise undertake; and

(10) Congress has expressed a strong interest in reducing the role of the Federal Government by allowing each State to manage its own affairs.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to provide a new policy blueprint to govern the Federal role in transportation once existing and prior financial obligations are met;

(2) to return to the individual States maximum discretionary authority and fiscal responsibility for all elements of the national surface transportation systems that are not within the direct purview of the Federal Government;

(3) to preserve Federal responsibility for the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways;

(4) to preserve the responsibility of the Department of Transportation for—

(A) design, construction, and preservation of transportation facilities on Federal public land;

(B) national programs of transportation research and development and transportation safety; and

(C) emergency assistance to the States in response to natural disasters;

(5) to eliminate to the maximum extent practicable Federal obstacles to the ability of each State to apply innovative solutions to the financing, design, construction, operation, and preservation of Federal and State transportation facilities; and

(6) with respect to transportation activities carried out by States, local governments, and the private sector, to encourage—

(A) competition among States, local governments, and the private sector; and

(B) innovation, energy efficiency, private sector participation, and productivity.

SEC. 63003. FUNDING LIMITATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Transportation determines for any of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 that the aggregate amount required to carry out transportation programs and projects under this title and amendments made by this title exceeds the estimated aggregate amount in the Highway Trust Fund available for those programs and projects for the fiscal year, each amount made available for that program or project shall be reduced by the pro rata percentage required to reduce the aggregate amount required to carry out those programs and projects to an amount equal to that available for those programs and projects in the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year.

SEC. 63004. FUNDING FOR CORE HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The following sums are authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account):

(A) FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM, ETC.—For the national highway performance program under section 119 of title 23, United States Code, the surface transportation program under section 133 of that title, and the highway safety improvement program under section 148 of that title, for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, an aggregate amount not to exceed 10 percent of the balance of the Highway Trust Fund (other than such Mass Transit Account) as estimated (taking into account estimated revenues) at the beginning of each such fiscal year.

(B) EMERGENCY RELIEF.—For emergency relief under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(C) FEDERAL LANDS PROGRAMS.—

(i) FEDERAL LANDS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM.—For the Federal lands transportation program under section 203 of title 23, United States Code, $300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, of which $240,000,000 of the amount made available for each fiscal year shall be the amount for the National Park Service and $30,000,000 of the amount made available for each fiscal year shall be the amount for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(ii) FEDERAL LANDS ACCESS PROGRAM.—For the Federal lands access program under section 204 of title 23, United States Code, $250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(D) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, to be made available to the Secretary for administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration, an amount equal to 1 percent of the balance of the Highway Trust Fund (other than such Mass Transit Account) as estimated (taking into account estimated revenues) at the beginning of each such fiscal year.

''(B)(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any measure that would make available for expenditure from the Highway

Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for a fiscal year an amount less than the amount authorized under subparagraph (A) for such fiscal year.

''(ii)(I) Clause (i) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of ⅗ of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

''(II) Debate on appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to subclause (I) shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the measure that would make available for expenditure from the Fund for a fiscal year an amount less than the amount described in subparagraph (A). An affirmative vote of ⅗ of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised in relation to subclause (I).

''(iii) This subparagraph is enacted by Congress—

''(I) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with those rules; and

''(II) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.''.

(2) TRANSFERABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) TRANSFERABILITY OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that a State determines that funds made available under this title to the State for a purpose are in excess of the needs of the State for that purpose, the State may transfer the excess funds to, and use the excess funds for, any surface transportation (including mass transit and rail) purpose in the State.

''(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has transferred funds under paragraph (1) to a purpose that is not a surface transportation purpose as described in paragraph (1), the amount of the improperly transferred funds shall be deducted from any amount the State would otherwise receive from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year that begins after the date of the determination.''.

(3) FEDERAL-AID SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the National Highway System, which includes''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in section 103 by striking the section designation and heading and inserting the following:

''§ 103. Federal-aid system'';

and

(ii) in the analysis by striking the item relating to section 103 and inserting the following:

''103. Federal-aid system.''.

(4) CALCULATION OF STATE AMOUNTS.—Section 104(c)(2) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading by striking ''FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014'' and inserting ''SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''fiscal year 2014'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2022 and each subsequent fiscal year''.

(5) FEDERALIZATION AND DEFEDERALIZATION OF PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on October 1, 2022—

(A) a highway construction or improvement project shall not be considered to be a Federal highway construction or improvement project unless and until a State expends Federal funds for the construction portion of the project;

(B) a highway construction or improvement project shall not be considered to be a Federal highway construction or improvement project solely by reason of the expenditure of Federal funds by a State before the construction phase of the project to pay expenses relating to the project, including for any environmental document or design work required for the project; and

(C)(i) a State may, after having used Federal funds to pay all or a portion of the costs of a highway construction or improvement project, reimburse the Federal Government in an amount equal to the amount of Federal funds so expended; and

(ii) after completion of a reimbursement described in clause (i), a highway construction or improvement project described in that clause shall no longer be considered to be a Federal highway construction or improvement project.

(6) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—No reporting requirement, other than a reporting requirement in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall apply on or after October 1, 2022, to the use of Federal funds for highway projects by a public-private partnership.

(b) EXPENDITURES FROM HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—

(1) EXPENDITURES FOR CORE PROGRAMS.—Section 9503(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), as amended by division G and section 51101(a)—

(i) by striking ''October 1, 2021'' and inserting ''October 1, 2026''; and

(ii) by striking ''DRIVE Act'' and inserting ''Transportation Empowerment Act'';

(B) in paragraph (2), as amended by section 51102(e)(1)(B), by striking ''July 1, 2024'' and inserting ''July 1, 2030''; and

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''October 1, 2011'' and inserting ''October 1, 2026''.

(2) AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR CORE PROGRAM EXPENDITURES.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) CORE PROGRAMS FINANCING RATE.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2)—

''(A) in the case of gasoline and special motor fuels the tax rate of which is the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(A)(i), the core programs financing rate is—

''(i) after September 30, 2022, and before October 1, 2023, 18.3 cents per gallon,

''(ii) after September 30, 2023, and before October 1, 2024, 9.6 cents per gallon,

''(iii) after September 30, 2024, and before October 1, 2025, 6.4 cents per gallon,

''(iv) after September 30, 2025, and before October 1, 2026, 5.0 cents per gallon, and

''(v) after September 30, 2026, 3.7 cents per gallon, and

''(B) in the case of kerosene, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels the tax rate of which is the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(A)(iii), the core programs financing rate is—

''(i) after September 30, 2022, and before October 1, 2023, 24.3 cents per gallon,

''(ii) after September 30, 2023, and before October 1, 2024, 12.7 cents per gallon,

''(iii) after September 30, 2024, and before October 1, 2025, 8.5 cents per gallon,

''(iv) after September 30, 2025, and before October 1, 2026, 6.6 cents per gallon, and

''(v) after September 30, 2026, 5.0 cents per gallon.

''(2) APPLICATION OF RATE.—In the case of fuels used as described in paragraphs (3)(C), (4)(B), and (5) of subsection (c), the core programs financing rate is zero.''.

(c) TERMINATION OF MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT.—Section 9503(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (2), by inserting '', and before October 1, 2022'' after ''March 31, 1983''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) TRANSFER TO HIGHWAY ACCOUNT.—On October 1, 2022, the Secretary shall transfer all amounts in the Mass Transit Account to the Highway Account.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments and repeals made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2023.

SEC. 63005. FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM.

(a) NATIONAL HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 119(d)(2) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (H);

(B) by striking subparagraph (M);

(C) by striking subparagraph (O); and

(D) by redesignating subparagraphs (I), (J), (K), (L), (N), and (P) as subparagraphs (H), (I), (J), (K), (L), and (M), respectively.

(2) REPEAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROVISIONS.—Section 119 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (g).

(b) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 133(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking ''Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, including electric vehicle and natural gas infrastructure in accordance with section 137, bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways in accordance with section 217, and the'' and inserting ''Any'';

(B) by striking paragraph (11);

(C) in paragraph (13), by adding a period at the end;

(D) by striking paragraph (14);

(E) by striking paragraph (17);

(F) in paragraph (24), by striking ''data collection, maintenance, and integration'' and inserting ''the maintenance and integration of data''; and

(G) by redesignating paragraphs (12), (13), (15), (16), (18), (19), (20), (21), (22), (23), (24), (25), and (26) as paragraphs (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), (22), and (23), respectively.

(2) REPEAL OF BRIDGES NOT ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS PROVISIONS.—Section 133 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (g); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 101(a)(29)(F)(i) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''133(b)(11), 328(a),'' and inserting ''328(a)''.

(B) Section 133(c) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (1);

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(11), (20), (25), and (26)'' and inserting ''(17), (22), and (23)''; and

(iii) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(C) Section 165(c)(7) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''(14), and (19)'' and inserting ''and (16)''.

(c) METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 134 of title 23, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The chapter analysis for chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 134.

(B) Section 2864(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Transportation Empowerment Act)'' after ''title 23''.

(C) Section 103(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) COOPERATION.—In proposing a modification under this paragraph, a State shall cooperate with local and regional officials.''.

(D) Section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in subsection (b)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking '', and to carry out section 134''; and

(II) by striking paragraph (5);

(ii) in subsection (d)(1)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (B);

(II) by striking ''(A) USE.—'';

(III) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(IV) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking ''clause (ii)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B)''; and

(V) in subparagraphs (A) and (B) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Transportation Empowerment Act)'' after ''subsection (b)(5)'' each place it appears; and

(iii) in subsection (d)(2)—

(I) by striking ''STATES.—'' and all that follows through ''The distribution'' in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), and inserting ''STATES.—The distribution'';

(II) in clause (ii), by striking ''to carry out section 134 and'';

(III) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(IV) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting appropriately.

(E) Section 106(h)(3)(C) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''sections 134 and 135'' and inserting ''section 135''.

(F) Section 108(d)(5)(A) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''sections 134 and 135'' and inserting ''section 135''.

(G) Section 119(d)(1)(B) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''sections 134 and 135'' and inserting ''section 135''.

(H) Section 133(d) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (2);

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking ''sections 134 and 135'' and inserting ''section 135''; and

(iii) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively.

(I) Section 135 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in paragraph (1)—

(aa) by striking ''Subject to section 134, to'' and inserting ''To''; and

(bb) by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Transportation Empowerment Act)'' after ''section 134(a)''; and

(II) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Transportation Empowerment Act)'' after ''section 134(a)'';

(ii) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''with the transportation planning activities carried out under section 134 for metropolitan areas of the State and'';

(iii) in subsection (f)(2)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(iv) in subsection (g)—

(I) in paragraph (2)—

(aa) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(bb) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(II) in paragraph (8), by striking ''and section 134''; and

(v) in subsection (j), by striking ''and section 134'' each place it appears.

(J) Section 137 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking subsection (e); and

(ii) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

(K) Section 142 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking subsection (d); and

(ii) by redesignating subsections (e) through (i) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively.

(L) Section 168(a)(2)(A) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or a transportation plan developed under section 134''.

(M) Section 201(c)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''sections 134 and 135'' and inserting ''section 135''.

(N) Section 217(g)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by striking ''metropolitan planning organization and State in accordance with section 134 and 135, respectively'' and inserting ''State in accordance with section 135''.

(O) Section 327(a)(2)(B) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in clause (iii), by striking ''42 U.S.C. 13'' and inserting ''42 U.S.C.''; and

(ii) in clause (iv)(I), by striking ''134 or''.

(P) Section 505 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(2)—

(I) by striking ''metropolitan and''; and

(II) by striking ''sections 134 and 135'' and inserting ''section 135''; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''sections 134 and 135'' and inserting ''section 135''.

(Q) Section 602(a)(3) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''sections 134 and 135'' and inserting ''section 135''.

(R) Section 610(d)(5) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 133(d)(3)'' and inserting ''section 133(d)(2)''.

(S) Section 174 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7504) is amended—

(i) in the fourth sentence of subsection (a), by striking ''the metropolitan planning organization designated to conduct the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the area under section 134 of title 23, United States Code,'';

(ii) by striking subsection (b); and

(iii) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(T) Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7506(c)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (7)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''section 134(i) of title 23, United States Code, or''; and

(ii) in paragraph (9), by striking ''section 134(i) of title 23, United States Code, or''.

(U) Section 182(c)(5) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7511a(c)(5)) is amended—

(i) by striking ''(A) Beginning'' and inserting ''Beginning''; and

(ii) in the last sentence by striking ''and with the requirements of section 174(b)''.

(V) Section 5304(i) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking ''sections 134 and 135'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 135''; and

(ii) by striking ''this this'' and inserting ''this''.

(d) NATIONAL BRIDGE AND TUNNEL INVENTORY AND INSPECTION STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)(1) by inserting ''on the Federal-aid system'' after ''any bridge''; and

(B) in subsection (f)(1) by inserting ''on the Federal-aid system'' after ''construct any bridge''.

(2) REPEAL OF HISTORIC BRIDGES PROVISIONS.—Section 144(g) of title 23, United States Code, is repealed.

(e) HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 148 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(I) by striking clause (v); and

(II) by redesignating clauses (vi) through (xxiv) as clauses (v) through (xxiii), respectively;

(ii) in paragraph (8), by striking ''bicyclist,''; and

(iii) by striking paragraphs (11) through (13);

(B) by striking subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i); and

(C) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (b).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 101(a)(27) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Transportation Empowerment Act)'' after ''section 148(a)''.

(B) Section 402(b)(1)(F)(v) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Transportation Empowerment Act)'' after ''section 148(a)''.

(f) REPEAL OF CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 149 of title 23, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The chapter analysis for chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 149.

(B) Section 106(d) of title 23, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''section, section 133, or section 149'' and inserting ''section or section 133''.

(C) Section 150 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in subsection (c)—

(I) by striking paragraph (5); and

(II) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5); and

(ii) in subsection (d), by striking ''(5), and (6)'' and inserting ''and (5)''.

(D) Section 322(h)(3) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program under section 149''.

(E) Section 505(a)(3) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''149,''.

(g) REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Section 213 of title 23, United States Code.

(2) The item relating to section 213 in the analysis for chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code.

(h) NATIONAL DEFENSE HIGHWAYS.—Section 311 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''under subsection (a) of section 104 of this title'' and inserting ''to carry out this section''; and

(2) by striking the second sentence.

SEC. 63006. FUNDING FOR HIGHWAY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out section 503(b) of title 23, United States Code, $115,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE.—Funds authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) shall—

(1) be available for obligation in the same manner as if those funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, except that the Federal share of the cost of a project or activity carried out using those funds shall be 80 percent, unless otherwise expressly provided by this Act (including the amendments by this Act) or otherwise determined by the Secretary; and

(2) remain available until expended and not be transferable.

SEC. 63007. RETURN OF EXCESS TAX RECEIPTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) RETURN OF EXCESS TAX RECEIPTS TO STATES FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—On the first day of each of fiscal years 2023, 2024, 2025, and 2026, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall—

''(i) determine the excess (if any) of—

''(I) the amounts appropriated in such fiscal year to the Highway Trust Fund under subsection (b) which are attributable to the taxes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) thereof (after the application of paragraph (4) thereof) over the sum of—

''(II) the amounts so appropriated which are equivalent to—

''(aa) such amounts attributable to the core programs financing rate for such year, plus

''(bb) the taxes described in paragraphs (3)(C), (4)(B), and (5) of subsection (c), and

''(ii) allocate the amount determined under clause (i) among the States (as defined in section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code) for surface transportation (including mass transit and rail) purposes so that—

''(I) the percentage of that amount allocated to each State, is equal to

''(II) the percentage of the amount determined under clause (i)(I) paid into the Highway Trust Fund in the latest fiscal year for which such data are available which is attributable to highway users in the State.

''(B) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has used amounts under subparagraph (A) for a purpose which is not a surface transportation purpose as described in subparagraph (A), the improperly used amounts shall be deducted from any amount the State would otherwise receive from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year which begins after the date of the determination.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2022.

SEC. 63008. REDUCTION IN TAXES ON GASOLINE, DIESEL FUEL, KEROSENE, AND SPECIAL FUELS FUNDING HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) REDUCTION IN TAX RATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4081(a)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''18.3 cents'' and inserting ''3.7 cents''; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking ''24.3 cents'' and inserting ''5.0 cents''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 4081(a)(2)(D) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''19.7 cents'' and inserting ''4.1 cents'', and

(ii) by striking ''24.3 cents'' and inserting ''5.0 cents''.

(B) Section 6427(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''7.4 cents'' and inserting ''1.5 cents''.

(b) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 4041(a)(1)(C)(iii)(I) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 51102(a)(1)(A), is amended by striking ''7.3 cents per gallon (4.3 cents per gallon after September 30, 2023)'' and inserting ''1.4 cents per gallon (zero after September 30, 2028)''.

(2) Section 4041(a)(2)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking ''24.3 cents'' and inserting ''5.0 cents''.

(3) Section 4041(a)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''18.3 cents'' and inserting ''3.7 cents''.

(4) Section 4041(m)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), as amended by section 51102(a)(2)(A), by striking ''2023'' and inserting ''2028,'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''9.15 cents'' and inserting ''1.8 cents'';

(C) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''11.3 cents'' and inserting ''2.3 cents''; and

(D) by striking subparagraph (B), as amended by section 51102(a)(1)(B), and inserting the following:

''(B) zero after September 30, 2028.''.

(5) Section 4081(d)(1) of such Code, as amended by section 51102(a)(1)(C), is amended by striking ''4.3 cents per gallon after September 30, 2023'' and inserting ''zero after September 30, 2028''.

(6) Section 9503(b) of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraphs (1) and (2), as amended by section 51102(e)(1)(A)(i), by striking ''October 1, 2023'' both places it appears and inserting ''October 1, 2028'';

(B) in the heading of paragraph (2), as amended by section 51102(e)(1)(A)(ii), by striking ''OCTOBER 1, 2023'' and inserting ''OCTOBER 1, 2028'';

(C) in paragraph (2), as amended by section 51102(e)(1)(A), by striking ''after September 30, 2023, and before July 1, 2024'' and inserting ''after September 30, 2028, and before July 1, 2029''; and

(D) in paragraph (6)(B), as amended by division G, by striking ''October 1, 2015'' and inserting ''October 1, 2020''.

(c) FLOOR STOCK REFUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

(A) before October 1, 2028, tax has been imposed under section 4081 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on any liquid; and

(B) on such date such liquid is held by a dealer and has not been used and is intended for sale;

there shall be credited or refunded (without interest) to the person who paid such tax (in this subsection referred to as the ''taxpayer'') an amount equal to the excess of the tax paid by the taxpayer over the amount of such tax which would be imposed on such liquid had the taxable event occurred on such date.

(2) TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS.—No credit or refund shall be allowed or made under this subsection unless—

(A) claim therefor is filed with the Secretary of the Treasury before April 1, 2029; and

(B) in any case where liquid is held by a dealer (other than the taxpayer) on October 1, 2028—

(i) the dealer submits a request for refund or credit to the taxpayer before January 1, 2029; and

(ii) the taxpayer has repaid or agreed to repay the amount so claimed to such dealer or has obtained the written consent of such dealer to the allowance of the credit or the making of the refund.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR FUEL HELD IN RETAIL STOCKS.—No credit or refund shall be allowed under this subsection with respect to any liquid in retail stocks held at the place where intended to be sold at retail.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''dealer'' and ''held by a dealer'' have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 6412 of such Code; except that the term ''dealer'' includes a producer.

(5) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (b) and (c) of section 6412 and sections 6206 and 6675 of such Code shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to fuel removed after September 30, 2023.

(2) CERTAIN CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The amendments made by subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (b)(6) shall take effect on October 1, 2023.

(B) The amendment made by subsection (b)(6)(D) shall take effect on October 1, 2022.

SEC. 63009. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 180 days after the effective date of this title, after consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit a report to Congress describing such technical and conforming amendments to titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and such technical and conforming amendments to other laws, as are necessary to bring those titles and other laws into conformity with the policy embodied in this title and the amendments made by this title.

SEC. 63010. EFFECTIVE DATE CONTINGENT ON CERTIFICATION OF DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that—

(1) this title will become effective only if the Director of the Office of Management and Budget certifies that this title is deficit neutral;

(2) discretionary spending limits are reduced to capture the savings realized in devolving transportation functions to the State level pursuant to this title; and

(3) the tax reduction made by this title is not scored under pay-as-you-go and does not inadvertently trigger a sequestration.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE CONTINGENCY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the later of—

(1)(A) the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as the ''Director'') submits the report as required in subsection (c); and

(B) the report contains a certification by the Director that, based on the required estimates, the reduction in discretionary outlays resulting from the reduction in contract authority is at least as great as the reduction in revenues for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2026; or

(2) October 1, 2022.

(c) OMB ESTIMATES AND REPORT.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 5 calendar days after the effective date of this title, the Director shall—

(A) estimate the net change in revenues resulting from this title for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2026;

(B) estimate the net change in discretionary outlays resulting from the reduction in contract authority under this title for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2026;

(C) determine, based on those estimates, whether the reduction in discretionary outlays is at least as great as the reduction in revenues for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2026; and

(D) submit to Congress a report setting forth the estimates and determination.

(2) APPLICABLE ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES.—

(A) REVENUE ESTIMATES.—The revenue estimates required under paragraph (1)(A) shall be predicated on the same economic and technical assumptions and score keeping guidelines that would be used for estimates made pursuant to section 252(d) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(d)).

(B) OUTLAY ESTIMATES.—The outlay estimates required under paragraph (1)(B) shall be determined by comparing the level of discretionary outlays resulting from this title with the corresponding level of discretionary outlays projected in the baseline under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907).

(d) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—

(1) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this title shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(2) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this title shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

(e) PAYGO INTERACTION.—On compliance with the requirements specified in subsection (b), no changes in revenues estimated to result from the enactment of this title shall be counted for the purposes of section 252(d) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(d)).

SA 2541. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 614, to provide access to and use of information by Federal agencies in order to reduce improper payments, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Improper Payments Coordination Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. AVAILABILITY OF THE DO NOT PAY INITIATIVE TO THE JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES AND STATES.

Section 5 of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''BY AGENCIES'';

(B) by striking ''For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) OTHER ENTITIES.—States and any contractor, subcontractor, or agent of a State, and the judicial and legislative branches of the United States (as defined in paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, of section 202(e) of title 18, United States Code), shall have access to, and use of, the Do Not Pay Initiative for the purpose of verifying payment or award eligibility for payments (as defined in section 2(g)(3) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note)) when, with respect to a State, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines that the Do Not Pay Initiative is appropriately established for that State and any contractor, subcontractor, or agent of the State, and, with respect to the judicial and legislative branches of the United States, when the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines that the Do Not Pay Initiative is appropriately established for the judicial branch or the legislative branch, as applicable.

''(C) CONSISTENCY WITH PRIVACY ACT OF 1974.—To ensure consistency with the principles of section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may issue guidance that establishes privacy and other requirements that shall be incorporated into Do Not Pay Initiative access agreements with States, including any contractor, subcontractor, or agent of a State, and the judicial and legislative branches of the United States.''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) may include States and their quasi-government entities, and the judicial and legislative branches of the United States (as defined in paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, of section 202(e) of title 18, United States Code) as users of the system in accordance with subsection (b)(3).''.

SEC. 3. IMPROVING THE SHARING AND USE OF DATA BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES TO CURB IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

The Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended—

(1) in section 5(a)(2), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) The death records maintained by the Commissioner of Social Security.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 7. IMPROVING THE USE OF DATA BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES FOR CURBING IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

''(a) PROMPT REPORTING OF DEATH INFORMATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall establish a procedure under which each Secretary shall, promptly and on a regular basis, submit information relating to the deaths of individuals to each agency for which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines receiving and using such information would be relevant and necessary.

''(b) GUIDANCE TO AGENCIES REGARDING DATA ACCESS AND USE FOR IMPROPER PAYMENTS PURPOSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, the heads of other relevant Federal, State, and local agencies, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations, as appropriate, shall issue guidance regarding implementation of the Do Not Pay Initiative under section 5 to—

''(A) the Department of the Treasury; and

''(B) each agency or component of an agency—

''(i) that operates or maintains a database of information described in section 5(a)(2); or

''(ii) for which the Director determines improved data matching would be relevant, necessary, or beneficial.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The guidance issued under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) address the implementation of subsection (a); and

''(B) include the establishment of deadlines for access to and use of the databases described in section 5(a)(2) under the Do Not Pay Initiative.''.

SEC. 4. DATA ANALYTICS.

Section 5 of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) REPORT ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS DATA ANALYSIS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Federal Improper Payments Coordination Act of 2015, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report which shall include a description of—

''(1) data analytics performed as part of the Do Not Pay Business Center operated by the Department of the Treasury for the purpose of detecting, preventing, and recovering improper payments through preaward, postaward prepayment, and postpayment analysis, which shall include a description of any analysis or investigations incorporating—

''(A) review and data matching of payments and beneficiary enrollment lists of State programs carried out using Federal funds for the purposes of identifying eligibility duplication, residency ineligibility, duplicate payments, or other potential improper payment issues;

''(B) review of multiple Federal agencies and programs for which comparison of data could show payment duplication; and

''(C) review of other information the Secretary of the Treasury determines could prove effective for identifying, preventing, or recovering improper payments, which may include investigation or review of information from multiple Federal agencies or programs;

''(2) the metrics used in determining whether the analytic and investigatory efforts have reduced, or contributed to the reduction of, improper payments or improper awards; and

''(3) the target dates for implementing the data analytics operations performed as part of the Do Not Pay Business Center''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2015, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Lifting The Crude Oil Export Ban.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Avoiding Duplication: An Examination of the State Department's Proposal to Construct a New Diplomatic Security Training Facility.''

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2015, at 11:30 p.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, that at 10 a.m., tomorrow, Wednesday, July 29, all postcloture time on the McConnell amendment No. 2266 be considered expired; further, that if cloture is invoked on H.R. 22, then the postcloture time count as if cloture had been invoked at 6 a.m. on Wednesday, July 29.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 22, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Executive Calendar Nos. 6, 137, and 193; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 232; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert P. Ashley, Jr.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

FEDERAL IMPROPER PAYMENTS COORDINATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 156, S. 614.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 614) to provide access to and use of information by Federal agencies in order to reduce improper payments, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Carper amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 2541) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Improper Payments Coordination Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. AVAILABILITY OF THE DO NOT PAY INITIATIVE TO THE JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES AND STATES.

Section 5 of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''BY AGENCIES'';

(B) by striking ''For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) OTHER ENTITIES.—States and any contractor, subcontractor, or agent of a State, and the judicial and legislative branches of the United States (as defined in paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, of section 202(e) of title 18, United States Code), shall have access to, and use of, the Do Not Pay Initiative for the purpose of verifying payment or award eligibility for payments (as defined in section 2(g)(3) of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note)) when, with respect to a State, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines that the Do Not Pay Initiative is appropriately established for that State and any contractor, subcontractor, or agent of the State, and, with respect to the judicial and legislative branches of the United States, when the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines that the Do Not Pay Initiative is appropriately established for the judicial branch or the legislative branch, as applicable.

''(C) CONSISTENCY WITH PRIVACY ACT OF 1974.—To ensure consistency with the principles of section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may issue guidance that establishes privacy and other requirements that shall be incorporated into Do Not Pay Initiative access agreements with States, including any contractor, subcontractor, or agent of a State, and the judicial and legislative branches of the United States.''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) may include States and their quasi-government entities, and the judicial and legislative branches of the United States (as defined in paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, of section 202(e) of title 18, United States Code) as users of the system in accordance with subsection (b)(3).''.

SEC. 3. IMPROVING THE SHARING AND USE OF DATA BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES TO CURB IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

The Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) is amended—

(1) in section 5(a)(2), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) The death records maintained by the Commissioner of Social Security.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 7. IMPROVING THE USE OF DATA BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES FOR CURBING IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

''(a) PROMPT REPORTING OF DEATH INFORMATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall establish a procedure under which each Secretary shall, promptly and on a regular basis, submit information relating to the deaths of individuals to each agency for which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines receiving and using such information would be relevant and necessary.

''(b) GUIDANCE TO AGENCIES REGARDING DATA ACCESS AND USE FOR IMPROPER PAYMENTS PURPOSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, the heads of other relevant Federal, State, and local agencies, and Indian

tribes and tribal organizations, as appropriate, shall issue guidance regarding implementation of the Do Not Pay Initiative under section 5 to—

''(A) the Department of the Treasury; and

''(B) each agency or component of an agency—

''(i) that operates or maintains a database of information described in section 5(a)(2); or

''(ii) for which the Director determines improved data matching would be relevant, necessary, or beneficial.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The guidance issued under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) address the implementation of subsection (a); and

''(B) include the establishment of deadlines for access to and use of the databases described in section 5(a)(2) under the Do Not Pay Initiative.''.

SEC. 4. DATA ANALYTICS.

Section 5 of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) REPORT ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS DATA ANALYSIS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Federal Improper Payments Coordination Act of 2015, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report which shall include a description of—

''(1) data analytics performed as part of the Do Not Pay Business Center operated by the Department of the Treasury for the purpose of detecting, preventing, and recovering improper payments through preaward, postaward prepayment, and postpayment analysis, which shall include a description of any analysis or investigations incorporating—

''(A) review and data matching of payments and beneficiary enrollment lists of State programs carried out using Federal funds for the purposes of identifying eligibility duplication, residency ineligibility, duplicate payments, or other potential improper payment issues;

''(B) review of multiple Federal agencies and programs for which comparison of data could show payment duplication; and

''(C) review of other information the Secretary of the Treasury determines could prove effective for identifying, preventing, or recovering improper payments, which may include investigation or review of information from multiple Federal agencies or programs;

''(2) the metrics used in determining whether the analytic and investigatory efforts have reduced, or contributed to the reduction of, improper payments or improper awards; and

''(3) the target dates for implementing the data analytics operations performed as part of the Do Not Pay Business Center''.

The bill (S. 614), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WOUNDED WARRIORS FEDERAL LEAVE ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 160, S. 242.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 242) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 242) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 242

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL LEAVE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 6329. Disabled veteran leave

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) notwithstanding section 6301, the term 'employee'—

''(A) has the meaning given such term in section 2105; and

''(B) includes an officer or employee of the United States Postal Service or of the Postal Regulatory Commission;

''(2) the term 'service-connected' has the meaning given such term in section 101(16) of title 38; and

''(3) the term 'veteran' has the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of title 38.

''(b) LEAVE CREDITED.—During the 12-month period beginning on the first day of the employment of an employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated as 30 percent or more disabling, the employee is entitled to leave, without loss or reduction in pay, for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability for which sick leave could regularly be used.

''(c) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) AMOUNT OF LEAVE.—The leave credited to an employee under subsection (b) may not exceed 104 hours.

''(2) NO CARRY OVER.—Any leave credited to an employee under subsection (b) that is not used during the 12-month period described in such subsection may not be carried over and shall be forfeited.

''(d) CERTIFICATION.—In order to verify that leave credited to an employee under subsection (b) is used for treating a service-connected disability, the employee shall submit to the head of the employing agency a certification, in such form and manner as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may prescribe, that the employee used the leave for purposes of being furnished treatment for the disability by a health care provider.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 6328 the following:

''6329. Disabled veteran leave.''.

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an employee (as that term is defined in section 6329(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)) hired on or after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) the Postmaster General shall prescribe regulations with respect to the leave provided under the amendment made by subsection (a) for employees of the United States Postal Service and the Postal Regulatory Commission; and

(B) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations with respect to the leave provided under the amendment made by subsection (a) for all other employees.

(2) BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 months thereafter until the date on which the Director of the Office of Personnel Management prescribes final regulations under paragraph (1)(B), the Director shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives regarding the development of such regulations.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 161, S. 764.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 764) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 764

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO THE NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.).

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION OF DEAN JOHN A. KNAUSS MARINE POLICY FELLOWSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208(b) (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)) is amended by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''.

(b) PLACEMENTS IN CONGRESS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (1), in the second sentence, by striking ''A fellowship'' and inserting the following:

''(2) PLACEMENT PRIORITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In each year in which the Secretary awards a legislative fellowship under this subsection, when considering the placement of fellows, the Secretary shall prioritize placement of fellows in the following:

''(i) Positions in offices of, or with members on, committees of Congress that have jurisdiction over the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

''(ii) Positions in offices of members of Congress that have a demonstrated interest in ocean, coastal, or Great Lakes resources.

''(B) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—In placing fellows in offices described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum degree practicable, that placements are equitably distributed among the political parties.

''(3) DURATION.—A fellowship''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to the first calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING FEDERAL HIRING OF FORMER FELLOWS.—It is the sense of Congress that in recognition of the competitive nature of the fellowship under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)), and of the exceptional qualifications of fellowship awardees, the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, should encourage participating Federal agencies to consider opportunities for fellowship awardees at the conclusion of their fellowship for workforce positions appropriate for their education and experience.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO ACCEPT DONATIONS FOR NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 204(c)(4)(E) (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(E)) is amended to read as follows:

''(E) accept donations of money and, notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, of voluntary and uncompensated services;''.

(b) PRIORITIES.—The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, shall establish priorities for the use of donations accepted under section 204(c)(4)(E) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(E)), and shall consider among those priorities the possibility of expanding the Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship's placement of additional fellows in relevant legislative offices under section 208(b) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)), in accordance with the recommendations under subsection (c) of this section.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Sea Grant College Program, in consultation with the National Sea Grant Advisory Board and the Sea Grant Association, shall—

(1) develop recommendations for the optimal use of any donations accepted under section 204(c)(4)(E) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(E)); and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the recommendations developed under paragraph (1).

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or otherwise affect any other amounts available for marine policy fellowships under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)), including amounts—

(1) accepted under section 204(c)(4)(F) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(F)); or

(2) appropriated under section 212 of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1131).

SEC. 5. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT ON COORDINATION OF OCEANS AND COASTAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.

Section 9 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002 (33 U.S.C. 857–20) is repealed.

SEC. 6. REDUCTION IN FREQUENCY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL SEA GRANT ADVISORY BOARD REPORT.

Section 209(b)(2) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''BIENNIAL'' and inserting ''PERIODIC''; and

(2) in the first sentence, by striking ''The Board shall report to the Congress every two years'' and inserting ''Not less frequently than once every 3 years, the Board shall submit to Congress a report''.

SEC. 7. MODIFICATION OF ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.

Section 204(b) (33 U.S.C. 1123(b)) is amended, in the matter before paragraph (1), by inserting ''for research, education, extension, training, technology transfer, and public service'' after ''financial assistance''.

SEC. 8. DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY; DEAN JOHN A. KNAUSS MARINE POLICY FELLOWSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal year 2016 and thereafter, the head of any Federal agency may appoint, without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, other than sections 3303 and 3328 of that title, a qualified candidate described in subsection (b) directly to a position with the Federal agency for which the candidate meets Office of Personnel Management qualification standards.

(b) DEAN JOHN A. KNAUSS MARINE POLICY FELLOWSHIP.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a former recipient of a Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)) who—

(1) earned a graduate or post-graduate degree in a field related to ocean, coastal and Great Lakes resources or policy from an accredited institution of higher education; and

(2) successfully fulfilled the requirements of the fellowship within the executive or legislative branch of the United States Government.

(c) LIMITATION.—The direct hire authority under this section shall be exercised with respect to a specific qualified candidate not later than 2 years after the date that the candidate completed the fellowship.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(a) (33 U.S.C. 1131(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting '';''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) $72,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

''(H) $75,600,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(I) $79,380,000 for fiscal year 2017;

''(J) $83,350,000 for fiscal year 2018;

''(K) $87,520,000 for fiscal year 2019;

''(L) $91,900,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

''(M) $96,500,000 for fiscal year 2021.'';

(2) in the heading for paragraph (2), by inserting ''FOR FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2014'' after ''PRIORITY ACTIVITIES''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) PRIORITY ACTIVITIES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2015 THROUGH 2020.—In addition to the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), there is authorized to be appropriated $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020 for competitive grants for the following:

''(A) University research on the biology, prevention, and control of aquatic nonnative species.

''(B) University research on oyster diseases, oyster restoration, and oyster-related human health risks.

''(C) University research on the biology, prevention, and forecasting of harmful algal blooms.

''(D) University research, education, training, and extension services and activities focused on coastal resilience and U.S. working waterfronts and other regional or national priority issues identified in the strategic plan under section 204(c)(1).

''(E) University research on sustainable aquaculture techniques and technologies.

''(F) Fishery extension activities conducted by sea grant colleges or sea grant institutes to enhance, and not supplant, existing core program funding.''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 212(b) (33 U.S.C. 1131(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There may not be used for administration of programs under this title in a fiscal year more than 5.5 percent of the lesser of—

''(i) the amount authorized to be appropriated under this title for the fiscal year; or

''(ii) the amount appropriated under this title for the fiscal year.

''(B) CRITICAL STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall use the authority under subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, to meet any critical staffing requirement while carrying out the activities authorized in this title.

''(ii) EXCEPTION FROM CAP.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), any costs incurred as a result of an exercise of authority as described in clause (i) shall not be considered an amount used for administration of programs under this title in a fiscal year.''.

(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 204(d)(3) (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)(3)) is amended—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking ''With respect to sea grant colleges and sea grant institutes'' and inserting ''With respect to sea grant colleges, sea grant institutes, sea grant programs, and sea grant projects''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), in the matter before clause (i), by striking ''funding among sea grant colleges and sea grant institutes'' and inserting ''funding among sea grant colleges, sea grant institutes, sea grant programs, and sea grant projects''.

(2) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING DISTRIBUTION OF EXCESS AMOUNTS.—Section 212 (33 U.S.C. 1131) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

SEC. 10. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

The National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 204(d)(3)(B) (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)(3)(B)), by moving clause (vi) two ems to the right; and

(2) in section 209(b)(2) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)(2)), as amended by section 6, in the third sentence, by striking ''The Secretary shall'' and inserting the following:

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.—The Secretary shall''.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 764), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 64, which is at the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the Monuments Men.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) was agreed to.

HONORING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN BUSINESS OWNERS ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 225.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 225) honoring the National Association of Women Business Owners on its 40th anniversary.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 225) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 21, 2015, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 20.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) recognizing and honoring the 25th anniversary of the date of enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

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

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

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1881 AND H.J. RES. 61

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill and a joint resolution at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the measures by title for the first time en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1881) to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the measures will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 29; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 22, under the previous order, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided in the usual form.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:04 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 29, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 28, 2015:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT P. ASHLEY, JR.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SAFE AND ACCURATE FOOD LABELING ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1599) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to food produced from, containing, or consisting of a bioengineered organism, the labeling of natural foods, and for other purposes:

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015. This legislation would prohibit the Food and Drug Administration from developing a national genetically modified organism (GMO) labeling system for food, block any state or local laws to require GMO labeling, and ultimately deny consumers the right to know what is in their food.

Nearly 90 percent of consumers wish to know if their food contains GMO ingredients and I believe Americans should have that same right that 64 other nations have already provided their citizens.

H.R. 1599 lets down the American consumer and for that reason I am opposed to this legislation and encourage the House of Representatives to take up legislation that adequately addresses this issue and gives consumers the information they demand.

TARRANT COUNTY COLLEGE DISTRICT 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Tarrant County College District on 50 years of making a difference in Tarrant County.

Fifty years ago, the citizens of Tarrant County came together to establish the Tarrant County Junior College District. Its creation marked the tradition of providing knowledge, skills and the hope for a better future to the people of Tarrant County.

At its founding, the College enrolled 4,272 students at its original South Campus. Within its first five years, the College created its curriculum, built and staffed two campuses and received full accreditation. Today, the Tarrant County College District includes 21st century curriculums for its students in fields as varied as healthcare, aviation and firefighting.

Because of the unbridled optimism of its leadership and the dedication to its mission, Tarrant County College District has seen its enrollment soar to more than 100,000 students each year. The original campus has been joined by five others that serve the community, and future growth is on the horizon.

Tarrant County College District is, has been and will continue to be, an integral part in the success of so many people in our community.

I offer my hearty congratulations to Chancellor Erma Johnson Hadley, the faculty, students and alumni of Tarrant County College District on this 50th Anniversary and look forward to their continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL

HON. STEVE RUSSELL

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the House floor to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the National Collegiate Honors Council. The NCHC, which is dedicated to achieving excellence in education in diverse subject and curriculum areas currently, represents over 800 colleges and universities around the country and over 325,000 students in honors programs. To recognize these achievements, I have sponsored House Resolution 360 which was introduced last Friday and was supported by my colleagues as original cosponsors, Reps. BOUSTANY, BENISHEK, BISHOP and COLE. H. Res. 360 commemorates the hard work that these students and their faculty and administrators have undertaken with the NCHC over the past five decades to maintain U.S. preeminence in education. As a member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I salute the NCHC and its officers for their valuable contribution to the high education of our young people.

I would also like to honor Southern Nazarene University, in my district, on their membership in the National Collegiate Honors Council. Having just completed their 7th year as an honors program, SNU's curriculum emphasizes service leadership and real-world application. As a part of the curriculum students in the Honors Program at SNU are required to write a grant on behalf of a local Title1 elementary school, where the first year honors students also mentor two children each throughout their first year of college. To date, the SNU Honors Program first year students have had just under $15,000-worth of their grants funded in the four years they have been doing this experience.

Most of the graduates of the SNU Honors Program continue on in their education, with the majority attending medical, professional, or graduate school directly after graduation from SNU.

HONORING JOEY MENDOZA

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Joseph "Joey" Mendoza Jr., who passed away on July 23, 2015, surrounded by his family and friends. A third-generation member of a pioneering Point Reyes ranching family, Joey Mendoza was a very active leader within the local agricultural community and has been among the industry's most steadfast and passionate supporters.

Joey Mendoza was born on December 30, 1943, to Joe Sr. and Doris "Scotty" Mendoza and was raised on the family's historic working ranch in Point Reyes National Seashore, known as 'B' Ranch, where he also attended the one room school house located on that property. He went on to graduate from Tomales High School in 1961 before completing his education at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

During his long career as a dairyman and agricultural advocate, Joey Mendoza was dedicated to the success of his family business. He shared his leadership skills and comprehensive knowledge of the dairy industry by contributing to the boards and committees of numerous organizations, including the Western United Dairymen, the Dairymen's Feed Co-op, and the Marin County Farm Bureau, where he served as board president from 1982 to 1984. The California State Milk Pooling Board, the Point Reyes National Seashore Ranchers Association, the California Gold Co-op, the Redwood Empire Holstein Association, and the North Bay Dairy Herd Improvement Association also benefitted from his support.

Known for his keen sense of humor and his ability to balance the principles of environmental stewardship while advancing economic viability and protecting future success for the long-standing ranching legacy in Point Reyes National Seashore, Joey was a reliable friend to the agricultural community, the National Park Service, and the extended West Marin community alike. Able to forge consensus around vexing and controversial issues, his steady thoughtfulness, strength, and wit were a model for others and won't be soon forgotten. Even as he battled cancer in his final days, Joey was a force to be reckoned with and respected by all.

While he was an incredibly dedicated rancher throughout his life, Joey never missed an opportunity to participate in social gatherings, enjoy a hunt with his deer club, or support the San Francisco Giants, San Francisco 49ers, and his beloved Tomales Braves. His love for his family and friends was immense, and his passing leaves a void.

Mr. Speaker, Joey Mendoza's legacy is one of dedication to the local agriculture and broader West Marin ranching community. It is therefore appropriate to pay tribute to him today and express deepest condolences to his

wife of thirty-five years, Linda Mendoza; brother, Jim Mendoza; daughter, Jolynn McClelland; son, Jarrod Mendoza; grandchildren, Collin and Luke McClelland and Layla Mendoza; in addition to his numerous nieces, nephews, extended family, and close friends.

CELEBRATION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ELASTEC/AMERICAN MARINE

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the celebration of the 25th Anniversary of Elastec/American Marine.

Elastec/American Marine is a company that manufactures pollution recovery systems, focusing in international oil spill recovery. The company has over 100 employees, and its headquarters are located in Carmi, Illinois, with another location in Fairfield, Illinois, that opened in 2012. The company has received numerous awards for not only its products, but its employees and operations as well.

Twenty-five years ago, CEO Donnie Wilson and VP Jeff Cantrell combined their skills to create a drum oil skimmer and established Elastec. Over the years, with investors, Director Bill Harmon, the continuing development of systems and products, among other contributors, Elastec/American Marine has become a leader in manufacturing systems of pollution recovery. These systems and products reach over 145 countries.

I am honored to have a company that is recognized for such work within my district, and I look forward to hearing about its continued success.

TRIBUTE TO OFFICERS MICHAEL SMITH, CHRISTOPHER ROMANO, AND WILLIAM FOSTER

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Officers Michael Smith, Christopher Romano, and William Foster of the Syracuse New York Police Department. On July 1, 2015, Officers Smith and Romano responded to the scene of a dispute call when they observed smoke coming from the second floor windows of a neighboring building. After immediately notifying the 911 dispatch center, along with Officer Foster's arrival, the three officers sprung to action and entered the burning building in search of potential residents. Due to these officer's heroic actions, three occupants, including a pregnant mother and her child were saved, unscathed from the home.

Officer Smith was appointed to the Syracuse Police Department on September 5, 1997 and has since been assigned to the Patrol Division. Officer Romano was appointed on July 25, 2005 and was also assigned to the Patrol Division. Officer Foster was appointed to the Syracuse Police Department in 1986 and has since been assigned to the K9 unit.

Officers Smith, Romano and Foster have each bravely served the Syracuse New York Police Department for over ten years. I am proud to share in the recognition of Officers Smith, Romano, and Foster as first-rate officers, performing tremendous service to the people of Syracuse, New York.

IN RECOGNITION OF PRATT & WHITNEY ON THE OCCASION OF THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR INCORPORATION

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the great aerospace manufacturer Pratt & Whitney on the 90th anniversary of their incorporation. Beginning with the first 24 men and two women who reported to work in 1925, and continuing through today, Pratt & Whitney's main purpose has been to build ever newer and better aircraft engines.

Today, that small company has grown to employ more than 31,000 people, including many in my district, in well-paying jobs in careers they can be proud of. Pratt & Whitney employs 103 people in Middletown, Pennsylvania, and I'm proud to say that they are looking to expand to over 200. This is cutting edge technology that, in turn, is putting food on the table for folks back home.

In the last ninety years, there have been few innovations that have affected our daily lives as much as the jet engine. And Pratt & Whitney has been there every step of the way for every improvement and breakthrough in technology.

Mr. Speaker, Pratt & Whitney has defined aviation, and built dependable engines for nine decades. And I wish them all of the best for their next 90 years.

IN HONOR OF TOM GREER

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and career of Tom Greer, an outstanding public servant on the occasion of his retirement as general manager of the Monterey Regional Airport. His exceptional career has spanned nearly five decades and included both military and civil service.

After graduating from Auburn University in Alabama in 1965 with a degree in aviation management, Tom joined the Marines and was sent to Officers Candidate School in Quantico, Virginia. Upon receipt of his wings as a Naval Flight Officer in March 1967, he was assigned to various Fighter/Attack squadrons flying F–4B Phantom in over 320 combat missions in Vietnam.

Following his release from active duty in March 1970, Tom was selected as Airport Director for Golden Triangle Regional Airport near Columbus, Missouri. Under his exceptional leadership, this new airport was constructed from the ground up, opening successfully in the fall of 1972. Tom then took his aviation management skills to Salt Lake City, where he served as Director of Operations for the Salt Lake City Airport Authority. His guidance allowed the airport to remain operational while undergoing major expansion programs to accommodate a new hub for Western Airlines, now Delta. He then served in various capacities for Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport authority from 1984 until 1999. During his tenure, passenger traffic increased from two million to over five million, and a new terminal building was constructed for the 70 year old facility.

We have been blessed to have Tom serving as General Manager for the Monterey Peninsula Airport District since December of 2003. Some of his numerous accomplishments include the Terminal re-model, the TSA screening moved to a central location, a contract for Fire Services with the City of Monterey, and, currently, the Runway Safety Area Project and Airport Master Plan Project.

Throughout his extraordinary career, Tom has received numerous awards for his contributions to the profession. He was the recipient of the American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) Leadership Award in 2000, served as AAAE chairman in 2003, received the Distinguished Service Award in 2005, and the Chair's Award for 2008. He was named Airport Manager of the Year in 1988 and received the Chapter's Award of Distinction in 2003.

Mr. Speaker, the Central Coast is exceptionally grateful to Tom for his service to the community, the aviation industry, and the country. I wish nothing but the best for Tom in his retirement, and I know he looks forward to spending more time with his wonderful family, including his five children and thirteen grandchildren.

ROBERT FISHER

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and to recognize Robert Fisher upon his recent election to the Board of Directors at the National Association of Federal Credit Unions.

Mr. Fisher has served as the President and CEO of Grow Financial Federal Credit Union for 23 years and his dedication to the community has been an outstanding asset to the Tampa Bay area. It is a testament to his leadership that Grow Financial is ranked as one of the best places to work in the Tampa Bay Times' employee survey of Top Workplaces.

Mr. Fisher has previously served on the Board of Directors of the Tampa Bay Partnership Regional Economic Development Group, the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta Jacksonville Branch, and he has chaired the Finance committee of the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors.

Mr. Fisher's knowledge and experience with serving his community and the financial services sector will undoubtedly benefit National Association of Federal Credit Unions as he has a deep understanding of the challenges and issues that lie ahead with credit unions at both the state and federal level and I look forward to working with him in his new capacity.

Mr. Speaker, I join the Tampa Bay community in thanking Mr. Robert Fisher for his exceptional service, not only to our district, but to the State of Florida.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. ARLINE FRANCES DENNIS ON THE OCCASION OF HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize my constituent, Mrs. Arline Frances Dennis, as she celebrates her 100th birthday. Arline presently resides with her son in Shickshinny, which I am proud to say is in my district. She has continually served our area through her involvement in the church and in the community as a whole.

Arline was born on November 23, 1915 in Reyburn, Pennsylvania. She grew up attending a one room school, and later went on to graduate from Shickshinny High School. Growing up, she belonged to the Reyburn Bible Church, where she was an active member of the congregation. As an avid piano player and energetic teacher, Arline taught Sunday school and helped to organize a number of the church's Christmas programs. She also dedicated her time to the church youth group, ''Christian Endeavor.''

In 1939, Arline married Charles Elmer Dennis, and the two were married for 63 years before Charles passed away in 2002. They have two sons together, Wayne Charles and Zane Elmer. The family attended Harmony Methodist Church, where Arline played the piano, directed the choir, and taught Sunday School, and Charles was the Sunday School superintendent. Later, the two went on to be founding members of the Woodland Bible Chapel. With her love for music and community, Arline continued to play the piano and teach Sunday school at this new house of worship. Though she no longer plays the piano or teaches, Arline continues to attend services at Woodland Bible Chapel.

Outside of church, Arline has served our community in a variety of roles. For 16 years, she proudly served as the Judge of Elections in Union Township, located in Luzerne County. Furthermore, in addition to giving private piano lessons to over 500 students until 2010, Arline also taught music at Muhlenburg Christian Academy for 22 years, touching the lives of many students until she retired at the age of 90. With a passion for travel, Arline also coordinated community bus trips to New Jersey and Florida. In fact, during their marriage, Arline and Charles visited every state in the continental US and also traveled to Hawaii and Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize Mrs. Arline Frances Dennis on this important milestone, and to thank her for her time spent serving our area. Arline's commitment to her faith, family, and community are admirable, and I wish her a happy and healthy 100th birthday celebration in the company of family and friends.

NATURAL GROCERS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Natural Grocers' efforts to promote healthy eating through their free educational outreach over the last 60 years.

Natural Grocers by Vitamin Cottage was founded by Margaret and Phillip Isely and is based in Lakewood, Colorado. In 2015, they were recognized as the 11th fastest growing Colorado public company. Their mission is to provide shoppers with an affordable, healthy lifestyle as well as empower them to take control of their own wellbeing.

Not only does Natural Grocers supply Coloradans with healthy food options, they also provide customers personalized nutrition information to help them meet their nutritional goals. Natural Grocers has provided Coloradans free nutrition education programs since 1955. Their health coaches organize nutritional outreach programs to numerous schools and businesses, as well as hold in-store cooking demonstrations and nutrition classes.

Additionally, I regularly hold my ''Government in the Grocery'' events at Natural Grocers stores around my district. These events give me the opportunity to visit with constituents in their communities on topics ranging from veterans issues, the economy and jobs to foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to congratulate Natural Grocers for their accomplishment in promoting healthy eating through educational outreach and I commend them for their dedication to providing extraordinary services to Colorado customers. I wish Natural Grocers all the best in their next 60 years of operation.

IRANIAN NUCLEAR STATE ''INEVITABLE'' UNDER FLAWED WEAPONS DEAL

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, President Obama continues to tell Congress and the American people that the Iran nuclear agreement is the best deal possible and advances peace. Such boasting collapses under scrutiny. What was previously unacceptable—an Iranian nuclear state—is now inevitable under the terms and conditions of what is officially known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Tragically, the deal is riddled with serious flaws, gaps, and huge concessions to Iran. Taken as a whole, the deal poses an existential threat to Israel, our allies in the region—and even poses significant risks to the United States, despite assurances from Secretary of State John Kerry in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee today.

Not only is Iran now permitted to continue enriching uranium—a previous nonnegotiable redline was no enrichment whatsoever—but inspections are anything but ''anytime, anywhere''—the Obama Administration's previous pledge to the nation and the world.

And the key restriction on Iran's nuclear program—the ability to enrich at high levels—begins to expire in as little as 10 years. Once these restrictions expire, Iran could enrich on an industrial scale and the U.S. and its allies will be left with no effective measures to prevent Iran from initiating an accelerated nuclear program to produce the materials needed for a nuclear weapon.

On the inspections front, Iran's Supreme Leader Khamenei has stated that he will ''never'' permit inspectors to inspect Iran's military bases. Even after the agreement was signed, the Iranian Minister of Defense reportedly said that ''Tehran will not allow any foreigner to discover Iran's defensive and missile capabilities by inspecting the country's military sites.''

Given Iran's repeated cover-ups of its clandestine nuclear program, its refusal to give the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) access to its Parchin military facility where Iran is believed to have tested detonators for nuclear warheads, and its stone-walling the IAEA concerning evidence that it had done extensive research and development on a nuclear explosive device, verification is fundamental to ensure that Iran is abiding by the agreement's terms. Secretary Kerry, after an Iranian history of refusal to allow inspections at Parchin, would only assure us of inspections there ''as appropriate,'' whatever that means.

Yet the agreement contains many limits on access by IAEA inspectors to suspected sites, including a 24-day period in which Iran is allowed to continue to refuse the IAEA's request to visit a facility followed by a very long process needed to increase pressure on Iran to permit access if it still blocks access by inspectors. During this period, Iran will have sufficient time to remove, cover up, or destroy any evidence. ''Managed access'' would be better called ''manipulated access'' as inspectors will get access to suspected sites only after consultations between the world powers and Iran, over as long as 24 days—or more.

Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman has said that pledges by Obama Administration officials that the agreement would guarantee ''anywhere, anytime'' inspections of Iran's nuclear facilities were only ''rhetorical.'' Mere words without substance? Why would our allies in the region trust us if our word—and negotiating positions-are indeed only rhetorical flourish?

Congress recently discovered that the United States and other P5+1 members have left the IAEA and Iran to work out inspection details in secret, which could allow Iran to simply submit samples and make its own certification of compliance in lieu of actual inspection of facilities such as Parchin.

Mr. Speaker, the IAEA has uncovered significant evidence that Iran has engaged in activities related to the development of a nuclear weapon. Despite many agreements with the IAEA in which Iran has pledged to provide satisfactory information, the IAEA has repeatedly said that Iran has given it virtually nothing. Secretary of State Kerry has said that the U.S. has ''absolute knowledge'' of Iran's past military activities regarding its nuclear program, but Gen. Michael Hayden, the former Director of the CIA, recently testified to Congress that the U.S. did not have that capability.

Furthermore, as witnesses testified at a joint hearing this afternoon by three Foreign Affairs

subcommittees, there is ample evidence that Iran has a longstanding nuclear collaboration with North Korea. In light of the abundant evidence they will present, what gives the Administration certainty that the Iranians won't at some point during this agreement acquire fissile material beyond what they are allowed to produce for themselves or actual warheads from North Korea?

Why was the Iran-North Korea nuclear collaboration not factored into the Iran nuclear agreement? Surely Secretary Kerry is aware of the Iran-North Korea nuclear linkage. Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs Douglas Frantz, previously a high-ranking Kerry Senate aide, wrote a 2003 article about Iran's ties to the North Korean nuclear program. Are we to believe Frantz and Kerry never discussed this issue? He dodged the question at today's committee hearing.

Mr. Speaker, in March 2007, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1747 which, inter alia, established an embargo on the export from Iran of all arms and related materials, thereby banning all states and groups from purchasing or receiving arms from Iran. The resolution also called on all states to ''exercise vigilance and restraint'' in their supply of any items covered by the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms to Iran.

However, reports indicate that Russia is eager to sell massive amounts of military hardware to Iran. How will this shape other regional conflicts in which Iran is currently involved, including Iraq, Syria, and Yemen? After the conventional arms embargo is lifted in just 5 years, what limitations, if any, will there be on Iran's ability to export arms, specifically heavy weapons? Besides Russia, who else will sell weapons to Iran? China?

Moreover, the Administration and its supporters of the Iranian nuclear agreement downplay the possibility of Saudi Arabia, for example, producing a nuclear weapon as part of a Middle East arms race. However, the Saudis are building King Abdullah City for Atomic Renewable Energy to train nuclear scientists and already have greater science and mathematics capacity than Pakistan had when it developed nuclear weapons. Why couldn't and why wouldn't the Saudis join the nuclear arms race when faced with a more nuclear and conventionally armed Iran? Secretary Kerry would have us believe that the Saudis and others in the region would prefer the current agreement to an effort to achieve a more effective one and would agree not to pursue nuclear weapons even though Iran is on the path to develop or acquire its own.

Mr. Speaker, ballistic missiles are a central component of any country's nuclear weapons program as they allow for the quick, accurate delivery of nuclear weapons over long distances. While the agreement calls for Iran to abide by all U.N. Security Council resolutions—including the requirement that ''Iran shall not undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons,'' Iranian Supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei's criticized the call for Iran to end its ballistic missile program, characterizing it as ''a stupid, idiotic expectation'' and claiming ''The Revolutionary Guards should definitely carry out their program and not be satisfied with the present level. They should mass produce.''

In an 11th hour concession by the Obama Administration and others, the agreement ''sunsets'' U.N. sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program after 8 years, and also requires that the European Union do the same. U.S. intelligence estimates Iran to have the largest arsenal of ballistic missiles in the Middle East. Congress has heard testimony that ''no country that has not aspired to possess nuclear weapons has ever opted to sustain'' a costly, long-range missile program. Simply put, countries build ICBMs to deliver nukes.

Under this agreement, the Iranians have stated they are under no obligation to stop developing ballistic missiles. In fact, this agreement would allow them the two things they need to advance their program: money and foreign assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement requires ''full implementation'' by October 15 of the commitments in the ''roadmap'' made by Iran to the IAEA in their 2011 agreement, following which the IAEA is to provide its ''final assessment on the resolution of all past and present outstanding issues.'' However, there is no stated penalty if Iran continues to refuse to provide sufficient information to fully answer the IAEA's questions, which Iran cannot do without admitting it had a secret nuclear weapons program.

Iran has repeatedly agreed to answer the IAEA's questions regarding extensive evidence that it had a secret research and development program regarding a nuclear device, including fitting it onto a ballistic missile. All that resulted was the Iranians stonewalling the inspectors.

Is the failure to resolve the possible military dimensions as required by the IAEA a violation of the agreement? Why would Iran provide any information now when there is nothing in the agreement to compel it to do so?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Saeed Abedini is an American citizen. He was in Iran in 2012, visiting family and building an orphanage, when he was taken prisoner. Twelve years before, he had converted to Christianity and later was involved in the home church movement in Iran. Knowing about his conversion and earlier engagement with home churches, Iranian authorities approved his 2012 trip, approved his orphanage-building, and then imprisoned him. He has been in prison ever since then, and has suffered immensely, from beatings that have caused internal bleeding, death threats, solitary confinement, and more. His wife, Naghmeh, who is also an American and has been a heroic champion for her husband, and their two young children, have also suffered.

I and many other Members of Congress have been advocating on behalf of Pastor Abedini and the other Americans unjustly held in Iran: Amir Hekmati, Jason Rezaian, and Robert Levinson. After our constant appeals for action to secure their release, Secretary Kerry said today that the Administration is now focusing on their release. We shall see what happens.

Congress should vote down the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, reinstate comprehensive, robust sanctions and direct the executive branch to resume the struggle to craft an enforceable accord to ensure no nuclear weapons capability for Iran—ever. Congress did this with the SALT 1, SALT II and the Chemical Weapons Convention and ended up with stronger accords. Why not do so once again?

IN RECOGNITION OF COLONEL RICK HARNEY, JR. ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Colonel Rick Harney, Jr. on the occasion of his retirement from the United States Army. Throughout his 37 year career, Col. Harney has selflessly served our country and community; namely, during the time he spent as Director of the United States Army Heritage and Education Center (USAHEC) at the Carlisle Barracks, which I am honored to represent. USAHEC is a tremendous institution within my congressional district charged with educating members of our Armed Forces and honoring soldiers—past and present.

Col. Harney enlisted in the Army in August of 1978. In 1987, after matriculating from the United States Officer Candidate School in Fort Benning, Georgia as a Distinguished Military Graduate, he received his commission as a Field Artillery Lieutenant. He has undertaken many notable assignments, including Assistant Commandant and Chief at the United States Army Quartermaster School in Fort Lee, Virginia, and Commander of the Defense Distribution Center at the Anniston Army Depot in Alabama. Such roles have enabled Col. Harney to positively influence his colleagues, as well as the future strategic leaders of our military.

A Magna Cum Laude graduate from Hawaii Pacific University with a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, he also holds an impressive number of advanced degrees, including a Master of Business Administration from Webster University, a Master of Military Arts and Science from the United States Army Command and General Staff College, and a Master of Strategic Studies from the Air War College. In addition to his academic success, Col. Harney has received an extensive amount of awards and decorations. These include the Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Meritorious Service Medal with Silver Oak Leaf Cluster, Joint Service Achievement Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Achievement Medal with five Oak Leaf Clusters, Joint Meritorious Unit Award with Oak Leaf Cluster, Army Superior Unit Award, Master Parachutist Badge, Air Assault Badge, and Parachute Rigger Badge. Such accolades are indicative of the high caliber of his dedicated service to our nation.

On July 7th, 2014, Col. Harney assumed duties as the Director of the USAHEC at the Carlisle Barracks in my congressional district. As an instructor and educator, Col. Harney has significantly improved the experiences of his fellow instructors and students. The initiatives and programs he has implemented have shaped the lives of the future leaders of our military, and have enhanced the effectiveness of the United States Army War College. Even though he will no longer be present at USAHEC on a day-to-day basis, his legacy will inevitably carry on.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to congratulate Col. Harney on the culmination of a distinguished, 37-year career in the United States

Army. I hope that he will celebrate the occasion in the company of his wife, Leslie, his children, Dominick, Aerin, Marc, and Ashley, and his grandchildren, Izumi, Eugene, Marc, Marvelo, Mecca, Ayrielle, and Ash'kelon. I wish him all the best in this next chapter of his life.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF CAPTAIN STEPHEN F. WILLIAMSON

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dedicated service of Captain Stephen F. Williamson. CAPT Williamson has served as the 48th Commanding Officer of Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility at Naval Base Kitsap.

Since June of 2012, his steadfast leadership has helped guide the civil servants and sailors at PSNS & IMF through periods of tumult and uncertainty, unprecedented growth, and continued strife around the world. In addition, his positive influence has gone well beyond the fences of Naval Base Kitsap and into the surrounding communities of the Kitsap Peninsula.

Prior to assuming the role of Commanding Officer at PSNS & IMF, CAPT Williamson served as Business & Operations Officer, Production Resource Officer, and Operations Officer within the Command. Using experience from these roles, his stellar educational background, and multiple waterfront maintenance and surface warfare tours, CAPT Williamson was well-prepared to take on the challenges that the PSNS & IMF Command can present to its Commanding Officer.

To meet challenging expectations to maintain the fleet and support changing deployment schedules, CAPT Williamson made great strides in growing civilian employment at PSNS & IMF to meet readiness standards and help replace an aging workforce. In addition to hiring thousands of new employees, CAPT Williamson has built on the strong tradition of the PSNS & IMF Apprenticeship Program to help grow the necessary expertise and future civilian leaders at the Shipyard.

Outside of the deployments and work schedules, CAPT Williamson was forced to deal with a number of external factors that put his true leadership skills on display. Congressional dysfunction and budget uncertainty during his tenure as PSNS & IMF Commander forced CAPT Williamson to make difficult decisions in times of uncertainty. Regardless of what needed to be done, CAPT Williamson proved to be an open and effective communicator to the entire Command and ultimately put the needs of our Service Members and the Country first.

Mr. Speaker, CAPT Stephen F. Williamson's leadership was not only exhibited within the gates of PSNS & IMF, but outside of the fence line in communities like Bremerton, Silverdale, and Port Orchard. CAPT Williamson was a regular participant in community events like Armed Forces Day and Whaling Days and rarely missed an opportunity to join a fun-run or service oriented 5K Race. He invested his time in building strong relationships with local service clubs and support organizations like the Bremerton-Olympic Peninsula Navy League and the Puget Sound Naval Bases Association.

On behalf of the residents of the 6th Congressional District of Washington State I stand today, proudly, to honor the service of CAPT Stephen F. Williamson as Commanding Officer of Puget Sound Naval Shipyard & Intermediate Maintenance Facility. His recent nomination for the rank of Rear Admiral by President Obama is well-deserved and represents his impact on this community and our Country. Mr. Speaker, I humbly offer Admiral-Select Williamson and his family my sincere gratitude, and wish them fair winds and following seas.

HONORING THE KIWANIS CLUB OF THOUSAND OAKS

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Kiwanis Club of Thousand Oaks on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

The Kiwanis Club of Thousand Oaks was founded in 1965 and is part of Kiwanis International, a global organization of steadfast volunteers dedicated to improving the world one child and one community at a time. For five decades, the ever-expanding Kiwanis Club of Thousand Oaks has served countless children and has held true to its mission of public service. It is through this service to community that the Kiwanis Club continues to make the Conejo Valley a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

Over the last half century, the organization has made a concerted effort to encourage members of the community of all ages to volunteer. With over 100 members across the Conejo Valley region, the Kiwanis Club of Thousand Oaks has quickly become an impressive success and annually dedicates thousands of volunteer hours to its cause.

In addition to its invaluable service to the community, the club provides support for several youth leadership programs such as KEY Clubs in local high schools and service learning organizations at both Pepperdine University and California Lutheran University. Furthermore, the Kiwanis Club has also focused on the Eliminate Project, an international program that works to end maternal and neonatal tetanus.

For its exceptional work towards building a better community and world, I am honored to recognize the Kiwanis Club of Thousand Oaks for 50 years of service. It is with sincere gratitude that I congratulate the organization on reaching this historic and momentous milestone.

SECURING EXPEDITED SCREENING ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2127, the "Securing Expedited Screening Act."

I support this bipartisan legislation because it addresses a major issue with the implementation of security measures and the impact of those measures on the traveling public while in our nation's airports.

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON of Mississippi for introducing this thoughtful and necessary legislation that will assist the Transportation Security Administration and the public.

The "Securing Expedited Screening Act" will allow the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to expedite security screening of passengers who participate in this program and allow the security agency to focus its resources on screening individuals who may need more extensive screening.

This legislation limits the categories of airline passengers who may receive expedited airport screening by the TSA, allowing such screening only for passengers who are members of a TSA trusted traveler program such as PreCheck.

This legislation will also include individuals who are a part of the United States Military.

The TSA may also provide expedited screenings to passengers who are 75 years of age or older; or 12 years of age and younger if their parent or guardian is a participant in the PreCheck program.

This legislation also allows for the TSA to have the freedom to determine if there is another group of individuals who may be included in the PreCheck program.

Though the TSA must allow for Congress to provide an individual assessment to include new groups into the program.

Trusted programs like PreCheck that allow for the TSA officers to remain vigilant of potential threats.

With the recent news of the low pass rate of the TSA in the news, this legislation assists those officers in focusing on those individuals who were not prechecked before they attempt to enter the airport terminals.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I join with my colleagues in working to strengthen the programs that assist the TSA in protecting our commercial airports throughout this country.

I urge all of colleagues in the House to support H.R. 2127 "Securing Expedited Screening Act."

SAWTOOTH NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AND JERRY PEAK WILDERNESS ADDITIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment that yesterday the House approved H.R. 1138, the Sawtooth National Recreation Area and Jerry Peak Wilderness Additions Act, by voice vote.

Throughout my career in Congress, I have strongly supported protection of America's wilderness, and applaud efforts to bring new lands into the National Wilderness Preservation System. However, provisions of this bill that will divide large tracts of roadless National

Forest land give me great concern. While this legislation made important improvements over previous versions, motorized/mechanized corridors including at Germania Creek divide one of the nation's most pristine wilderness areas and reduces the habitat available to vulnerable wildlife.

In order to provide stronger protection for pristine wilderness in Idaho and other parts of the Northern Rockies, I have introduced the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act (NREPA)—which would designate 23 million acres of roadless lands as permanent wilderness. This bill would protect vulnerable habitats, connect biological corridors, and restore habitats that have been damaged by road construction and clear cutting.

I am pleased to see Congress turn its attention to the Northern Rockies, but hope that Members will recognize the significant shortfalls of H.R. 1138. As it is considered in the Senate, this legislation should be amended to preserve one of the largest roadless wilderness areas in the lower 48 states, as well as grant protection to additional areas in the Northern Rockies identified in NREPA.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 2015

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, the House voted on H.R. 675, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2015, a bipartisan bill that protects veterans' benefits from inflation. I was unavoidably detained; however, if I had been present, I would have voted in favor of this much needed legislation.

Veterans and their families have sacrificed greatly for our country, and it is unacceptable that so many military families are struggling every day to make ends meet. These brave individuals should never be faced with the difficult choice of either paying their bills or feeding their families. As the greatest country in the world, we have a moral obligation to fix this situation and provide veterans with the compensation and support they deserve. I believe this bill is a strong first step in the right direction.

Today, I applaud my colleagues in Congress for voting in favor of struggling veterans, disabled former service members, and their families by supporting the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2015. Moreover, I ask my fellow Members of Congress to continue advocating for our veterans by encouraging companies to hire vets while also addressing the systemic problems within the VA healthcare system.

RECOGNIZING THOMAS GRIFFIN

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thomas Griffin, a very intelligent, talented, and motivated member of my staff who transitions this week from my office to begin law school next month at the University of Oregon.

Hailing from Central Oregon, Thomas was born at Mountain View Hospital where his mom was a pharmacist. He was raised on a third generation family farm between Culver and Lake Billy Chinook and became involved in the family grass and vegetable seed company.

Thomas graduated from Culver High School, where he was a state champion in football, student body president, and valedictorian of his class of 54. He was also involved in the FFA, rising to be President of the state organization in March of his senior year in high school.

He spent the next year on the road, visiting more than 50 FFA chapters and facilitating agricultural leadership and awareness workshops for over 5,000 high school students. It was through FFA that Thomas made his first trip to Washington, D.C., and first met me during the state convention in La Grande in 2009.

After his dedicated leadership as FFA state president, Thomas started college at Oregon State in 2009. He followed in the footsteps of his parents, both proud Beaver alums. He graduated in 2012 with a degree in environmental economics, policy and management, and a minor in agricultural business management.

I originally hired Thomas as an intern in my office, and since then he has served in my office as a Legislative Correspondent and currently as a senior Legislative Assistant. When Thomas first applied for an internship, he was recommended to me by several top leaders in the agricultural community. Once he started, I quickly took note of Thomas's dedication, work ethic, and passion for serving constituents in Oregon's Second Congressional District. This led me to hire Thomas to work in my office full time after he graduated from Oregon State. In my office, he quickly acclimated to the multifaceted job he was hired to tackle.

Thomas has been assisting me primarily on issues related to federal agriculture, forestry, natural resources, and water policy. With 53 percent of the land in Oregon being owned and managed by the federal government, these issues are of critical importance to the economy and people in my congressional district. Thomas's good work and assistance helped me pass federal forestry reform legislation through the House of Representatives for the first time in nearly 10 years, in addition to several other pieces of legislation that were Oregon focused.

As Thomas proved that he was capable of handling more responsibility in my office, he has since added other issue areas to his legislative portfolio including education, trade, energy, and financial services. I have been impressed as Thomas has approached these new responsibilities with a can-do attitude, demonstrating a high level of commitment and integrity. Thomas has my complete confidence in his abilities, something I hear echoed from my Chief of Staff and others that he works with.

Now, Thomas is headed to the University of Oregon for law school. He plans to focus on environmental and business law to help ensure that our farmers, ranchers, and foresters can focus on what they do best: producing the best food, fiber, and fuel in the world.

On a personal note, as a dedicated Oregon Duck myself, I am eager to see Thomas—a lifelong Oregon State Beaver—join our proud Duck community.

Thomas will be sorely missed by me and my team, but we plan to stay in close touch and will enjoy seeing his successes down the road. With that, Mr. Speaker, please join me in wishing Thomas the best of luck as he heads West and "Go Ducks!"

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Call vote numbers 467, 468, and 469. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on each.

HONORING CARL JENSEN

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Carl Jensen, founder of Project Censored, who passed away on April 23, 2015.

Mr. Jensen was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1929, the only child of Danish and Swedish immigrants. His family moved to Northern California at the outbreak of World War II, settling in Arcata in Humboldt County. Throughout his career and life, he lived many places including Europe, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara and eventually to Cotati in 1973 where he met his wife Sandra while teaching at Sonoma State University. Prior to his time in academia Jensen served his country as an Air Force intelligence officer in Puerto Rico during the Korean War. In addition to his wife, he is survived by two sons, Sherman Jackson of Crescent City and John Jensen of Lucerne, and two daughters, Lisa Jensen of Monterey and Pia Jensen.

Mr. Jensen was a professor emeritus of Sociology and Communications Studies at Sonoma State University in California and author of Censored—The News That Didn't Make the News and Why (from 1976 to 1996), 20 Years of Censored News (1997), and Stories That Changed America: Muckrakers of the 20th Century (2000). He founded Project Censored, the internationally recognized media research project, in 1976.

Project Censored has remained a distinguishing aspect of the university's curriculum for 39 years. Jensen's pioneering program of hands-on student training in independent journalism has now been adopted at dozens of college and university campuses across the country and around the world. And today, Project Censored is the longest running research project on news media censorship. A true and lasting achievement to be sure.

His legacy is not fully encompassed by his published work. It also includes the hundreds of undergraduate students, at Sonoma State and in classrooms across the nation, who research news stories from the independent

press to determine if those stories were censored in the corporate media. Mr. Jensen has had a profound and lasting impact on hundreds of students in the 5th District and around the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time to acknowledge the life and accomplishments of Carl Jensen, a true leader, patriot, and defender of the first amendment. May he rest in peace.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Votes #467, 468 and 469, I am not recorded because I was absent from the U.S. House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner.

On Roll Call #467. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call #468. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call #469. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

COMMENDING MRS. GLENDA PITTMAN FOR HER INSTRUMENTAL ROLE IN THE COMPLETION OF ''THE HUB,'' THE NEW SENIOR CENTER IN COLVILLE, WASHINGTON

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Glenda Pittman, of Colville, Washington for her tireless commitment to Eastern Washington. Starting in 2000, Mrs. Pittman began raising money for the ''Meals on Wheels'' program. Due to her widespread success feeding countless seniors, she offered her leadership to raise money for a new senior center. After years of fundraising, Glenda helped raise the finds necessary to purchase the land and on March 7, 2015, ''The Hub'' opened its doors to the community.

Glenda and her husband, Glen moved to Colville, Washington nearly 50 years ago. As local business owners, the Pittman's life-long dedication to their community began when they opened the first convenient store in Orient, Washington.

In March of 2006, Glenda began raising money for the new senior center. Glenda and her sister, JoAnna began hosting popular wine tasting galas. After an incredibly successful first gala, these events became an October tradition. Eventually, Glenda expanded her fund raising efforts to include an autumn pinochle tournament, bake sales, bingo, and a partnership with Schwan's Food Company.

Thanks to Mrs. Glenda Pittman's leadership, the senior community center broke ground in April of 2014, with an open house and dedication. Today, a brand new building valued at $1.1 million offers seniors meals, health and wellness activities, and recreational opportunities, including games and activities. ''The Hub'' is also used for weddings, parties, and meetings.

This effort took representatives from the entire Colville community, including local foundations, businesses, and a community block grant. The community effort is highlighted by Glenda's motto: We work as a ''TEAM''—Together Everyone Accomplishes More.

So today, I rise to acknowledge and thank Mrs. Glenda Pittman for her years of dedication and hard work. I also want to congratulate her—her leadership in Colville encouraged an entire community to band together, supporting Eastern Washington's seniors. Due to Glenda's genuine care and involvement in the community, Colville has a brand new building, ''The Hub'' that will unite their community together for generations to come.

THE PRICE OF FETAL PARTS

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following:

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 2015]

(By Charles Krauthammer)

Planned Parenthood's reaction to the release of a clandestinely recorded conversation about the sale of fetal body parts was highly revealing. After protesting that it did nothing illegal, it apologized for the ''tone'' of one of its senior directors.

Her remarks lacked compassion, admitted Planned Parenthood President Cecile Richards. As if Dr. Deborah Nucatola's cold and casual discussion over salad and wine of how the fetal body can be crushed with forceps in a way that leaves valuable organs intact for sale is some kind of personal idiosyncrasy. On the contrary, it's precisely the kind of psychic numbing that occurs when dealing daily with industrial scale destruction of the growing, thriving, recognizably human fetus.

This was again demonstrated by the release this week of a second video showing another official sporting that same tone, casual and even jocular, while haggling over the price of an embryonic liver. ''If it's still low, then we can bump it up,'' she joked, ''I want a Lamborghini.''

Abortion critics have long warned that the problem is not only the obvious—what abortion does to the fetus—but also what it does to us. It's the same kind of desensitization that has occurred in the Netherlands with another mass exercise in life termination: assisted suicide. It began as a way to prevent the suffering of the terminally ill. It has now become so widespread and wanton that one-fifth of all Dutch assisted-suicide patients are euthanized without their explicit consent.

The Planned Parenthood revelations will have an effect. Perhaps not on government funding, given the Democratic Party's unwavering support and the president wishing it divine guidance. Planned Parenthood might escape legal jeopardy as well, given the loophole in the law banning the sale of fetal parts that permits compensation for expenses (shipping and handling, as it were).

But these revelations will have an effect on public perceptions. Just as ultrasound altered feelings about abortion by showing the image, the movement, the vibrant livingness of the developing infant in utero, so too, I suspect, will these Planned Parenthood revelations, by throwing open the door to the backroom of the clinic where that being is destroyed.

It's an ugly scene. The issue is less the sale of body parts than how they are obtained. The nightmare for abortion advocates is a spreading consciousness of how exactly a healthy fetus is turned into a mass of marketable organs, how, in the words of a senior Planned Parenthood official, one might use ''a less crunchy technique''—crush the head, spare the organs—''to get more whole specimens.''

The effect on the public is a two-step change in sensibilities. First, when ultrasound reveals how human the living fetus appears. Next, when people learn, as in these inadvertent admissions, what killing the fetus involves.

Remember. The advent of ultrasound has coincided with a remarkable phenomenon: Of all the major social issues, abortion is the only one that has not moved toward increasing liberalization. While the legalization of drugs, the redefinition of marriage and other assertions of individual autonomy have advanced, some with astonishing rapidity, abortion attitudes have remained largely static. The country remains evenly split.

What will be the reaction to these Planned Parenthood revelations? Right now, to try to deprive it of taxpayer money. Citizens repelled by its activities should not be made complicit in them. But why not shift the focus from the facilitator to the procedure itself?

The House has already passed a bill banning abortion after 20 weeks. That's far more fruitful than trying to ban it entirely because, apart from the obvious constitutional issue, there is no national consensus about the moral status of the early embryo. There's more agreement on the moral status of the later-term fetus. Indeed, about two-thirds of Americans would ban abortion after the first trimester.

There is more division about the first trimester because one's views of the early embryo are largely a matter of belief, often religious belief. One's view of the later-term fetus, however, is more a matter of what might be called sympathetic identification—seeing the image of a recognizable human infant and, now, hearing from the experts exactly what it takes to ''terminate'' its existence.

The role of democratic politics is to turn such moral sensibilities into law. This is a moment to press relentlessly for a national ban on late-term abortions.

HONORING ADA'S LEGACY, BUILDING FOR ITS FUTURE

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend our nation celebrated the 25th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Since its enactment in 1990, this seminal law has not only benefited millions of persons with disabilities; it has benefited every American. Today, we are a stronger, more diverse, fairer, and more accessible society thanks to the ADA.

One part of our daily lives where the law's achievements are particularly visible is in public transportation. Mr. Michael P. Melaniphy, president and CEO of the American Public Transportation Association (APTA), captured the hope and promise of the ADA in an essay

published this week in APTA's Passenger Transport newsmagazine. I commend APTA and the public transportation community for their efforts to help us move closer to an America, as Mr. Melaniphy states, "With equal access for everyone, everywhere and at all times." I submit his essay.

(By Michael Melaniphy, APTA President & CEO)

The history of public transportation is the story of American progress. Over decades of technological and social change, our industry has helped open frontiers, grow local economies, and improve the lives of millions.

This month's silver anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a reminder of how mobility can change attitudes and break down barriers, both real and perceived.

When Congress in 1990 guaranteed equal opportunity for persons with disabilities, seminal changes were already writing the prelude for a new century focused on freedom and equity. It was the year that Nelson Mandela was released from a South African prison. East and West Germany were united. Tim Berners-Lee gave us the World Wide Web.

None of us could have foreseen what would emerge 25 years later, but we knew ADA would change the way our nation and our industry thought about access to public transportation.

It's been said that without struggle there can be no progress, and the early days of implementing this new law were challenging. The country had just entered a recession and many cash-strapped public transit agencies were politically and fiscally encumbered.

As a young general manager in Hamilton, Ohio, at the time, a dearth of resources for ADA compliance forced me to think differently about what equal access could mean for our community. We established a system-wide point deviation plan and introduced braille and tactile bus stop signs—both firsts in the nation that became models for other public transit organizations. The experience marked the beginning of a new personal passion to provide equal access to all.

To design practical solutions, we needed to gain a true understanding of the difficulties faced by persons with disabilities. While sitting in wheelchairs, our drivers, supervisors and I learned firsthand what it was like to navigate high floor buses and ride when incorrectly secured in a paratransit vehicle. We donned blackened goggles to experience a bus trip without visual clues to our location, and we discovered that ADA-mandated curb cuts didn't necessarily mean a sidewalk would take us to a desired destination once we left the bus. All of this helped us become better problem solvers, better thought leaders and better citizens.

Today the public transportation sector can take pride in how far we have come. Aspiration has replaced apprehension. From 1993 to 2013, the portion of accessible buses nearly doubled (from 51 percent to 99.8 percent), accessible light rail and streetcar fleets more than doubled (from 41 percent to 88 percent) and accessible commuter and hybrid rail fleets almost tripled (from 32 percent to 87 percent). Additionally, all of America's heavy rail and trolleybus fleets are 100 percent ADA compliant. Such advances in fixed route access have allowed tens of millions of people with disabilities to participate more fully in their communities.

For individuals who are unable to use these modes of public transit, our systems provided more than 230 million demand-response trips in 2013—from a starting point of 68 million in 1990, the year ADA was enacted.

The achievements of the past quarter century should encourage us to address any remaining challenges. Our industry must continue to build productive partnerships with the ADA community. Both physical and financial barriers persist for some legacy rail systems. And we need to find new, more cost-efficient ways to reach more people, especially through our fixed-route services.

In this 25th-anniversary year, there is good reason to be enthusiastic. Unlike 1990, today's technological innovations appear almost monthly, offering fresh ways to increase access and choice while reducing fear and complexity for new riders.

Still, an industry is made great not just by its newest machines, but by how it lives its values and meets its customers' greatest needs. Our work is about more than getting people to and from a workplace or doctor's office; it's about giving everyone the freedom, independence, and access to achieve their greatest potential.

ADA has taught our industry that progress is impossible without change. Our commitment to fulfilling the law's spirit has become a core tenet of who we are and what we do. Like so many of the people whose stories are told—and who are pictured—in this special publication, I am proud to have played a role in ADA's foundational years.

Thanks to ADA and the efforts of public transportation leaders, we move closer every day to a world with equal access for everyone, everywhere and at all times. It's a legacy that deserves to be celebrated.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF DR. GAYLE ALEXANDER

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Dr. Gayle Alexander, of Lexington, Kentucky. Dr. Alexander, a part of the greatest generation, served our nation in the United States Army.

Alexander grew up with a love for airplanes. He got his pilot's license at the age of fifteen, after just a few lessons. Following the attack on Pearl Harbor, Alexander volunteered and was accepted immediately into the Army Air Corps as a pilot. He was assigned to be a flight instructor, training other pilots for combat flying.

After two years, Dr. Alexander finally got his wish to be a part of combat and was sent to England to fly B–24 and B–17 bombers that hit targets in Nazi-held Europe on a daily basis. He named his plane the "Kentucky Kloudhopper". Alexander spent much of the time flying a "Mickey ship" equipped with special radar and led other bombers to their targets. On one mission, he and his crew barely made it back to England with 308 holes in their plane, two engines out, and part of the tail missing.

On his nineteenth mission, Dr. Alexander led one of the biggest raids of the war, with 1,200 bombers attacking a German oil plant. His plane was blown to bits just moments after dropping its bombs. Alexander struggled to deploy his parachute, reached the ground, and was immediately captured. He spent seven long months in German POW camps, where he received virtually no medical care and endured bedbugs, starvation, bitter cold, and long distance marches. He and his fellow POWs were finally liberated on April 29, 1945 by General George Patton and his troops. Dr. Alexander returned home on a hospital ship, weighing barely 113 pounds.

Dr. Alexander eventually recovered. He became a veterinarian and had a long and successful career in Lexington, Kentucky. Dr. Alexander has shared a video of his war memories, his uniform, and other memorabilia with the American Air Museum in Duxford, England.

The bravery of Dr. Alexander and his fellow men and women of the United States Army is heroic. Because of his courage and the courage of individuals from all across Kentucky and our great nation, our freedoms have been preserved for our generation and for future generations. He is truly an outstanding American, a patriot, and a hero to us all.

TRIBUTE TO BOB BREWSAUGH

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of one of the best men I've ever known, Bob Brewsaugh who passed away over the weekend at the age of 76.

The good book says in 2 Corinthians 9:6, "He who sows sparingly will also reap sparingly, and he who sows bountifully will also reap bountifully."

Bob Brewsaugh lived this scripture.

Bob was a lifelong farmer, and a loving father and grandfather.

But, most importantly, Bob Brewsaugh was a man of God.

He worked hard. He treated everyone with kindness and respect.

Whether as a Sunday school teacher at Sandusky United Methodist Church or as a County Councilman or in his daily work on the farm . . . Bob tilled the land.

He sowed bountifully. And as a consequence, he reaped a blessed and bountiful life.

My thoughts and prayers are with Bob's wife Carolyn, his two kids Scott and Mandy, my brother Richie who is Bob's son-in-law, and Scott's wife Sarah.

I also pray for Bob's grandchildren, including my nephews Connor, Trey and Reid, and the entire extended Brewsaugh family.

RECOGNIZING MR. DUNCAN SHAW, CHAIRMAN EMERITUS, DEVIL PUPS

HON. JOSEPH J. HECK

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to honor the life of Mr. Duncan E. Shaw, a Korean War veteran and Chairman Emeritus of Devil Pups.

For more than 60 years, Duncan Shaw dedicated his time and talents to Devil Pups, a program started by his father in 1953 to provide teenagers with a life-changing opportunity to become better citizens and develop mentally, as well as physically, through Marine-inspired training.

Like his father, Duncan Shaw enlisted in the Marine Corps where he was assigned to Aviation and achieved the rank of Captain. He deployed to the combat zone during the Korean

War and was proud to be given the opportunity to serve his country.

Following his service, Mr. Shaw got into the food business, eventually rising to the position of National Product Manager for the Carnation Company.

And while he was certainly successful in the business world, he will long be remembered for the lasting impact he had on the more than 50,000 teenagers who have completed the Devil Pup program to date.

As President, Chairman, and Chairman Emeritus of Devil Pups, Duncan Shaw was most known for his endless energy in promoting the program and giving thousands of hours of his own time to ensure the program's continued success.

Many Devil Pup graduates relate being recipients of a famous ''Duncan One-on-One,'' a conversation designed to guide and inspire an aspiring Pup.

Mr. Shaw's daughter Susan says that one of the most valuable lessons he taught was to be on time and always give 110%. Duncan Shaw lived that lesson throughout his life but most especially through his commitment to the Devil Pups.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 467 through 469 my flight from Cleveland, OH to Washington (DCA) was delayed. I landed in Washington at 7:00 p.m. versus scheduled landing at 4:30 p.m. If I was present I would have voted yes on all three. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed roll call votes 467, 468, and 469. If present, I would have voted ''yea'' on roll call 467, ''yea'' on roll call 468, and ''yea'' on roll call 469.

CONGRATULATING DC CENTRAL KITCHEN

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate DC Central Kitchen on the graduation of its 100th Culinary Job Training program. This is a remarkable milestone and I am truly inspired by the ''Class of 100.''

Since its inception 26 years ago, DC Central Kitchen has provided a path for nearly 1,500 people to rejoin their community, reunite with their families, contribute to our economy, and break the intergenerational cycle of hunger, homelessness, prison, and poverty. DC Central Kitchen doesn't just feed people who are hungry; it gives them the skills to feed themselves and their families, building lives of self-sufficiency.

The 14-week Culinary Job Training program prepares unemployed, underemployed, previously incarcerated persons, and homeless adults for careers in the food service industry. Upon completion of a month-long internship, the students are provided with job readiness skills and job placement assistance.

Graduates of the Culinary Job Training program have a 90% job placement rate, are 90% less likely to return to prison than other ex-offenders nationwide, and contribute upwards of $225,000 in payroll taxes back into the community each year.

But these impressive statistics are just one part of the Culinary Job Training program's success story. The program gives so much more to its students. It gives them the support they need to discover their own confidence and rebuild their lives.

In just the few weeks since graduation, more than half of the class has secured jobs, with the remaining graduates in the final stages of completing interviews and accepting jobs. That is extraordinary.

Mr. Speaker, I could not be prouder of the Class of 100. I wish them all the best in their culinary careers and in life. I can't wait to try their food at local restaurants.

And I offer my most heartfelt congratulations to founder Robert Egger, CEO Michael Curtin, and the wonderful staff and volunteers at DC Central Kitchen. You are an incredible example of what real leadership and innovative thinking looks like to end poverty in this country. Here's to another 100 classes of inspiring graduates.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, TREY GOWDY, JERROLD NADLER, JOSÉ SERRANO, KAREN BASS and I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of the history behind, as well as describe the workings of the Private Calendar. I hope this might be of some value to the Members of this House, especially our newer colleagues.

Of the four House Calendars, the Private Calendar is the one to which all Private Bills are referred. Private Bills deal with specific individuals, corporations, institutions, and so forth, as distinguished from public bills which deal with classes only.

Of the 108 laws approved by the First Congress, only 5 were Private Laws. But their number quickly grew as the wars of the new Republic produced veterans and veterans' widows seeking pensions and as more citizens came to have private claims and demands against the Federal Government. The 49th Congress, 1885 to 1887, the first Congress for which complete workload and output data is available, passed 1,031 Private Laws, as compared with 434 Public Laws. At the turn of the century the 56th Congress passed 1,498 Private Laws and 443 Public Laws—a better than three to one ratio.

Private bills were referred to the Committee on the Whole House as far back as 1820, and a calendar of private bills was established in 1839. These bills were initially brought before the House by special orders, but the 62nd Congress changed this procedure by its rule XXIV, clause six which provided for the consideration of the Private Calendar in lieu of special orders. This rule was amended in 1932, and then adopted in its present form on March 27, 1935.

A determined effort to reduce the private bill workload of the Congress was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Section 131 of that Act banned the introduction or the consideration of four types of private bills; first, those authorizing the payment of money for pensions; second, for personal or property damages for which suit may be brought under the Federal tort claims procedure; third, those authorizing the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream, or fourth, those authorizing the correction of a military or naval record.

This ban afforded some temporary relief but was soon offset by the rising postwar and Cold War flood for private immigration bills. The 82nd Congress passed 1,023 Private Laws, as compared with 594 Public Laws. The 88th Congress passed 360 Private Laws compared with 666 Public Laws.

Under rule XV, clause five, the Private Calendar is called the first and third Tuesday of each month. The consideration of the Private Calendar bills on the first Tuesday is mandatory unless dispensed with by a two-thirds vote. On the third Tuesday, however, recognition for consideration of the Private Calendar is within the discretion of the Speaker and does not take precedence over other privileged business in the House.

On the first Tuesday of each month, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table for reference only, the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. If a bill called is objected to by two or more Members, it is automatically recommitted to the committee reporting it. No reservation of objection is entertained Bills un-objected to are considered in the House in the Committee of the Whole.

On the third Tuesday of each month, the same procedure is followed with the exception that omnibus bills embodying bills previously rejected have preference and are in order regardless of objection.

Such omnibus bills are read by paragraph, and no amendments are entertained except to strike out or reduce amounts or provide limitations. Matters so stricken out shall not be again included in an omnibus bill during that session. Debate is limited to motions allowable under the rule and does not admit motions to strike out the last word or reservation of objections. The rules prohibit the Speaker from recognizing Members for statements or for requests for unanimous consent for debate. Omnibus bills so passed are thereupon resolved in their component bills, which are engrossed separately and disposed of as if passed separately.

Private Calendar bills unfinished on one Tuesday go over to the next Tuesday on which such bills are in order and are considered before the call of bills subsequently on the calendar. Omnibus bills follow the same procedure and go over to the next Tuesday on which that class of business is again in order.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to describe to the newer Members the Official Objectors

Committee, the system the House has established to deal with Private Bills.

The Majority Leader and the Minority Leader each appoint three Members to serve as Private Calendar Objectors during a Congress. The Objectors are on the Floor ready to object to any Private Bill which they feel is objectionable for any reason. Should any Member have a doubt or question about a particular Private Bill, he or she can get assistance from objectors, their staff, or from the Member who introduced the bill.

The amount of private bills and the desire to have an opportunity to study them carefully before they are called on the Private Calendar has caused the six objectors to agree upon certain ground rules. The rules limit consideration of bills placed on the Private Calendar only shortly before the calendar is called. With this agreement of July 28, 2015 the members of the Private Calendar Objectors Committee have agreed that during the 114th Congress, they will consider only those bills which have been on the Private Calendar for a period of seven (7) legislative days, excluding the day the bill is placed on the calendar and the day the calendar is called. Reports must be available to the Objectors for three (3) calendar days. It is agreed that the majority and minority clerks will not submit to the Objectors any bills which do not meet this requirement.

This policy will be strictly enforced except during the closing days of a session when the House rules are suspended.

This agreement was entered into by: The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

I feel confident that I speak for my colleagues when I request all Members to enable us to give the necessary advance considerations to private bills by not asking that we depart from the above agreement unless absolutely necessary.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE.
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER.
TREY GOWDY.
JERROLD NADLER.
KAREN BASS.
JOSÉ SERRANO.

RECOGNIZING THE CITY OF SHAWNEE, KANSAS FOR RECEIVING THE ''2015 EMPLOYER SUPPORT FREEDOM AWARD''

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Shawnee, Kansas for receiving the ''2015 Employer Support Freedom Award.'' This distinction is the highest recognition given to employers by the United States Department of Defense and the nomination process is open to all Guard and Reserve personnel across the entire country. This year, there were nearly 3,000 employers that applied for the award, of which 15 were selected.

The City of Shawnee employs service members from the Army National Guard, Army Reserves, and the Kansas Air National Guard. As these heroes well know, the city goes above and beyond federal requirements in its support of employees on military leave. For example, the city offers a service member reintegration program to ease employees back into the workplace after deployment; assists family members with chores during deployment; sends care packages to service members; recognizes service members publicly during city council meetings when they return home; and also pays the entire premium for benefits such as medical, dental and vision while the employee is serving abroad. Based on these same merits, Shawnee has also received other awards from the Department of Defense, including the ''Above and Beyond Award'' in 2014 and the ''Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve Patriot Award'' in 2005.

All of these prestigious distinctions are a testament to the hospitality and level of dedication to our men and women in uniform and their families in Shawnee and throughout the entire Third District of Kansas. The 2015 Freedom Award will be presented on August 21st at the Pentagon by the Secretary of Defense. Thank you, Shawnee for your dedication to our troops and their service and sacrifice.

RECOGNIZING ASYA GONZALEZ

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Asya Gonzalez of Centennial, Colorado. Asya is the winner of the 2015 Dan Danner Leadership Award at the National Federation of Independent Businesses (NFIB) Young Entrepreneur Awards held July 23, 2015 in Washington, DC.

Asya is an exceptional young woman who started her own business, Stinky Feet Gurlz, at the age of fourteen. Stinky Feet Gurlz is a 1940's inspired apparel and accessories collection aimed at teen-aged girls and young women. She donates a portion of every sale to her charity ''She is Worth It,'' which brings preventative awareness and education of child sex trafficking. Aside from running a successful business and charity, Asya is a radio personality and preferred speaker for International Youth. As the recipient of the 2015 Dan Danner Leadership Award, Asya received a $15,000 Young Entrepreneur Foundation college scholarship, which she will be able to use as she enters her first year of college this fall.

Asya's entrepreneurial spirit and passion is truly inspiring to see at such a young age. I take great pride representing Asya Gonzalez in Colorado's Sixth Congressional District and I join her family, friends, and colleagues in congratulating her on this achievement. I wish her the very best of luck in all of her future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF PETER L. FISCHL

HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Peter L. Fischl of Ontario, California for his life-long work dedicated to remembering the Holocaust. Having survived the heinous acts of violence and persecution brought about by Nazi Germany, Mr. Fischl turned the hardships he witnessed as a child into poetry that helps encapsulate the experience and honor the lives of the many who perished during this harrowing time.

Mr. Fischl was a young boy during the onset of World War II. The German invasion of Hungary in 1944 forced him to separate from his family and take refuge inside of a Budapest Catholic school. While in hiding, Mr. Fischl's father, a successful businessman prior to the war, was discovered by the Gestapo and disappeared. Mr. Fischl survived the Holocaust along with his mother and sister, and later relocated to the United States in 1957.

Years later, Mr. Fischl wrote a poem upon finding a picture in Life magazine of a young Polish child interned in the Warsaw concentration camp. ''To the Little Polish Boy Standing with His Arms Up'' is a poignant recollection of the horrors faced by many within the Jewish community during the Holocaust. It showcases the terror that many helpless civilians endured while also expressing a sense of frustration at the lack of intervention by the international community. Mr. Fischl's work forces us to confront the history of state-sponsored mass killings in hopes of encouraging us to work together to prevent future atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that later this month, Mr. Fischl will be a special guest attending the International Quilt Study Center & Museum at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Upon his arrival, a quilt square bearing his poem will be entered into the museum's collection. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Mr. Fischl for his honors and thank him for his contributions to remembering this important period of history.

TRIBUTE TO SANTANA SMITH

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Santana Smith of Madison County, Iowa, for qualifying for the National Junior High Rodeo Finals in ribbon roping and goat tying.

Each summer, approximately 1,000 youth competitors from across the country qualify to compete for scholarships and prizes at the National Junior High Rodeo Finals. I commend Santana for her hard work and dedication to achieving her goals. She is a phenomenal young role model for others who are aspiring to compete in this prestigious national event.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I represent Iowans like Santana in the United States House of Representatives. I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Santana on a job well done, and wishing her nothing but continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 2015, my flight was delayed and I was unable to vote on S. 1482, H.R. 1656 and H.R. 2770.

If present, I would have voted "yea" on S. 1482, "yea" on H.R. 1656, and "yea" on H.R. 2770.

HONORING BARBARA DUBLER

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Barbara Dubler of Boynton Beach and to congratulate her on her retirement after forty years of dedicated service to the children of Florida.

A Bronx native, Mrs. Dubler moved to South Florida in 1960 and later became an educator after graduating from the University of Florida. Since then, she has worked tirelessly to inspire and educate her students. After nearly twenty years teaching in the Dade County Public Schools, she moved in 1993 to Palm Beach County to continue her work as a teacher, most recently at the Woodlands Middle School in Lake Worth, Florida. During her tenure at Woodlands, she primarily taught sixth and eighth grade English, and consistently produced some of the best-performing students in the county. Over the course of her career, Mrs. Dubler also served as the Chair of the English Department and ran a high school drama program, which she considers one of her fondest memories. Barbara's efforts have not gone unnoticed. In 2000, Mrs. Dubler was the recipient of the Social Studies Teacher of the Year Award for Palm Beach County.

Dedicated teachers like Mrs. Dubler are the backbone of the American education system. Throughout her career, she worked tirelessly to foster a positive class environment, while keeping her students engaged and eager to learn both inside and outside of the classroom. She truly serves as a model for other educators to emulate.

As a loving mother and wife, Barbara is still happily married after twenty-nine years to her husband Dr. Gary Dubler, and they have one son. In her free time, Barbara enjoys reading, traveling, and going to the theater.

In honor of her tireless work to educate our children, I am proud to recognize Barbara Dubler and to thank her for her forty years of service to our children. I wish her good health and a well-earned retirement.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL ANDREW COOLEY

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I stand in recognition of the late Major General Andrew Cooley; a dear friend and tremendous patriot who dedicated a life of service to this great nation. A true leader and a combat veteran, he faithfully served 38 years leading from the front and accomplishing much along the way. His career was marked by several tours at home and abroad, including the command of an Army Division, and was witness to combat in Vietnam, Korea, Lebanon, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Angola.

In 1951 General Cooley enlisted in the army at the age of 17, and went on to receive his commission from Officer Candidate School at Ft. Benning in 1955. Over the course of his career he served in various staff and command positions including the principal representative of the Department of Defense to the Lebanese-Israeli negotiations and Commanding General of the 24th Infantry Division. Upon retirement from the Army, General Cooley was instrumental in instituting a forward focused logistical infrastructure that remains instrumental to our nation's defense.

Without a doubt General Cooley's many accomplishments should be honored. However, his accomplishments could only be realized with the support and commitment of his wife of 57 years, Joan and their two children, Cathleen and Caroline.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today humbled by the many accomplishments of a true patriot and it is my great honor to recognize Major General Andrew Cooley for his friendship and his service to our great nation.

WE CARE ACT

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Grace, Sharon, and Eric Li. Together, these siblings founded a group called We Care Act and have helped countless people around the world.

We Care Act began in response to the 2008 earthquake in the Sichuan Province of China. Since its founding, We Care Act has distributed goods to over 30,000 people while involving 30,000 donors and volunteers. Most recently, the group gathered donations for families affected by the Houston Memorial Day floods and the victims of the Nepal earthquake. They've donated everything from laptops to letters of condolences to countries from Nicaragua to Japan. Sharon, a recent Dawson High School graduate, is headed to Yale in the fall with a $10,000 scholarship from Kohl's and a $20,000 from the Coca-Cola Foundation. We are proud of how much these siblings have helped people all over the world.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, thank you to the Li siblings and We Care Act for all they do to help people at home and around the world.

TRIBUTE TO MAKENNA LILLY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Makenna Lilly of Bridgewater, Iowa, for being chosen as a charter member for the 4–H Shooting Sports Ambassador Team. Makenna is the daughter of Rich and Brooke Lilly of Adair, Iowa.

Charter membership is given to youth who demonstrate exceptional leadership and communication skills. Through the program, ambassadors develop their skills in leadership, public presentation, citizenship, community service, public relations, and team building. The character and work ethic Makenna has displayed to achieve charter membership is a true example of Iowa spirit, and I commend her for her hard work.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to represent future leaders of America like Makenna in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her on this outstanding achievement and wish her nothing but continued success moving forward.

RECOGNIZING ALYSSA BARTON

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am grateful to welcome Alyssa Evelyn Barton on her visit to the U.S. Capitol. Alyssa will attend Lemon Road Elementary School in Falls Church, Virginia this fall.

A model student, Alyssa is frequently named to the Honor Roll. She is active in martial arts and dance, interested in politics, and her future career aspirations include being an attorney. I congratulate her parents, Darlene and Jacob Barton, on raising an impressive young lady, and I am confident in her future success.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,151,893,254,765.19. We've added $7,525,016,205,852.11 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL OF THE SACRED HEART

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 150th Anniversary of the Country Day School of the Sacred Heart in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.

Today, the school remains committed to the philosophy envisioned by St. Madeline Sophie Barat, founder of the Sacred Heart school network, to provide young women with a challenging education, develop their faith, and promote a desire to help others.

The Country Day School of the Sacred Heart has a long tradition of fostering the growth of young women into scholars and leaders. By offering a strong liberal arts program, the Country Day School of the Sacred Heart has helped many young women reach their personal and scholastic potential. Students are able to develop academically, personally, spiritually and socially through the school's well-rounded curriculum.

I appreciate the dedication of the staff members who work around the clock to educate and guide the students. Their persistence has empowered generations of young women, helping them attain the skills and character to become the leaders that St. Madeline Sophie Barat imagined.

Mr. Speaker, the Country Day School of the Sacred Heart has been changing the lives of young women for the past 150 years. I congratulate the school and look forward to seeing the excellent work it will continue to do in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO EMILY DOOLEY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Emily Dooley of Madison County, Iowa, for qualifying for the National Junior High Rodeo Finals in the pole bending event.

Each summer, approximately 1,000 youth competitors from across the country qualify to compete for scholarships and prizes at the National Junior High Rodeo Finals. I commend Emily for her hard work and dedication to achieving her goals. She is a phenomenal young role model for others who are aspiring to compete in this prestigious national event.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I represent Iowans like Emily in the United States House of Representatives. I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Emily on a job well done, and wishing her nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. RINIA SHELBY-CROOMS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, if there are three core qualities that make an exemplary public servant, they might be the following: integrity, energy, and compassion. Mrs. Rinia Shelby-Crooms, who is leaving my office after 13 years of extraordinary service, uniquely embodies each of these qualities.

Rinia is a woman of undeniable integrity. Her commitment to her family, her faith, and her focus on building a better world animate her to excellence in the workplace and beyond. Whether it's conducting legislative research to protect America's endangered honeybees or juggling a dozen or more urgent scheduling requests over the course of an afternoon, Rinia has always emphasized quality, honesty, and care in each and every one of her undertakings.

Rinia also possesses incredible energy. While caring for two precious young boys, she has written legislation, organized Congressional briefings, counseled and cared for her fellow staffers, managed my often hectic schedule, and ensured my timeliness in arriving at speaking engagements and on airplanes. She maintains an upbeat attitude and focused attention—even when called upon for complicated logistical requests in the wee hours of the morning.

Rinia is driven by deep compassion. Through her legislative portfolio, she has worked toward achieving progress in the areas most aligned with her life's mission: ensuring that foster children have access to safe and loving homes, guaranteeing Americans high-quality food, and defending the rights of Mother Nature. Rinia embodies compassion both big and small. She's not only committed to large-scale change in order to support and protect people and the planet, but also committed to showing the utmost care and kindness to the people she encounters each and every day.

I am indebted to Rinia for her selfless service. But I am also indebted to her husband, Jeremiah, and her two young sons, Jayden and Jayee, who have also made important sacrifices as Rinia spent long hours, late nights, and weekends in service of our mission of advancing the causes of jobs, justice, and peace.

There is one consolation for me as I bid farewell to Rinia: This is only the beginning of her contributions to Southeast Michigan and to our nation. She and her family are returning to the Detroit Metropolitan Area, so that she can pursue work as a consultant focused on bringing new economic opportunity to our region.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Mrs. Rinia Shelby-Crooms for her 13 years of selfless service. I am deeply moved by her example of integrity, energy, and compassion.

TRIBUTE TO ELI KASAP

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Eli Kasap of the Earlham High School Track Team for winning the class IA Shuttle Hurdle State Championship.

Eli, along with his three teammates, finished the shuttle hurdle race in first place with a time of 1:00.23 at the 2015 Iowa IA State Track and Field Championships. Eli has dedicated his time and talents to achieving a single goal and I commend him for his hard work and determination. This group of young men came together to achieve great success.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Eli and his teammates demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Eli on a job well done, and wishing him nothing but continued success in all his future endeavors.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. GARY EASTERLING

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gary L. Easterling on his recent election to the Board of Directors at the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU).

Since 2007, Mr. Easterling has served as the President and CEO of United Federal Credit Union headquartered in St. Joseph, Michigan. Under his leadership, the credit union has seen its assets more than double. United Federal Credit Union has over $1.8 billion in assets, serves over 130,000 members, and employs more than 900 people. With more than 32 years of credit union experience, Mr. Easterling will be an incredible federal advocate for credit unions.

Mr. Easterling served previously as CEO of Century Credit Union in Cleveland, Ohio, and with Wright Patt Credit Union in Fairborn, Ohio, where he held leadership roles in almost every functional area. He holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Science from Capital University in Columbus, Ohio, as well as a Master's in Business Administration from Indiana Wesleyan University in Marion, Indiana. He currently serves on NAFCU's Legislative Committee. Mr. Easterling's deep knowledge of legislative and regulatory issues facing credit unions will give him tremendous expertise on the NAFCU Board, especially as the country continues to recover from the financial crisis.

I wish Mr. Easterling the best of luck in his new role on the NAFCU Board and I look forward to working with him in this capacity. I ask that my colleagues join me today in congratulating him on this special achievement.

WELCOME TO SCENIC SUGAR LAND, TEXAS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my hometown of Sugar Land, Texas for earning a Gold Level Scenic City Certification. Sugar Land residents know full well what a beautiful city we live in, and we are proud that everybody across Texas agrees.

Scenic Texas, a non-profit organization, awarded the Gold Level Scenic City Certification to Sugar Land for the next five years. The organization took note of our City's beautiful landscapes, tree-lined streets, and dedication to cultural arts. This certification further demonstrates Sugar Land's commitment to improving the quality of life for its residents. We are extremely proud of our growing city and are proud to call it home.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second District of Texas, congratulations to the City of Sugar Land. Thank you for keeping our little piece of Texas beautiful.

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN VANDERHEIDEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Brian Vanderheiden of the Earlham High School Track Team for winning the class 1A Shuttle Hurdle State Championship.

Brian, along with his three teammates, finished the shuttle hurdle race in first place with a time of 1:00.23 at the 2015 Iowa 1A State Track and Field Championships. Brian has dedicated his time and talents to achieving a single goal and I commend him for his hard work and determination. This group of young men came together to achieve great success.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Brian and his teammates demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on a job well done, and wishing him nothing but continued success in all his future endeavors.

THE STATE-BASED UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2015

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will give states the tools they need to guarantee the health security of their citizens. The State-Based Universal Health Care Act of 2015 establishes a new procedure through which states may apply for a waiver of federal law in order to design and implement single-payer health care systems. This will allow states to achieve universal coverage and control costs by removing greed and inefficiency from the system.

One of the many achievements of the Affordable Care Act is its provisions that grant states the authority to innovate in their health care systems. Under Section 1332 of the law, a state may apply for a State Innovation Waiver that will provide it with control of federal dollars that otherwise would have been spent on premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions for its residents. Through this waiver, a state may design a system to cover its residents, so long as benefits are at least as comprehensive and affordable as those offered by Qualified Health Plans available on the Exchanges.

However, even with this flexibility, numerous barriers limit states' ability to design true single-payer systems. Existing waivers are narrow in scope, requiring states to seek out imperfect and convoluted solutions to circumvent federal limitations. A sweeping preemption provision in the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) denies states authority to regulate employer-sponsored health plans. And, due to the complexities of our existing federal health programs, it is essentially impossible for a state to design a single benefit package that can be administered simply and efficiently on behalf of all of its residents.

The State-Based Universal Health Care Act removes these barriers. It builds upon the ACA's State Innovation Waiver by offering states new tools that will allow them to truly innovate in health care. Under this legislation, a state may apply for a Universal Health Care Waiver that will grant it authority over federal health care dollars that otherwise would have been spent on the state's residents. To the extent necessary to design a universal system, a state may waive provisions of federal law relating to the following:

The rules governing premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions, as provided for in existing waiver authority under Section 1332 of the ACA.

Provisions necessary for states to pool funds that otherwise would be spent on behalf of residents enrolled in Medicare, Medicaid, CHIP, TRICARE, and the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program.

ERISA's preemption clause, which currently forbids states from enacting legislation relating to employee health benefit programs.

Any state seeking a Universal Health Care Waiver must design a system that covers substantially all of its residents. The benefits that each citizen receives must be at least as comprehensive and no less affordable than what would have been provided under any federal health programs for which its residents otherwise would have been eligible. Once enacted, the state plan must be publicly administered, and it may not add to the federal deficit.

The Affordable Care Act was a landmark achievement and a strong first step toward achieving health security in this country. However, we still have a tremendous amount of work left to do. The United States spends by far the most per capita on health care, yet we fail to achieve superior outcomes or even guarantee coverage as a basic human right. Insurance companies are a powerful force in our economy, enjoying billions in profits and growing power in the marketplace. Meanwhile, hospitals are consolidating at an astonishing rate, raising new questions about the quality of patient care and the future of medicine. What's more, we have failed to make meaningful efforts to combat the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs, threatening patient access to treatments and the financial sustainability of the entire system.

As we explore ways to build upon the successes of the ACA, it is critical that we look for creative solutions to the challenges that still exist. Granting states tools to design single-payer systems will help spur necessary innovation, achieve universal coverage, and control costs. It is time to take this next step as we continue to move forward in our historic effort to guarantee the health security of every American.

IN HONOR OF MR. JAMES A. MCMULLEN, SR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to a truly outstanding citizen of our community, Mr. James Allen McMullen, Sr. Mr. McMullen passed away on Sunday, July 26, 2015 at the age of 75 in his home in Columbus, Georgia. Funeral services will be held at 11:00 a.m. on Friday, July 31, 2015 at Beallwood Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia.

A Georgia man through and through, Mr. McMullen was born in Columbus, Georgia and after graduating from Jordan Vocational High School in Columbus in 1958, he attended Georgia Southwestern College, now Georgia Southwestern State University, in Americus, Georgia. Following his graduation from college, he joined the United States Army and served in Germany.

Upon his return from Europe in 1961, Mr. McMullen began his career in funeral service, graduating from the Dallas Institute of Mortuary Science in Dallas, Texas in 1964. He worked locally for many years and in 1987, he and his family established the McMullen Funeral Home in Columbus.

For more than 50 years, Mr. McMullen served thousands of families in the Columbus area through the difficult time that follows the loss of a loved one. In order to provide the best service he could, Mr. McMullen was a member of Selected Independent Funeral Homes, the Georgia Funeral Directors Association, and the National Funeral Directors Association. Despite battling cancer for the last three years of his life, Mr. McMullen continued to work at the funeral home until a month before his passing. To him, this was not just his job, but an opportunity to serve others at a time when they need it the most.

A member of the Beallwood Baptist Church and the Lions Club for over 40 years, Mr. McMullen proved himself a leader in the community as well as in the workplace. He was named Lion of the Year in 1973, District 18–E governor of Lions International in 1976, and Chairman of the Georgia Sight Conservation Committee. His leadership extended to serving on the Board of Directors of the Georgia Lions Eye Bank and what is now known as the Chick-Fil-A Bowl. He also served for more than 36 years as chairman for the educational trip to Washington sponsored by the Lions Club. This annual trip has carried more than 40,000 fifth- and sixth-graders to the nation's capital, demonstrating once more the grand impact Mr. McMullen had on countless lives.

Dr. Maya Angelou once said, ''I've learned that people will forget what you said, people will forget what you did, but people will never forget how you made them feel.'' The people of Columbus will never forget how Mr. McMullen heartened the brokenhearted and consoled the inconsolable. We are once again confronted with the loss of a loved and respected leader in this community, but we are comforted by his great legacy of service, which will endure for years to come.

Mr. McMullen achieved much in his life but none of this would have been possible without

the love and support of his wife of 52 years, Cecille; his children, Allen and Lisa; and his cherished grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the Columbus community in honoring Mr. James A. McMullen, Sr. His leadership, wisdom, and skill aided thousands of people during the most difficult of times. Mr. McMullen was a truly outstanding individual and a blessing to the Columbus community. We extend our deepest sympathies to his family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time and we pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

TRIBUTE TO DEREK HENSLEY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Derek Hensley of the Earlham High School Track Team for winning the class 1A Shuttle Hurdle State Championship.

Derek, along with his three teammates, finished the shuttle hurdle race in first place with a time of 1:00.23 at the 2015 Iowa IA State Track and Field Championships. Derek has dedicated his time and talents to achieving a single goal and I commend him for his hard work and determination. This group of young men came together to achieve great success.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Derek and his teammates demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Derek on a job well done, and wishing him nothing but continued success in all his future endeavors.

HONORING THE EXTRAORDINARY LIFE OF WAYNE TOWNSEND

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a beloved member of the Indiana community, Wayne Townsend. He was a well-known member of the Indiana legislature, an esteemed farmer, and a vigorous supporter of Purdue University. Sadly, Wayne passed away at the age of 89 on July 3, 2015. He will be dearly missed by the Hoosier community, but we will remember him forever through the spectacular legacy he left behind.

A lifelong Hoosier, Wayne was born on his family's farm in Grant County. He started school at Walnut Creek Elementary School and then went to Jefferson Township High School. While his parents did not attend college, they encouraged all six of their children to go to college. Wayne, like his older siblings, attended Purdue University and graduated with a bachelor's degree in Agriculture.

Wayne's professional life reveals his different avenues of interest. A few years after graduating from Purdue, Wayne entered military service, serving primarily in Washington, D.C. as a special agent in the Counter Intelligence Corps. He stayed in the Army for two years until he returned to his family farm with his wife, Helen. Wayne maintained a hog and grain farm in Blackford County his whole adult life, but he was also heavily involved in Indiana politics. Wayne began his political career when he was elected to the Indiana House of Representatives in 1958. He served in the Indiana House of Representatives for six years, serving on the House Ways and Means Committee, and in 1970 he was elected to the Indiana Senate, where he served on the Senate Finance Committee. In the Senate, he is remembered for being the tie-breaking vote for Indiana to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment in 1977. Wayne was also selected as the Democratic nominee for Governor of Indiana in 1984, and he notably chose a female running mate, which was the first time in state history.

After 16 years in the Indiana Senate, Wayne retired from the legislature and started a new adventure serving on the Board of Trustees for Purdue for 15 years. His commitment to the Boilermakers was evident through his extensive involvement with the university. He served as the Director of the Purdue Research Foundation and sat on the Search Committee tasked with finding a new president when President Steven Beering retired. He was a member of the John Purdue Club for 35 years and a lifetime member of the Purdue Alumni Association. Wayne, an effective advocate for education, was also a Trustee of Earlham College in Richmond, Indiana.

In addition to his commitment to education, he was an active Quaker and served as a member and Trustee of the First Friends Church of Marion for 50 years.

On many occasions, Wayne was recognized for his impressive work. Four different governors from both sides of the aisle named Wayne the prestigious Sagamore of the Wabash. In 2014, he was honored with the Order of the Griffin, the highest honor bestowed by Purdue University. For his skill in farming, he was named a Master Farmer by Indiana Prairie Farmer and a Distinguished Purdue Agriculture Alumnus.

Wayne is survived by his wife, Helen Townsend, children Jay Townsend, Mark Townsend, Lisa McHone, Steve Townsend, and Alan Townsend, eighteen grandchildren, and many nieces and nephews. Wayne was a leader in the community who will always be remembered for his dedication to Indiana and the enduring benefits he created. Please join me in thanking Wayne's family for sharing this truly remarkable man with the Hoosier community.

HONORING DR. G. RICHARD OLDS ON HIS RETIREMENT AS DEAN OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to recognize and congratulate Dr. G. Richard Olds, Dean of the University of California Riverside School of Medicine, on his retirement.

Dean Olds has led a life of distinguished service as an educator, scientist, physician and founding dean of the UC Riverside School of Medicine. He has served as a full professor of medicine, molecular, and cell and development biology at Brown University, and professor and chairman of medicine at the MetroHealth Campus of Case Western Reserve University. Prior to joining the faculty at UC Riverside, Dean Olds was appointed professor and chair of medicine at the Medical College of Wisconsin. He has been an inspirational leader and adviser to hundreds of graduates. Among his many contributions to higher education, he also served as a tropical disease specialist on the World Health Organization expert committee on schistosomiasis, and has authored over 100 peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and reviews.

Dean Olds came to UC Riverside to create a School of Medicine—the first public medical school in California in more than four decades. His drive and vision led to a school with the unique and special mission focusing on the needs of the surrounding communities and the future path of community-based, value-based health care. In an effort to address the severe doctor shortage in Inland Southern California, Dean Olds created a medical school that would expand and diversify the physician workforce and serve as a catalyst for improving the health of the community.

UC Riverside School of Medicine is accredited largely in part to Dean Olds. In 2011, the State of California eliminated pledged annual funding for the school, resulting in the denial of accreditation. Dean Olds' unrelenting determination fostered an ambitious year of fundraising and advocacy, in which the medical school raised $100 million to support the school for over ten years. The school was accredited and the doors opened in fall 2013—the first time in three decades that an American medical school was approved after previously having been denied accreditation.

I am proud to recognize Dean Olds on his years of service and congratulate him on his retirement from UC Riverside School of Medicine. I look forward to his forthcoming accomplishments and future success, wherever he begins his next journey. On behalf of the countless medical students, future doctors, and patients, whose lives you have changed and impacted, thank you for your service.

TRIBUTE TO JACK GENESER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jack Geneser of the Earlham High School Track Team for winning the class 1A Shuttle Hurdle State Championship.

Jack, along with his three teammates, finished the shuttle hurdle race in first place with a time of 1:00.23 at the 2015 Iowa 1A State Track and Field Championships. Jack has dedicated his time and talents to achieving a single goal and I commend him for his hard work and determination. This group of young men came together to achieve great success.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Jack and his teammates demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Jack on a job well done, and wishing him nothing but continued success in all his future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF JOHN F. HEGARTY, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF THE POSTAL MAIL HANDLERS UNION

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of John F. Hegarty, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the National Postal Mail Handlers Union (NPMHU) and the United States Postal Service (USPS). John retired on May 1, 2015 and has moved back to his beloved Western Massachusetts.

The son of Charles and Ann Marie Hegarty, John was born on January 31, 1955 in Holyoke but grew up on Rupert Street in Springfield, before moving his family to Wilbraham, MA, where he currently resides.

Mr. Speaker, John Hegarty attended Commerce High School. After graduation like many of his contemporaries he sought work. He worked at Titeflex in Springfield and started his union career as a steward (Teamsters Union) representing his fellow workers. John left Titeflex in 1985 when the USPS called and he started his Postal career.

John was National President of the National Postal Mail Handlers Union from July 2002 to his retirement. He was re-elected to that position by acclamation of the delegates to the Union's National Conventions in 2004, 2008, and 2012. In this capacity, John is the chief spokesperson for the NPMHU in national bargaining with the USPS.

For the ten years prior to becoming National President, John served as Administrative Vice President for the General Mail Facility/Bulk Mail Center in Springfield, Massachusetts. He then became President of Local 301 in New England, one of the largest local unions affiliated with the NPMHU, covering six states. In addition, beginning in 1996, he also served on the NPMHU National Executive Board of the NPHMU's parent union, the Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA).

Mr. Speaker, John Hegarty is known for his generous spirit and kind heart. He has had the good fortune to be married to his wife, Constance, for thirty-three years. John and Connie are proud parents of two children, two grandchildren with a third on the way.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to join with John Hegarty's family, friends, and contemporaries to thank him for his extraordinary service to the National Postal Mail Handlers and the United States Postal Service.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAPT. RICHARD ''DICK'' CURRIER

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of retired Navy Captain Richard ''Dick'' Currier, the commanding officer who oversaw the construction of what was known then as Naval Submarine Support Base Kings Bay.

Captain Currier spent most of his Navy career in the submarine service during the transition from diesel to nuclear-powered submarines. He joined the Navy in 1954 and served upon four surface ships before becoming a submariner. As his first sea duty, Captain Currier served aboard the diesel powered submarine USS *Grampus*. After that tour of duty, he was sent to nuclear power school and was assigned to the nuclear submarine USS *Scorpion*. Five more submarine assignments followed, three of which he served as the commanding officer.

Captain Currier's last duty assignment started in 1983 as the commanding officer of Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay in St. Marys, Georgia. At the time of his arrival, only 100 people were assigned to the base. Kings Bay's pier was still under construction, a majority of roads were unpaved, and most buildings were still in the planning stages. Under Captain Currier's leadership Kings Bay developed into the Navy gem of Georgia's Golden Isles.

Captain Currier retired after 34 years of service and continued to be active in the St. Marys community where he served on the board of directors for the St. Mary's Submarine Museum among other roles.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the service and life of Captain Richard ''Dick'' Currier, a pioneer of Kings Bay who will always be remembered.

TRIBUTE TO JHETT WILLIAMS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jhett Williams of Madison County, Iowa, for qualifying for the National Junior High Rodeo Finals in breakaway roping, team roping, and chute dogging.

Each summer, approximately 1,000 youth competitors from across the country qualify to compete for scholarships and prizes at the National Junior High Rodeo Finals. I commend Jhett for his hard work and dedication to achieving his goals. He is a phenomenal young role model for others who are aspiring to compete in this prestigious national event.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I represent Iowans like Jhett in the U.S. House of Representatives. I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jhett on a job well done, and wishing him nothing but continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 469, my flight was delayed due to inclement weather.

Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

TRIBUTE TO ANITA LYONS BOND, PH.D.

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable woman and long-time civic icon in St. Louis, Missouri, who has set a standard of excellence in academics, educational reform, social justice, community leadership and personal courage, Dr. Anita Lyons Bond.

Anita Lyons Bond has been making history for decades. As the first African American student to graduate with Latin Honors from Saint Louis University in 1949, she has devoted her life to opening up the doors of equal educational opportunity to all, especially those students in urban areas who are still striving to overcome difficult circumstances and persistent academic disparities.

In May of this year, as she presented an honorary doctorate to Mrs. Bond, Saint Louis University trustee Martha Uhlhorn recognized her ''extraordinary determination, her exemplary character, her exceptional commitment to education, her concerns for others, her fearless focus on social justice and her desire to provide equal access to education for all students.''

In 1965, Mrs. Bond challenged the Missouri Board of Education's elections. Her lawsuit, contending civil rights violations, went to the Missouri Supreme Court and ultimately resulted in changes in election procedures. Later that year, the Urban League of Metropolitan St. Louis honored her with the Argus Distinguished Public Service Award for her service to the city as a leader in education and in the community.

Mrs. Bond established the Citizens Education Task Force, an organization funded through the Danforth Foundation that functioned as an independent critical body of the Board of Education.

In 1974, she became president of the St. Louis Board of Education. She served the board in various roles and was instrumental in the Board of Education and the Higher Educational Council establishing Harris-Stowe as a state college, rather than a secondary school.

In 1981, U.S. District Judge James Meredith appointed her to serve on the committee that wrote the St. Louis public school desegregation plan. She also served on the boards of the YMCA, NAACP, Urban League, United Negro College Fund and others. The NAACP named her one of the ''Most Outstanding St. Louisans.''

Mrs. Bond has also served as a delegate to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and is a nationally recognized educational expert in special techniques of speech correction for the culturally disadvantaged.

I have known Mrs. Bond, her late husband (the remarkable Dr. Leslie Bond), and her wonderful family since my earliest days growing up in St. Louis. Both she and her husband stood shoulder-to-shoulder with my father, former Congressman Bill Clay, as he led the historic Jefferson Bank protests which broke down the walls of segregation in our city.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of Congress to join me in honoring this great American who has helped so many and continues to inspire us to have courage, to work towards transformative change, and to confront injustice and inequality wherever it exists.

TRIBUTE TO THE ATTACK 121 VOLLEYBALL TEAM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Attack 121 Volleyball Team of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for qualifying for the USA Volleyball Junior National Tournament. The competition began June 27th and ran through June 30th.

This team dedicated their time and talents to achieving a single goal and I commend them for their hard work and determination. They were able to come together to achieve great success.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this group of young Iowans demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent them in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating the Attack 121 volleyball team on a job well done, and wishing them nothing but continued success as they continue their volleyball careers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 468; my flight was delayed due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

HONORING TURLOCK CITY FIRE DEPARTMENT CHIEF TIM LOHMAN

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Turlock City Fire Department Chief Tim Lohman, who announced his retirement after serving 35 years in the fire service.

Since the beginning of his career, Tim Lohman has always been dedicated to the Turlock City Fire Department. On July 1, 1980, he took his first step into the Department by becoming a Volunteer Firefighter. After only three years of hard work and perseverance, Tim Lohman succeeded in becoming a full-time Firefighter for the City of Turlock. There he worked at all levels of the department including Fire Engineer, Fire Captain, Battalion Chief, Division Chief of Training, and Division Chief of Operations. On account of his commitment, professionalism, and integrity he had demonstrated throughout the years, Tim Lohman was awarded the high rank of Fire Chief four years ago.

Response times and personnel safety are a priority to Chief Lohman, and during his tenure as Fire Chief, he ensured many technological advances to the Turlock City Fire Department to achieve this goal. He oversaw the installation of Mobile Data Computers to each fire engine, which provided the crews with the most recent advances in mapping systems and programs. Furthermore, Chief Lohman oversaw the implementation of the 911 system and other additions that changed the landscape of emergency service response for the Fire Department.

Serving as a Firefighter was not the only calling for Chief Lohman, as he owns and operates his own almond farm in Ballico, California. In 1989, he purchased the 28 acre parcel from his grandparents, and has been growing and harvesting the land ever since. Chief Lohman has been familiar with the almond industry for some time, but will be experiencing a new challenge after his retirement from the Turlock City Fire Department. He will be beginning a new career as Chief Executive Officer with the almond cooperative Northern Merced Hulling Association. Chief Lohman's vast experience and leadership will ensure he thrives in his imminent position.

Chief Lohman has been recognized by colleagues with many awards and accolades. He is well respected by his community and fellow firefighters.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending the outstanding contributions made to fire service and the City of Turlock by Turlock City Fire Department Chief Tim Lohman and hereby wish him continued success in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE CAREER OF CURTIS M. GRAVES

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished public service career of Curtis M. Graves.

Mr. Graves was one of the first African Americans elected to the Texas House of Representatives since the turn of the 20th century. A Democrat and political contemporary of Barbara Jordan, Mr. Graves served in the Texas legislature from 1967 to 1973, where he championed progressive legislation on issues ranging from gun control to criminal justice reform. Mr. Graves also spent many years actively participating in the Civil Rights Movement, fighting for equal rights of all Americans.

Mr. Graves was born August 26, 1938 in New Orleans, Louisiana. He is an alumnus of Texas Southern University and Princeton University. After serving in the Texas House of Representatives, Mr. Graves had a thirty year career at the National Aeronautic and Space Administration—first in NASA's Academic Affairs Division and ultimately as its Director for Civil Affairs.

On behalf of the people of Maryland's Eighth Congressional District, and in anticipation of his seventy-seventh birthday on August 26, 2015, I would like to thank Curtis M. Graves for his lifelong career of public service and for his many contributions to our nation. I wish him and his family all the best in the years to come.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS SHOOTING IN LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak out against the loss of innocent lives that resulted from yet another unimaginable act of violence in our great country.

I humbly ask the House to observe a moment of silence for the victims of the horrific tragedy that occurred in a movie theater in Lafayette, Louisiana, on July 23, 2015.

My thoughts and prayers are with these victims, the families, and the friends of those who lost loved ones in this horrific shooting.

From current reports, we know that the gunman unloaded over 13 rounds into the crowd at the movie theater late Thursday night.

The gunman inexplicably began his rampage by firing shots into the seats directly in front of him, and then took his own life.

His actions claimed the lives of two young women, Mayci Breaux and Jillian Johnson, and injured nine others at the Grand Multiplex Theater in Lafayette, Louisiana.

I want to commend the rapid response by the law enforcement personnel that arrived at the scene and acted with courage and skill, likely preventing any further loss of innocent lives.

Individuals who have a history of mental instability, as did this shooter, should never be allowed to possess a firearm.

This is why my colleagues and I co-sponsored, H.R. 226, the "Keeping Guns from High Risk Individuals Act", which prevents individuals with a history of mental illness from gaining access to firearms.

Tragic events such as this should not be a part of the American culture.

Yet, in 2015 alone, we have had 204 mass shootings where innocent lives have been senselessly taken from our communities.

No American should ever have to experience fear and violence when they are stepping out into their communities to participate in activities, such as going to the movies or attending a faith meeting.

Americans have proven time and time again that we are capable of tackling the tough issues that face our nation and culture.

Violent acts such as this highlight the need for serious and positive reforms to help enhance public safety.

Congress needs to work with the President to develop and enact sensible gun violence prevention legislation.

We cannot give up, no matter the obstacles placed before us.

We can no longer be complacent or passive; we need to enact policies that could save lives.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask, how many more lives and incidents will it take before Congress acts to take on this pressing issue?

Are not the shootings in Aurora, Colorado; Sandy Hook, Connecticut; Charleston, South Carolina; Tucson, Arizona; Blacksburg, Virginia; and Chattanooga, Tennessee, or any of the other 200 mass shootings across the nation, enough to spur us to act?

Mr. Speaker, it does not have to be this way; there are many actions we can take to reduce gun violence in America.

All we have to do is summon the will.

HONORING KRISTIN WELSH-SIMPSON

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of this great institution and those who serve and work here to acknowledge and express appreciation to one of our long-tenured House employees, Kristin Welsh-Simpson—a Senior Employee Assistance Counselor with the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)—who is departing the House following her fifteen years of service in the Office of Employee Assistance (OEA).

Kristin first came to the House in 1996 as a graduate student intern in the Office of Employee Assistance as part of her graduate studies at the National Catholic School of Social Services, at The Catholic University of America. Following the awarding of her Master's Degree in Social Work, she took a position in the private sector as an Employee Assistance Account Manager for an international EAP provider, and oversaw the employee assistance service contract for a large global health products company. Fortunately for the House, the CAO and OEA were able to permanently hire her in 2000 when she joined the Office of Employee Assistance as an Employee Assistance Counselor.

Almost immediately, Kristin began applying her special case management and organizational skills in service to the Members and employees of the House, the Congressional Budget Office and the United States Capitol Police. She has worked diligently and tirelessly to assist managers and employees in addressing the myriad of personal challenges, mental health and addiction problems, and other behavioral and work-life balance issues that potentially impact the performance and productivity of our workforce. With barely a year of service under her belt, Kristin and her 0EA colleagues found themselves in the uncharted territory of assisting House Leadership, Members, Officers, and employees through the emotional turmoil and psychological recovery following September 11th and the anthrax crisis in October 2001. Specifically, she was part of both the OEA team's response to the emotional and psychological support needs of individual employees and work groups, and the CAO's larger communications effort managed by the (OEA. She served with the OEA as the critical informational link to the House workforce throughout the six weeks in which sections of the House campus were closed—keeping employees and families informed of the status of the remediation efforts and the staggered opening of offices as well as the availability of House services as sections of the House buildings were cleared for occupancy and resumption of operations. Unfortunately, with the realities of our world, these were not to be the only crises that Kristin and the employee assistance team would be called upon to assist us with and support us through. Kristin's skills and capabilities would be particularly helpful following the tragic shootings in Tucson in January 2011, beginning with her on-site support and assistance within hours of the incident.

In addition to being on the front lines in providing the support and services of the Office of Employee Assistance team to the House, CBO and Capitol Police communities in the aftermath of some of the most troubling events of the past fifteen years, Kristin has established a reputation as a go-to person. Kristin has been sought out for her day-to-day work in consulting with and coaching Members, managers and employees to assist them with the challenges presented when an employee's personal issues impact their performance or the effectiveness of the office. It is on this level that I personally became familiar with Kristin and her tremendous work ethic, insights and capabilities. She has worked with me and my staff for several years, helping to plan and facilitate our annual staff retreat and to incorporate some critical staff development into the process.

Whether providing the OEA's critical assessment, referral and follow-up services to an employee in crisis, consulting with a Member or Chief of Staff on strategies to effectively integrate communications and team development into an annual staff retreat, or conducting a training session for the general House workforce, Kristin has consistently brought compassion, competence, organizational insight, institutional sensitivity, and practical solutions to her work. It seems fitting that one of Kristin's major responsibilities in the Office of Employee Assistance this past year was serving as the office's Intern Field Placement Instructor for a graduate student from Catholic University—somewhat bringing her career with the House full circle.

As Kristin departs the House to assume the position of Employee Assistance Director for the United States Senate, I regret the House's loss but take comfort in knowing that the Congress will continue to benefit from her knowledge and experience. I join the Chief Administrative Officer, Ed Cassidy; the CAO's Acting Chief Human Resource Officer, Darnell Lee; and the entire OEA team—Bernard Beidel, Liz McBride-Chambers, Margot Hawkins-Green, and Paul Tewksbury—in thanking Kristin for her service to the Office of Employee Assistance and the House, and in wishing her well and much success as her employee assistance career takes her to new challenges and opportunities. As someone who has personally benefited from the assistance and support she has provided my staff and office, I am confident I speak for the many Members, employees and family members she has helped, assisted and supported over the past fifteen years. Well done and Godspeed, Kristin.

TRIBUTE TO TOM McMAHON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tom McMahon of Fairfield, Iowa, for receiving the 2015 Leadership for Iowa Award from the Iowa Association of Business and Industry Foundation.

Each year, the Iowa Association of Business and Industry Foundation selects one distinguished recipient to receive the Leadership for Iowa Award. The individual selected for this award must display a willingness and commitment in serving Iowa. They must also have occupied a leadership position in civic or professional organizations as well as displayed a knack for leading others on a wide-range of issues.

Tom was granted this prestigious award because of his involvement and leadership in his community. He demonstrated his willingness to serve through his time as a volunteer for Leadership Iowa, Leadership Iowa University and Business Horizons, along with his tenure on the ABI Board of Directors. Tom's commitment to mentoring future business leaders truly embodies our Iowa values.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to represent Iowans like Tom in the United States Congress, and I applaud him for his commitment to service and giving back to the community. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him for receiving this award. I wish him all the best moving forward.

IN RECOGNITION OF TOM JAWETZ AND HIS SERVICE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I, along with Representative ZOE LOFGREN of California, would like to thank Tom Jawetz for more than six years of service to the House of Representatives. Throughout this time, Torn has served as a dedicated counsel to the Judiciary Committee under three Chairmen, including myself, Representative LAMAR SMITH, and Representative BOB GOODLATTE. For the past year, he has served as the Minority Chief Counsel to the Judiciary's Committee's Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

A native of New York City, Tom graduated summa cum laude from Dartmouth College with a bachelor's degree in Philosophy and Government. Tom developed a passion for working with low-income communities through an AmeriCorps fellowship in Charleston, South Carolina. As an AmeriCorps fellow, Tom

worked with community members and witnessed the myriad challenges faced by those suffering from chronic poverty. Tom took his passion for working with the disadvantaged to Yale Law School where he served as a student clerk in the Complex Federal Litigation Clinic and a Student Director in the Immigration Legal Services Clinic.

After graduating from Yale Law School, Tom clerked for the Honorable Kimba M. Wood in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York. He continued his immigration advocacy as an Arthur Liman Public Interest Fellow at the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs where he represented asylum seekers and designed pro se programs for immigrants in removal proceedings.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, Tom began working with the National Prison Project of the American Civil Liberties Union. As a litigation fellow with the National Prison Project, Tom helped to produce a groundbreaking comprehensive report condemning the belated evacuation of the Orleans Parish Prison. Tom combined his experience investigating prison abuse in New Orleans with his immigration expertise when he was hired to be the Immigration Detention Staff Attorney for the National Prison Project. In that role, Tom raised attention and awareness to the deficient and abusive medical care practices in immigrant detention and assisted Francisco Castaneda in a landmark case of medical abuse in detention. Tom testified honorably before the Judiciary Committee on two occasions, once accompanied by two of his clients who shared their stories in an effort to improve conditions of confinement.

As counsel for the Judiciary Committee, Tom worked tirelessly to provide assistance to members and staff He was always available for legal analysis, advice and good conversation. Tom was known to many members and staff as a leader on all things relating to immigration. Tom developed a reputation for being dependable and easily approachable. His energetic disposition and positive attitude were always appreciated by Members and staff on both sides of the aisle.

Tom played an important role in Comprehensive Immigration Reform negotiations, the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, issues concerning the surge of unaccompanied children and families at the Southern border and enactment of several private immigration bills. Tom's absence will be felt on matters pertaining to immigration law and policy, but we are pleased to know that he will continue his efforts as the Vice President of Immigration Policy for the Center of American Progress.

Mr. Speaker, we applaud Tom's tireless, principled and loyal public service to the U.S. House of Representatives and the American people wish him every success in his future endeavors.

MRS. UNITED STATES 2015

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pearland's Katie Garza for being crowned Mrs. United States 2015.

Mrs. Garza truly encompasses the qualities of this competition. She is an intelligent wife, mother, and professional and beautiful on the inside and out. During her reign as Mrs. United States, Katie will use her platform to benefit the Pumping for Preemies foundation. Her foundation helps save the lives of premature infants by providing donor milk to mothers who are unable to provide breast milk. As a mother to three premature children, this cause is near and dear to Katie's heart. We are proud of Katie for highlighting her personal cause on the national stage. She is an excellent role model who represents Pearland well.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Katie Garza for being crowned Mrs. United States 2015.

PRATT & WHITNEY 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Pratt & Whitney on their 90th anniversary. Back in my home state of Georgia, this American company has six major facilities, employing more than 2,000 Georgians. In my district in Middle and Southwest Georgia alone, Pratt & Whitney employs over 1,000 employees at their Engine Center in Columbus.

I remember the tour I took of Pratt & Whitney's Columbus Engine Center to get a first-hand account of the plant's operation and how it impacts the local economy. From what I could see, Pratt & Whitney's employees truly take customer service to a new level. For almost 30 years, Pratt & Whitney has been a driving force for job creation in the Columbus community, and have become good corporate citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before and I will say it again, Congress' first, second, and third priority must be job creation, as it is a crucial part to our continued economic recovery. For the past 90 years, Pratt & Whitney has also been focused on creating good jobs in Columbus and throughout the nation, and have succeeded through producing dependable engines and supporting great communities.

I congratulate Pratt & Whitney on this auspicious occasion.

RECOGNIZING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF ANDERSON, INDIANA

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Anderson, Indiana. Anderson has played an integral role in the industrial development of Indiana and Hoosiers from every part of the state are thankful for the contributions of the men and women of Anderson.

The city of Anderson is celebrating 150 years, but the history of Anderson dates back further. Chief William Anderson of the Delaware tribe first settled in the area, giving it the name Anderson Town. Eventually the name was shortened to Anderson and in 1865, it was officially incorporated.

From its early origins, Anderson has been a model for other cities and towns to follow, through its continued dedication to building a welcoming community for residents and visitors alike. In the years since its first mayor, Robert Williams, who served from 1865–1866, Anderson has developed into a lively and thriving community, serving as a home for generations to families, businesses, professionals, churches, schools, and other organizations.

In 1887, the city saw a great influx in business due to the discovery of natural gas. This discovery is responsible for the initial spike in automotive, electric, and other manufacturing companies to settle in Anderson, most notably Delco Remy and Guide Lamp. Despite the downturn in the automotive industry in past decades, the city has exhibited resilience and welcomed new businesses such as, Nestle, Xerox, Greenville Technologies, Inc., Keihin North America, and Sirmax, to name only a few. In addition to its industries, the city is home to the Paramount Theatre, Mounds State Park, Anderson University, and Hoosier Park Racing & Casino.

Anderson, with all of its industry and attractions, is nothing without the people. The citizens have a clear passion and love for their city. I am proud to represent such an amazing city, one with a history of growth and prosperity as well as the promise of a prosperous future. Please join me in celebrating the sesquicentennial anniversary of the incorporation of the great city of Anderson, Indiana.

HONORING MS. GLORIA MARGARITA RODRIGUEZ ON THE OCCASION OF HER NEW POSITION AS A REPORTER FOR ABC 11 WTVD

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to recognize Ms. Gloria Margarita Rodriguez on her new position as a reporter for WTVD in Raleigh-Durham, North Carolina.

A native to the Coachella Valley, Ms. Rodriguez has served the community as KMIR Anchor, Reporter, and Producer for over 9 years. She has used her talent to cover several nationally recognized local events such as the Humana Challenge, Palm Springs International Film Festival, and the BNP Paribas Open. Additionally, she has interviewed celebrities and politicians, reported on numerous wildfires, and covered President Gerald Ford's death and state funeral. Ms. Rodriguez has used her reporting to shed light on important issues including working conditions of migrant workers, living conditions at Thermal mobile home parks, immigration at the U.S.-Mexico border, and LGBT equality rights.

After completing high school at Cathedral City, Ms. Rodriguez received her bachelor's degree in broadcast journalism and political

science from the University of Southern California. She completed her master's degree program at the Columbia University School of Journalism in New York City, and then worked as a reporter for KNWA in Arkansas. She has written articles for The New York Times, The Boston Globe, the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and The Desert Sun. She returned to the desert in 2006, working as a weekend anchor and field reporter for KMIR/KPSE-TV. Most recently she has been the co-anchor of KMIR's two-hour Today Show.

In addition to her many contributions to journalism, Ms. Rodriguez has been a passionate advocate for access to higher education. Serving as both Executive Director with the Reynaldo J. Carreon Foundation and professor of media and public relations at the College of the Desert, she has been a strong voice, inspiring and empowering students to pursue and complete undergraduate degrees. In October 2010, Ms. Rodriguez was named one of Palm Spring Life's "40 Under 40" for contributions to the community.

Ms. Rodriguez will be reporting in one of the top 25 media markets in the country in her new position at WTVD, bringing her integrity and advocacy to an even larger audience. I am proud to recognize Ms. Rodriguez's contributions to Coachella Valley, and I look forward to her success and accomplishments at WTVD.

CELEBRATING CONGREGATION MICKVE ISRAEL'S 282ND ANNIVERSARY

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 282nd Anniversary of Congregation Mickve Israel, the third oldest Jewish Congregation in the United States of America, and the grand opening of their Lawrence and Nancy Gutstein Museum.

Five months after General James Oglethorpe founded the Georgia colony in 1733, Jewish refugees from the Iberian Peninsula landed in Savannah. These refugees started the Congregation Mickve Israel which has met in various locations ever since. The congregation is still operating under the same charter which they received from Governor Edward Telfair in 1790. Using primary sources, the diaries of one of the first settlers and minute books from 1790–1851, a carefully constructed exhibit ties Mickve Israel and its members to events in Jewish history, in the life of the Savannah community, the country, and the world.

The new museum tells the Congregation's story through the American Revolution, the Civil War and today. Some of the artifacts on display include the oldest Torah scrolls in the United States from the 15th century, a scale model of the ship, William and Sarah, which brought over the founding members of the Congregation, and copies of letters written by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. Others include contributions of its members with the early Girl Scout movement as well as leadership in the civic and cultural life of Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join the Savannah community in celebration of the opening of Congregation Mickve Israel's new museum and their 282nd Anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 467; my flight was delayed due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

FINANCIAL NET WORTH

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, through the following statement, I am making my financial net worth as of March 31, 2015, a matter of public record. I have filed similar statements for each of the thirty-six preceding years I have served in the Congress.

ASSETS

REAL PROPERTY

Single family residence at 609 Ft. Williams Parkway, City of Alexandria, Virginia, at assessed valuation. (Assessed at $1,372,549). Ratio of assessed to market value: 100% (Unencumbered): $1,372,549.00.

Condominium at N76 W14726 North Point Drive, Village of Menomonee Falls, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at assessor's estimated market value. (Unencumbered): $136,600.00.

Undivided 25/44ths interest in single family Residence at N52 W32654 Maple Lane, Village of Chenequa, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at 25/44ths of assessor's estimated market value of $1,552,500: $882,102.27.

Total real property: $2,391,251.27.

Common & preferred stock	# of shares	$ per share	Value
Abbott Laboratories, Inc.	12200	46.33	$565,226.00
AbbVie Inc.	10980	58.54	642,769.20
Alcatel-Lucent	135	3.73	503.55
Allstate Corporation	370	71.17	26,332.90
AT & T	7275	32.65	237,528.75
JP Morgan Chase	4539	60.58	274,972.62
Benton County Mining Company	333	0.00	0.00
BP PLC	3604	39.11	140,952.44
Centerpoint Energy	300	20.21	6,063.00
Chenequa Country Club Realty Co.	1	0.00	0.00
Comcast	634	56.47	35,801.98
Darden Restaurants, Inc.	2160	69.34	149,774.40
Discover Financial Services	156	56.35	8,790.60
Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.	1250	128.36	160,450.00
E.I. DuPont de Nemours Corp.	1200	71.47	85,764.00
Eastman Chemical Co.	540	69.26	37,400.40
Exxon Mobil Corp.	9728	85.00	826,880.00
Frontier Comm.	591	7.05	4,166.55
Gartner Inc.	651	83.85	54,586.35
General Electric Co.	15600	24.81	387,036.00
General Mills, Inc.	5760	56.60	326,016.00
NRG Energy	28	25.19	705.32
Hospira	1220	87.84	107,164.80
Imation Corp.	99	4.03	398.97
Kellogg Corp.	3200	65.95	211,040.00
3M Company	2000	164.95	329,900.00
Express Scripts	6656	86.77	577,541.12
Monsanto Company	2852.315	112.54	320,999.53
Moody's	5000	103.80	519,000.00
Morgan Stanley	312	35.69	11,135.28
NCR Corp.	68	29.51	2,006.68
Newell Rubbermaid	1676	39.07	65,481.32
PG & E Corp.	175	53.07	9,287.25
Pfizer	30415	34.79	1,058,137.85
Century Link	95	34.55	3,282.25
Tenneco Inc.	182	57.42	10,450.44
Unisys Corp.	16	23.21	371.36
US Bancorp	3081	43.67	134,547.27
Verizon	1918	48.63	93,272.34
Vodafone Group PLC	323	32.68	10,555.64
WEC Energy (Wisconsin Energy)	2044	49.50	101,178.00
Total common & preferred stocks & bonds			$7,537,470.16

Life insurance policies	Face $	Surrender $
Northwestern Mutual #00	12,000.00	$119,406.33
Northwestern Mutual #61	30,000.00	287,297.39
Massachusetts Mutual #75	10,000.00	17,203.64
Massachusetts Mutual #44	100,000.00	459,747.68
American General Life Ins. #59L	175,000.00	42,067.21
Total life insurance policies		$925,722.25

Bank & IRA accounts	Balance
JP Morgan Chase Bank, checking account	$51,830.86
JP Morgan Chase Bank, savings account	14,675.76
M&I Bank, checking account	6,112.65
Burke & Herbert Bank, Alexandria, VA, checking account	4,034.78
JP Morgan, IRA accounts	153,919.18
Total bank & IRA Accounts	$230,573.23

Miscellaneous	Value
2009 Ford Taurus	$8,002.00
2013 Ford Taurus	18,837.00
1996 Buick Regal	1,529.00
Office furniture & equipment (estimated)	1,000.00
Furniture, clothing & personal property (estimated)	180,000.00
Stamp collection (estimated)	190,000.00
Deposits in Congressional Retirement Fund	236,488.14
Deposits in Federal Thrift Savings Plan	527,709.81
Traveler's checks	7,800.00
17 ft. Boston Whaler boat & 70 hp Johnson outboard motor (estimated)	4,500.00
20 ft. Pontoon boat & 40 hp Mercury outboard motor (estimated)	7,500.00
Total miscellaneous	$1,183,365.95
Total assets	$12,268,382.86

Liabilities: None.

Total liabilities: $0.00.

Net worth: $12,268,382.86.

STATEMENT OF 2014 TAXES PAID

Federal Income Tax	$154,822.00
Wisconsin Income Tax	43,951.00
Menomonee Falls, WI Property Tax	2,321.00
Chenequa, WI Property Tax	21,036.00
Alexandria, VA Property Tax	14,381.00

I further declare that I am trustee of a trust established under the will of my late father, Frank James Sensenbrenner, Sr., for the benefit of my sister, Margaret A. Sensenbrenner, and of my two sons, F. James Sensenbrenner, III, and Robert Alan Sensenbrenner. I am further the direct beneficiary of five trusts, but have no control over the assets of either trust. My wife, Cheryl Warren Sensenbrenner, and I are trustees of separate trusts established for the benefit of each son.

Also, I am neither an officer nor a director of any corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin or of any other state or foreign country.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6045–S6087.

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1873–1881, S.J. Res. 20, S. Res. 233, and S. Con. Res. 20. **Pages S6073–74**

Measures Reported:

S. 1334, to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6073**

Measures Passed:

Federal Improper Payments Coordination Act: Senate passed S. 614, to provide access to and use of information by Federal agencies in order to reduce improper payments, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S6084–85**

McConnell (for Carper/Johnson) Amendment No. 2541, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6084**

Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act: Senate passed S. 242, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability. **Page S6085**

National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act: Senate passed S. 764, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S6085–87**

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 64, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the Monuments Men. **Page S6087**

National Association of Women Business Owners 40th Anniversary: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 225, honoring the National Association of Women Business Owners on its 40th anniversary, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6087**

25th Anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 20, recognizing and honoring the 25th anniversary of the date of enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. **Page S6087**

Measures Considered:

Hire More Heroes Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 22, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S6046–67**

Pending:

McConnell Modified Amendment No. 2266, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6046**

McConnell Amendment No. 2421 (to Amendment No. 2266), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6046**

McConnell (for Inhofe) Amendment No. 2533 (to Amendment No. 2421), relating to Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs. **Page S6046**

McConnell Amendment No. 2417 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 2266), to change the enactment date. **Page S6046**

McConnell Amendment No. 2418 (to Amendment No. 2417), of a perfecting nature. **Page S6046**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, that at 10 a.m., on Wednesday, July 29, 2015, all post-cloture time on McConnell Modified Amendment No. 2266 (listed above) be considered expired; and that if cloture is invoked on the bill, then the post-cloture time count as if cloture had been invoked at 6 a.m., on Wednesday, July 29, 2015. **Page S6084**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, July 29, 2015, with the time until 10 a.m., equally divided in the usual form. **Page S6087**

Beck, Prieto, and Ochoa Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached

providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 22, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Allison Beck, of the District of Columbia, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director, Jeffrey Michael Prieto, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and Carol Fortine Ochoa, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration, that Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations, and that no further motions be in order to the nominations. **Page S6046**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

1 Army nomination in the rank of general. **Page S6087**

Messages from the House: **Page S6070**

Measures Referred: **Page S6070**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S6070, S6087**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6070–72**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S6072–73**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S6073**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6074–77**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6077–78**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6069–70**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6078–83**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S6083–84**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 7:04 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 29, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6087.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CRUDE OIL EXPORT BAN

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine lifting the crude oil export ban, after receiving testimony from Senators Murkowski and Hoeven; Richard Muncrief, WPX Energy, Tulsa, Oklahoma; and Michèle Flournoy, Center for a New American Secuirty, Benjamin Zycher, American Enterprise Institute, and Leo W. Gerard, United Steelworkers, on behalf of the AFL–CIO, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Jonathan Elkind, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (International Affairs).

Committee also began consideration of an original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again on Wednesday, July 29.

DIPLOMATIC SECURITY TRAINING FACILITY

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the State Department's proposal to construct a new diplomatic security training facility, after receiving testimony from Gregory Starr, Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security; David Mader, Acting Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; and Connie L. Patrick, Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, Department of Homeland Security.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 41 public bills, H.R. 3231–3271; 1 private bill, H.R. 3272; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 65–66; and H. Res. 385–387 and 389–391, were introduced. **Pages H5587–90**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5591–93**

Reports Filed: A report was filed on July 27, 2015 as follows:

H.R. 1656, to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–231).

Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 455, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a northern border threat analysis, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–232);

H.R. 2786, to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to submit a report on cross-border rail security, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–233); and

H. Res. 388, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3236) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–234).

Page H5587

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Valadao to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5527**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:55 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5533**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan, their families, and all who serve in our armed forces and their families. **Page H5544**

Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 427, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, by a recorded vote of 243 ayes to 165 noes, Roll No. 482.

Pages H5539–72

Rejected the Nolan motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 167 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 481. **Pages H5570–71**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–230, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H5552**

Agreed to:

Rodney Davis (IL) amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–230) that requires the agency submitting the report on proposed Federal rule to include an assessment, as part of the cost-benefit analysis submitted to the Comptroller General and each House of Congress, of anticipated jobs gained or lost as a result of implementation, and to specify whether those jobs will come from the public or private sector; **Pages H5557–58**

Young (IA) amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–230) that would require agencies to publish in the federal register a list of information on which a rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and where the public can access it online (by a recorded vote of 250 ayes to 159 noes, Roll No. 473);

Pages H5555–56, H5564–65

Smith (MO) amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–230) that requires congressional approval for all rules proposed under the authority of the Affordable Care Act (by a recorded vote of 242 ayes to 167 noes, Roll No. 474);

Pages H5556–57, H5565–66

Rejected:

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–230) that sought to add an exception to the bill for rules that the Administrator of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job growth (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes to 246 noes, Roll No. 475);

Pages H5558–59, H5566

Capps amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–230) that sought to ensure that any rule intended to ensure the safety of natural gas or hazardous materials pipelines or prevent, mitigate, or reduce the impact of spills from such pipelines is not considered a ''major rule'' under the bill (by a recorded vote of 166 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 476);

Pages H5559–60, H5566–67

Cicilline amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–230) that sought to exempt rules pertaining to the protection of the public health or safety from the requirements of the Act (by a recorded vote of 166 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 477);

Pages H5560–61, H5567–68

Cicilline amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–230) that sought to provide a ''special rule'' pertaining to the safety of any products specifically designed to be used or consumed by a child under the age of 2 years (including cribs, car seats,

and infant formula) (by a recorded vote of 167 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 478); **Pages H5561, H5568**

Nadler amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–230) that sought to exempt from the bill's congressional approval requirement any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards in order to prevent nuclear meltdowns like the one in Fukushima (by a recorded vote of 167 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 479); and **Pages H5561–63, H5568–69**

Pocan amendment (No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–230) that sought to exempt the Department of Veterans Affairs from the requirements of this legislation, in regards to rulemaking for the availability of affordable medication and effective healthcare management for veterans (by a recorded vote of 167 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 480). **Pages H5563–64, H5569–70**

H. Res. 380, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 427) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 167 noes, Roll No. 471, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 240 yeas to 167 nays, Roll No. 470. **Pages H5543–44**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:25 p.m. and reconvened at 4:55 p.m. **Page H5564**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Monday, July 27th:

Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2015: H.R. 675, amended, to increase, effective as of December 1, 2015, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 409 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 472. **Page H5545**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To increase, effective as of December 1, 2015, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, to improve the processing of claims by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.". **Page H5545**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 387, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H5572**

Official Objectors for the Private Calendar for the 114th Congress: On behalf of the Majority and Minority leadership, the Chair announced the following official objectors for the Private Calendar for the 114th Congress: Representatives Goodlatte, Sensenbrenner, and Gowdy for the Majority and Representatives Serrano, Nadler, and Bass for the Minority. **Page H5572**

Commission on Care—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Democratic Leader, in which she appointed Mr. Michael Blecker of San Francisco, California to the Commission on Care. **Page H5574**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and eleven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5543–44, H5544–45, H5545, H5564–65, H5565–66, H5566, H5566–67, H5567–68, H5568, H5568–69, H5569–70, H5571, and H5571–72. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGETING

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "First Principles of Congressional Budgeting". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

REVIEWING THE POLICIES AND PRIORITIES OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Reviewing the Policies and Priorities of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services". Testimony was heard from Sylvia Mathews Burwell, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

CONTINUING CONCERNS WITH THE FEDERAL SELECT AGENT PROGRAM: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SHIPMENTS OF LIVE ANTHRAX

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Continuing Concerns with the Federal Select Agent Program: Department of Defense Shipments of Live Anthrax". Testimony was heard from D. Christian Hassell, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Chemical and Biological Defense, Department of Defense; Dan Sosin, Deputy Director, Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Gregory Demske, Chief Counsel to the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; and Marcia Crosse, Director, Healthcare, Government Accountability Office.

CONTINUED OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Continued Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission''. Testimony was heard from Tom Wheeler, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; and Ajit Pai, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

THE DODD–FRANK ACT FIVE YEARS LATER: ARE WE MORE PROSPEROUS?

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Dodd-Frank Act Five Years Later: Are We More Prosperous?''. Testimony was heard from former Senator Phil Gramm; former Member R. Bradley Miller; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 766, the ''Financial Institution Customer Protection Act of 2015''; H.R. 1210, the ''Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act''; H.R. 1317, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes; H.R. 1553, the ''Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act of 2015''; H.R. 1737, the ''Reforming CFPB Indirect Auto Financing Guidance Act''; H.R. 1839, the ''Reforming Access for Investments in Startup Enterprises Act of 2015''; H.R. 1941, the ''Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act''; H.R. 2091, the ''Child Support Assistance Act of 2015''; H.R. 2243, the ''Equity in Government Compensation Act of 2015''; H.R. 2643, the ''State Licensing Efficiency Act of 2015''; H.R. 2912, the ''Centennial Monetary Commission Act of 2015''; H.R. 3032, the ''Securities and Exchange Commission Reporting Modernization Act''; H.R. 3189, the ''Fed Oversight Reform and Modernization Act of 2015''; and H.R. 3192, the ''Homebuyers Assistance Act''.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT: THE ADMINISTRATION'S CASE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Iran Nuclear Agreement: The Administration's Case''. Testimony was heard from John Kerry, Secretary of State, Department of State; Jacob Lew, Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the Treasury; and Ernest Moniz, Secretary of Energy, Department of Energy.

THE IRAN–NORTH KOREA STRATEGIC ALLIANCE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade; Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific; and Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, held a joint hearing entitled ''The Iran-North Korea Strategic Alliance''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROMOTING AND INCENTIVIZING CYBERSECURITY BEST PRACTICES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held a hearing entitled ''Promoting and Incentivizing Cybersecurity Best Practices''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AMERICA'S GROWING HEROIN EPIDEMIC

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''America's Growing Heroin Epidemic''. Testimony was heard from Michael Botticelli, Director, White House Office of National Drug Policy Center; John (Jack) Riley, Acting Deputy Administrator, Drug Enforcement Association; Nancy G. Parr, Commonwealth Attorney, City of Chesapeake, Virginia; and Angela R. Pacheco, First Judicial District Attorney, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

ACCOUNTABILITY, POLICIES, AND TACTICS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND FOREST SERVICE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Accountability, Policies, and Tactics of Law Enforcement within the Department of Interior and Forest Service''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Federal Implementation of the Coastal Zone Management Act''. Testimony was heard from Holly A. Bamford, Acting Assistant Secretary for Conservation and Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and public witnesses.

IMPACT OF THE BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, AND SANCTIONS MOVEMENT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled ''Impact of the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

VA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015; SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND VETERANS HEALTH CARE CHOICE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Committee on Rules: Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1994, the ''VA Accountability Act of 2015''; and H.R. 3236, the ''Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015''. The committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a structured rule for H.R. 1994. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs now printed in the bill and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule also grants a closed rule for H.R. 3236. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Chairman Miller of Florida, Chairman Shuster, Representatives Takano, Brown of Florida, Heck of Washington, Fincher.

EXPLORATION OF THE SOLAR SYSTEM: FROM MERCURY TO PLUTO AND BEYOND

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Exploration of the Solar System: From Mercury to Pluto and Beyond''. Testimony was heard from John Grunsfeld, Associate Administrator, Science Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Robert Pappalardo, Study Scientist, Europa Mission Concept, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled ''A Hearing on the Federal Radionavigation Plan, H.R. 1684, the Foreign Spill Protection Act, and H.R. ____, the National Icebreaker Fund Act of 2015''. Testimony was heard from Gary C. Rasicot, Director of Marine Transportation Systems, U.S. Coast Guard; Mary E. Landry, Director of Incident Management and Preparedness, U.S. Coast Guard; Karen Van Dyke, Director of Positioning, Navigation and Timing and Spectrum Management, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, Department of Transportation; and a public witness.

RURAL HEALTH CARE DISPARITIES CREATED BY MEDICARE REGULATIONS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing to discuss rural health care disparities created by Medicare regulations. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IRAN

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing on Iran. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

DYNAMIC SCORING

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine dynamic scoring, focusing on how it will affect fiscal policymaking, after receiving testimony from former Senator Phil Gramm; John L. Buckley, former Chief of Staff to the Joint Committee on Taxation, and Kevin A. Hassett, American Enterprise Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; and John W. Diamond, Rice University Baker Institute for Public Policy, Houston, Texas.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the impacts of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) on United States interests and the military balance in the Middle East, 9:45 a.m., SD–G50.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine best practices at public and private shipyards, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection, to hold hearings to examine the role of bankruptcy reform in addressing too-big-to-fail, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine wireless broadband and the future of spectrum policy, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to continue consideration of an original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, S. 133, to approve and implement the Klamath Basin agreements, to improve natural resource management, support economic development, and sustain agricultural production in the Klamath River Basin in the public interest and the interest of the United States, S. 145, to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown, S. 146, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, S. 329, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 403, to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, S. 521, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of President Station in Baltimore, Maryland, S. 583, to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, S. 593, to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets, S. 610, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of P.S. 103 in West Baltimore, Maryland and for other purposes, S. 720, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, S. 873, to designate the wilderness within the Lake Clark National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska as the Jay S. Hammond Wilderness Area, S. 1103, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Clark Canyon Dam, S. 1104, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam, S. 1240, to designate the Cerro del Yuta and Rio San Antonio Wilderness Areas in the State of New Mexico, S. 1305, to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir, S. 1483, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the James K. Polk Home in Columbia, Tennessee, as a unit of the National Park System, S. 1694, to amend Public Law 103–434 to authorize Phase III of the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project for the purposes of improving water management in the Yakima River basin, and an original bill to provide for reforms of the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider the nominations of Vanessa Lorraine Allen Sutherland, of Virginia, to be Chairperson of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years, Kristen Marie Kulinowski, of New York, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years, Gregory Guy Nadeau, of Maine, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, and Eric Martin Satz, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2018, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. 284, to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, S. 1632, to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram, an original bill entitled, ''Afghanistan Accountability Act'', and the nominations of Michele Thoren Bond, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Consular Affairs), and Sarah Elizabeth Mendelson, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, both of the District of Columbia, Sheila Gwaltney, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kyrgyz Republic, Perry L. Holloway, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana, Laura Farnsworth Dogu, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua, Peter F. Mulrean, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Haiti, Paul Wayne Jones, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Poland, Gayle Smith, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, Kathleen Ann Doherty, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cyprus, James Desmond Melville, Jr., of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Estonia, Samuel D. Heins, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Norway, all of the Department of State, and routine lists in the Foreign Service; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation, to hold hearings to examine the financial crisis in Greece, focusing on implications and lessons learned, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on combating campus sexual assault, 9 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Department of Homeland Security Border Security Metrics Act of 2015'', an original bill entitled, ''Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2015'', an original bill entitled, ''EINSTEIN Act of 2015'', S. 1073, to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, an original bill entitled, ''Quarterly Financial Reporting Reauthorization Act of 2015'', S. 1607, to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, S. 1526, to amend title 10 and title 41, United States Code, to improve the manner in which Federal contracts for construction and design services are awarded, to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements, to amend title 31 and 41, United States Code, to improve the payment protections available to construction contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers for work performed, S. 1820, to require agencies to publish an advance notice of proposed rule making for major rules, S. 1817, to improve the effectiveness of major rules in accomplishing their regulatory objectives by promoting retrospective review, S. 1808, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a Northern Border threat analysis, S. 779, to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency, S. Res. 104, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the success of Operation Streamline and the importance of prosecuting first time illegal border crossers, S. 708, to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, S. 1170, to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, H.R. 1531, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, an original bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the ''Lieutenant Colonel James 'Maggie' Megellas Post Office'', S. 1596, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2082 Stringtown Road in Grove City, Ohio, as the ''Specialist Joseph W. Riley Post Office Building'', and the nomination of Denise Turner Roth, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of General Services, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 383, to provide for Indian trust asset management reform, and S. 732, to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes, to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the true costs of alcohol and drug abuse in Native communities, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Judiciary: Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts, to hold hearings to examine IRS targeting, focusing on progress of agency reforms and congressional options, 2 p.m., SD–106.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: business meeting to consider S. 1400, to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses, S. 1756, to help small businesses take advantage of energy efficiency, S. 1857, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, S. 1866, to establish the veterans' business outreach center program, to improve the programs for veterans of the Small Business Administration, an original bill entitled, ''A Sense of the Committee on the Small Business Tax Compliance Relief Act of 2015'', and an original bill entitled, ''Veterans Entrepreneurial Transition Act of 2015'', Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine ending veteran homelessness, 2:30 p.m., SR–418.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Dodd-Frank Turns Five: Assessing the Progress of Global Derivatives Reforms'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Potential Implications in the Region of the Iran Deal'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 985, ''Concrete Masonry Products Research, Education, and Promotion Act of 2015''; H.R. 3154, ''E-Warranty Act of 2015''; H.R. 1344, ''Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2015''; H.R. 1462, ''Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015''; H.R. 1725, ''National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Authorization Act of 2015''; and H.R. 2820, ''Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Reauthorization Act of 2015'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 766, the ''Financial Institution Customer Protection Act of 2015''; H.R. 1210, the ''Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act''; H.R. 1317, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes; H.R. 1553, the ''Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act of 2015''; H.R. 1737, the ''Reforming CFPB Indirect Auto Financing Guidance Act''; H.R. 1839, the ''Reforming Access for Investments in Startup Enterprises Act of 2015''; H.R. 1941, the ''Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act''; H.R. 2091, the ''Child Support Assistance Act of 2015''; H.R. 2243, the ''Equity in Government Compensation Act of 2015''; H.R. 2643, the ''State Licensing Efficiency Act of 2015''; H.R. 2912,

the ''Centennial Monetary Commission Act of 2015''; H.R. 3032, the ''Securities and Exchange Commission Reporting Modernization Act''; H.R. 3189, the ''Fed Oversight Reform and Modernization Act of 2015''; and H.R. 3192, the ''Homebuyers Assistance Act'' (continued), 9 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Women Under ISIS Rule: From Brutality to Recruitment'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled ''Threats to Press Freedom in the Americas'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Aviation Security Challenges: Is TSA ready for the threats of today?'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, hearing entitled ''Internet of Things'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Federal Agencies' Selective Enforcement of ESA Consultation'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''EPA Mismanagement, Part II'', 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Information Technology; and Subcommittee on Government Operations, joint hearing entitled ''DATA Act Implementation'', 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled ''A Review of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Licensing Process'', 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 22, Hire More Heroes Act. At 10 a.m., Senate will vote on or in relation to a series of amendments to H.R. 22, followed by a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill.

Following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 22, Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Allison Beck, of the District of Columbia, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director, Jeffrey Michael Prieto, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and Carol Fortine Ochoa, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration, and vote on confirmation of the nominations.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 29

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 1994—VA Accountability Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.R. 3236—Highway Trust Fund Extension (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1136, E1137, E1138
Barr, Andy, Ky., E1142
Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E1143
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1147, E1152
Blum, Rod, Iowa, E1149, E1150, E1153
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1141
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E1148, E1152
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E1139
Carter, Earl L. ''Buddy'', Ga., E1149, E1153
Castor, Kathy, Fla., E1136
Clay, Wm. Lacy, Mo., E1149
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1144, E1145, E1145
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1145
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1146, E1151
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E1150, E1151
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1136
Foxx, Virginia, N.C., E1141
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E1145
Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E1143
Granger, Kay, Tex., E1135
Heck, Joseph J., Nev., E1142
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1135
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E1146
Israel, Steve, N.Y., E1135
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1139, E1150
Kato, John, N.Y., E1136
Kilmer, Derek, Wash., E1139
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1139
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E1147
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1143
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E1141
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E1145
Messer, Luke, Ind., E1142
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E1149
Olson, Pete, Tex., E1145, E1146, E1152
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1137
Pittenger, Robert, N.S., E1141
Renacci, James B., Ohio, E1143
Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E1148, E1152
Russell, Steve, Okla., E1135
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E1153
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1140
Shimkus, John, Ill., E1136
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E1140
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1137
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1140
Torres, Norma J., Calif., E1144
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1150
Walden, Greg, Ore., E1140
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1145
Yoder, Kevin, Kans., E1144
Young, David, Iowa, E1144, E1145, E1146, E1146, E1147, E1148, E1148, E1149, E1150, E1151

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.