House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, June 8, 2016.
I hereby appoint the Honorable Mike Bost to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Brian Britton, The Dwelling Place Churches, Williamsburg, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, today we are thankful for Your great grace and faithfulness toward our Nation and its leaders. It is my prayer that You would continue to bless this Congress with Your wisdom, insight, and increased revelation of Your will for this land and its people.

May Your holy spirit guide us into a greater unity with You and with each other. Shed Your light on the pressing issues of this day in such a way that Your glory would increase in the Earth.

Open eyes to see what needs to be seen, ears to hear what needs to be heard, and grant each leader here the courage to do what needs to be done and to say what needs to be said.

Today I declare that this Nation will continue to be a beacon of light, hope, prosperity, justice, and liberty to all the peoples of the Earth.

In Jesus’ name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. HURT of Virginia 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND BRIAN BRITTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize today’s guest chaplain, Reverend Brian Britton, and thank him for delivering this morning’s invocation.

Reverend Britton serves as the senior pastor of The Dwelling Place Church in Williamsburg, Virginia, where he lives with his wife, Valerie, and daughter, Anastasia. In addition to his work in the First District, Reverend Britton pastors a church in Richmond, Virginia, and travels internationally to act as a missionary to communities in Africa, South America, and Central Asia. Pastor Britton will be leaving tomorrow to pursue his work in Africa.

Our Nation was built on a foundation of faith. Through Reverend Britton, we can all see firsthand how God uses his ministry to eternally impact the lives of men, women, and children of his church, of his community, of his Commonwealth, and of this world.

Thank you, Reverend Britton, for your prayer this morning, and for acting as a spiritual leader to those of the First District. May God continue to bless the Britton family, our Commonwealth, and our country.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

Hon. Paul D. Ryan,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 3(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 8, 2016 at 9:27 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 119.

That the Senate passed S. 2487.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment S. 2536.

That the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 58.

That the Senate passed S. 2537.

That the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 59.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment S. 2533.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment S. 2534.

Sincerely,

Karen L. Haas.
The Speaker, pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The Speaker, pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, May 26, 2016, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 10 o’clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.
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JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY NARENDRA MODI, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o’clock and 50 minutes a.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The Speaker. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Narendra Modi into the House:

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Scalise);

The gentlemanwoman from Washington (Ms. Mora Raskin);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Walden);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Messer);

The gentleman from Kansas (Ms. Jenkins);

The gentleman from California (Mr. Royce);

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Holding);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Wilson);

The gentlemanwoman from Wyoming (Mrs. Lummis);

The gentleman from California (Ms. Pratiksha)

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Hoyer);

The gentleman from California (Mr. Becerra);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. Crowley);

The gentleman from California (Mr. Beira);

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDermott);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pallone);

The gentlemanwoman from Hawaii (Ms. Gabbard);

The gentlemanwoman from New York (Mrs. Lowey);

The gentleman from Maryland (Ms. Edwards);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen); and

The gentlemanwoman from California (Ms. Eshoo);

The Vice President. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Narendra Modi into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McConnell);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. Cornyn);

The Senator from Utah (Mr. Hatch);

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. Blunt);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso);

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Corker);

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. Portman);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. Murray);

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow);

The Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar); and

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. Cardin).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Her Excellency Hunainah Sultan Ahmed Al Mughairy, the Sultana of Oman.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for her.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker’s rostrum.

At 11 o’clock and 13 minutes a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India.

The Prime Minister of the Republic of India, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk’s desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The Speaker. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Prime Minister Modi, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of the U.S. Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored by the invitation to address this joint meeting of the U.S. Congress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for opening the door of this magnificent Capitol. This temple of democracy has encouraged and empowered other democracies the world over.

It manifests the spirit of this great Nation which, in Abraham Lincoln’s words, “was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.”

In granting me this opportunity, you have honored the world’s largest democracy and its 1.25 billion people. As a representative of the world’s largest democracy, it is, indeed, a privilege to speak to the leaders of its oldest.

Speaker, 2 days ago I honor my visit by going to the Arlington National Cemetery, the final resting place of many brave soldiers of this great land. I honored their courage and sacrifice for the ideals of freedom and democracy.

It was also the 72nd anniversary of the D-day. On that day, thousands from this great country fought to protect the torch of liberty. They sacrificed their lives so that the world lives in freedom. I applaud the great sacrifices of the men and women from the land of the free and the home of the brave in service of mankind.

India knows what this means because our soldiers have fallen in distant battlefields for the same ideals. That is why the threads of freedom and liberty form a strong bond between our two democracies.

Mr. Speaker, our nations may have been shaped by differing histories, cultures, and faiths. Yet, our belief in democracy for our nations and liberty for our countrymen is common.

The idea that all citizens are created equal is a central pillar of the American Constitution. Our founding fathers, too, shared the same belief and sought individual liberty for every citizen of India. There were many who doubted India when, as a newly independent nation, we reposed our faith in democracy. Indeed, wagers were made on our failure. But the people of India did not waver.

Our founders created a modern nation with freedom, democracy, and
equality as the essence of its soul. And, in doing so, they ensured that we continued to celebrate our age-old diversity.

Today, across its individuals and institutions, in its villages and cities, in its states and its states, anchored in equal respect for all faiths, and in the melody of hundreds of its languages and dialects, India lives as one; India grows as one; India celebrates as one.

Mr. Speaker, modern India is in its 70th year. For my government, the constitution is its real holy book. And, in that holy book, freedom of faith, speech and franchise, and equality of all citizens, regardless of background, are enshrined as fundamental rights. Eight hundred million of my countrymen may exercise the freedom of franchise once every 5 years. But all the 1.25 billion of our citizens have freedom from fear, a freedom they exercise every day.

Distinguished Members, engagement between our two democracies has been visible in the manner in which our thinkers impacted one another and shaped the course of our societies. Thoreau’s nonviolent disobedience influenced our political thoughts. And, similarly, the call by the great sage of India, Swami Vivekananda, to embrace humanity was most famously delivered in Chicago.

Gandhi’s nonviolence inspired the heroism of Martin Luther King. Today, a mere distance of 3 miles separates the Martin Luther King Memorial at the Tidal Basin from the statue of Gandhi at Massachusetts Avenue. This proximity of their memorials in Washington mirrors the closeness of ideals and values they believed in.

The genius of Dr. Bhimrao “Babasaheb” Ambedkar was nurtured in the years he spent at the Columbia University a century ago. The impact of the U.S. Constitution on him was reflected in his drafting of the Indian constitution some three decades later.

Our independence was ignited by the same ideals that fueled your struggle for freedom. No wonder, then, that former Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, called India and the U.S. “natural allies.” No wonder that the shared ideals and common philosophy of freedom shaped the bedrock of our ties. No wonder, then, that President Obama has called our ties the defining partnership of the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, more than 15 years ago, Prime Minister Vajpayee stood here and gave a call to step out of the “shadow of hesitation” of the past. The pages of our friendship since then tell a remarkable story.

Today, our relationship has overcome the limitations of history. Comfort, candor, and convergence define our conversations. Through the cycle of elections and transitions of administrations, the intensity of our engagements has only grown. And, in this exciting journey, the U.S. Congress has acted as its compass. You helped us turn barriers into bridges of partnership.

In the fall of 2008, when the Congress passed the India-U.S. Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, it changed the very colors of leaves of our relationship. We thank you for being there when the partnership needed you the most.

You have also stood by us in times of sorrow. India will never forget the solidarity shown by the U.S. Congress when terrorists from across our border attacked Mumbai in November of 2008. And for this, we are grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the working of the U.S. Congress is harmonious. I am also told that you are well known for your bipartisanship. Well, you are right, and you are not alone. And, again, I have also witnessed a similar spirit in the Indian Parliament, especially in our upper House. So, as you can see, we have many shared practices.

Mr. Speaker, as this country knows well, every journey has its pioneers. Very early on, they shaped a development partnership, even when the meeting ground was more limited. The genius of Norman Borlaug brought the Green Revolution and food security to my country. The excellence of the American universities nurtured institutions of technology and management in India. And I could go on, but fast forward to the present.

The embrace of our partnership extends to the totality of human endeavor, from the depths of the oceans to the vastness of the space. Our science and technology collaboration continues to help us in solving pressing problems in the fields of public health, education, food, and agriculture.

Ties of commerce and investment are flourishing. We trade more with the U.S. than with any other nation. And the flow of goods, services, and capital between us generates jobs in both our societies.

As in trade, so in defense. India exercises with the United States more than we do with any other partner. Defense purchases have moved from almost zero to $10 billion in less than a decade. Our cooperation also secures our cities and citizens from terrorists, and protects our infrastructure from ever-mounting cyber threats. Civil nuclear cooperation, as I told President Obama yesterday, is a reality.

Mr. Speaker, our people-to-people links are strong. There is a close cultural connect between our societies. SIRI—yes, you are familiar with the SIRI. SIRI tells us that India’s ancient heritage of yoga has over 30 million practitioners in the U.S. Time estimated that more Americans bend for yoga than to throw a curve ball.

And, no, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet claimed intellectual property right on yoga.

Connecting our two nations is also a unique and dynamic bridge of 3 million Indian Americans. Today, they are among your best CEOs, academics, astronauts, scientists, economists, doctors, engineers, and entrepreneurs.

They are your strength. They are also the pride of India. They symbolize the best of both of our societies.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding of your great country began long before I entered public office. Long before assuming office, I traveled coast to coast, covering more than 25 States of America.

I realized then that the real strength of the U.S. was in the dreams of its people and the boldness of their ambitions.

Today, Mr. Speaker, a similar spirit animates India. Our 800 million youth are especially impatient. India is undergoing a profound social and economic change.

A billion of its citizens are already politically empowered. My dream is to economically empower them through many social and economic transformations and do so by 2022, the 75th anniversary of India’s independence.

My to-do list is long and ambitious but, you will understand, it includes: a vibrant rural economy with a robust farm sector; a roof over each head and electricity for all; skill millions of our youth; build 100 smart cities; have broadband for a billion, and connect our villages to the digital world; and create a 21st century rail, road, and port infrastructure.

These are not just aspirations: they are goals to be reached in a finite time frame, and to be achieved with a light carbon footprint, with greater emphasis on renewables.

Mr. Speaker, in every sector of India’s forward march, I see the U.S. as an indispensable partner. Many of you also believe that a stronger and prosperous India is in America’s strategic interest.

Let us work together to convert shared ideals into practical cooperation. There can be no doubt that, in advancing this relationship, both nations stand to gain.

As the U.S. businesses search for new areas of economic growth, markets for their goods, a pool of skilled resources, and a global location to produce and manufacture, India could be their ideal partner.

India’s strong economy and growth rate of 7.6 percent per annum is creating a new opportunity for our mutual prosperity.

Transformative American technologies in India and growing investment by Indian companies in the United States both have a positive impact on the lives of our citizens. Today, for their global research and development centers, India is the destination of choice for the U.S. companies.

Looking eastward from India, across the Pacific, the innovation strength of our two countries comes together in California. Here, the innovative genius of America and India’s intellectual creativity are working to shape new industries of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the 21st century has brought with it great opportunities, but it has also come with its own set of challenges.

While some parts of the world are islands of growing economic prosperity,
others are mired in conflicts. In Asia, the absence of an agreed security architecture creates uncertainty. Threats of terror are expanding, and new challenges are emerging in cyber and outer space.

And global institutions conceived in the 20th century seem unable to cope with new challenges or take on new responsibilities. In this world full of multiple transitions and economic opportunities, growing uncertainties and political complexities, existing threats and new challenges, our engagement can make a difference by promoting: cooperation, not dominance; connectivity, not isolation; inclusive, not exclusive, mechanisms; respect for global commons; and, above all, adherence to international rules and norms.

India is already assuming her responsibilities in securing the Indian Ocean region. A strong India-U.S. partnership can anchor peace, prosperity, and stability from Asia to Africa and from the Indian Ocean to the Pacific. It can also help ensure security of the sea lanes of commerce and freedom of navigation on the seas. But the effectiveness of our cooperation would increase if international institutions, framed with the mind-set of the 20th century, were to reflect the realities of today.

Mr. Speaker, before arriving in Washington, D.C., I had visited Herat, in western Afghanistan, to inaugurare the Afghanistan-Pakistan Friendship Dam built with Indian assistance. I was also there on Christmas Day last year to dedicate to that proud nation its Parliament, a testimony to our democratic ties.

Afghans naturally recognize that the sacrifices of Americans have helped create a better life, but your contribution in keeping the region safe and secure is deeply appreciated even beyond.

India, too, has made an enormous contribution and sacrifices to support our friendship with the Afghan people. A commitment to rebuild a peaceful, stable, and prosperous Afghanistan is our shared objective.

Yet, distinguished Members, not just in Afghanistan, but elsewhere in south Asia and globally, terrorism remains the biggest threat. In the territory stretching from west of India’s border to Africa, it may go by different names, from Lashkar-e-Taiba, to Taliban, to ISIS, but its philosophy is common: of hate, murder, and violence. Although, its shadow is spreading across the world, it is incubated in India’s neighborhood.

I commend the Members of the U.S. Congress for sending a clear message to those who preach and practice terrorism for political gains. Refusing to reward them is the first step towards holding them accountable for their actions.

The fight against terrorism has to be fought at many levels, and the traditional tools of military, intelligence, or diplomacy alone would not be able to win this fight.

Mr. Speaker, we have both lost civilians and soldiers in combating terrorism. The need of the hour is for us to deepen our security cooperation and base it on a policy that isolates those who harbor, support, and sponsor terrorists; that does not distinguish between “good” and “bad” terrorists; and that delinks religion from terrorism.

Also, for us to succeed, those who believe in humanity must come together to fight for it as one, and speak against this menace in one voice. Terrorism must be delegitimized.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of our partnership are not just to the nations and regions that need it most. On our own, and by combining our capacities, we are also responding to other global challenges, including when disaster strikes and where humanitarian relief is needed. Far from our shores, we evacuated thousands from Yemen—Indians, Americans, and others. Nearer home, we were the first responders during Nepal’s earthquake, in the Maldives water crisis, and, most recently, during the landslide in Sri Lanka.

We are also one of the largest contributors of troops to U.N. peacekeeping operations. Often, India and the U.S. have combined their strengths in science, technology, and innovation to help fight hunger, poverty, diseases, and illiteracy in different parts of the world. The India-U.S. partnership is also opening up new opportunities for learning, security, and development from Asia to Africa.

And the protection of the environment and caring for the planet is central to our shared vision of a just world. For us in India, to live in harmony with Mother Earth is part of our ancient belief, and to take from nature only what is most essential is part of our Indian culture.

Our partnership, therefore, aims to balance responsibilities with capabilities, and focus on new ways to increase the availability and use of renewable energy.

A strong U.S. support for our initiative to form an International Solar Alliance is one such effort. We are working together not just for a better future for ourselves, but for the whole world. This has also been the goal of our efforts in G20, East Asia Summit, and climate change summits.

Mr. Speaker, as we deepen our partnership, there would be times when we would have differing perspectives; but since our interests and concerns converge, the autonomy in decisionmaking and diversity in our perspectives can only add value to our partnership.

So, as we embark on a new journey and seek new goals, let us focus not just on matters routine, but also transformative ideas which can focus not just on creating wealth, but also creating value for our societies; not just on immediate gains, but also long-term benefits; not just on sharing best practices, but also shaping partnerships; and not just on building a bright future for our peoples, but in being a bridge to a more united, humane, and prosperous world.

And important for the success of this journey would be a need to view it with new eyes and new sensitivities. When we do this, we will realize the full promise of this extraordinary relationship.

Mr. Speaker, in my final thoughts and words, let me emphasize that our relationship is primed for a momentous future. The constraints of the past are behind us, and foundations of the future are firmly in place.

In the lines of Walt Whitman: “The orchestra have sufficiently tuned their instruments; the baton has given the signal. And to that, if I might add, there is a new symphony in play.”

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, and distinguished Members, for this honor.

Thank you very much.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 12 o’clock and 11 minutes p.m., His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President’s Cabinet:

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The Speaker, the purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The Speaker. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.
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AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Collins of New York) at 12 o’clock and 46 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. Woodall. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.
PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4775, OZONE STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 89, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETERIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 112, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS OPPOSING THE PRESIDENT’S PROPOSED $10 TAX ON EVERY BARREL OF OIL

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 767 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 767
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 of the Whole House of the United States for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes, on its first reading, and if the bill is not ordered on the bill and amendments thereto shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider 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 Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. 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 Energy and Commerce. 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 Energy and Commerce. 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 Energy and Commerce.

The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered ordered and the concurrent resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Providing for a structured procedure for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes.

Section 1. The concurrent resolutions referred to in section 2 of this resolution are as follows:

(1) The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

(2) The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President’s proposed $10 tax on every barrel of oil.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as the agreement. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

General leave

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was none.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 767 provides a structured rule for the consideration of three bills. You heard the reading Clerk read them, but I will read them again: H.R. 4775, Ozone Standards Implementation Act; H. Con. Res. 89, Expressing the Sense of Congress that a Carbon Tax would be Deterimental to the United States Economy; and, H. Con. Res. 112, Expressing the Sense of Congress Opposing the President’s Proposed $10 Tax on Every Barrel of Oil.

It is a little unusual that we put three different bills into a single rule, but today has been a bit of an unusual day. It has been a bit of an unusual day.

Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to you, standing not 3 feet from where you were just 30 minutes ago was the leader of a democracy of 1.3 billion people. That is Mr. Kumar Patel, the 35th in the midst of his remarks, he commented on the reputation of the United States Congress, known far and wide around the globe. He commented on the comity—that is with an i-t-y, not an e-d-y—that we have been known for. And I hope this rule will be no exception, Mr. Speaker.

We are not going to agree on all the underlying bills, all the underlying policy, but what we can agree on is that this Congress needs to have its voice heard.

If we approve this rule today—and I recommend to all of my colleagues that we do approve this rule today—we will be able to get to the underlying debate. And in the underlying debate, Mr. Speaker, we have two senses of Congress and a piece of legislation—a piece of legislation for which amendments were submitted. I am committed to ask the Rules Committee to say that we have ideas as Members of this body about how we can improve the underlying bill.

One of them came from my friend from Colorado. I don’t particularly support the idea that is put forth, but I support his right to have the idea heard on the floor of the House. This rule makes the Polis amendment in order, along with every other non-duplicative amendment submitted. I add non-duplicative because virtually the same amendment was submitted by two different Members and we decided to debate it once instead of twice, as is customary.

We are going to disagree, but we are going to have the debate over those disagreements. And my great hope is that the work product we will produce will be a stronger work product because we have had an opportunity to discuss it here on the floor. My great hope is that, after we have had the chance to perfect that work product, we will send it on to the Senate with a big bipartisan vote from both parties.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to talk about taxes as if they don’t come from somebody. When we have an academic conversation about tax policy, what is the saying? Don’t tax him, don’t tax me, tax the man behind that tree.

What people like to have the folks say: You are always trying to put the tax burden on somebody else.

What the President proposed was $10 a barrel on every barrel of oil consumed in America. Now, historically, we have had some low oil prices of late. That $10 a barrel tax would have amounted to almost a 50 percent increase in the cost of a barrel of oil. Today it is going to be closer to a 20 percent increase in the cost of a barrel of oil.

This tax is implemented in the name of what, Mr. Speaker? It is in the name of improving our failing infrastructure because we do need to improve our failing infrastructure. We do have to have a conversation about user fees in this country and how it is we are going to build the best logistical system the world has ever known. But that is not what this tax was about.

This is a tax that is part of what has been a long campaign against the consumption of any fossil fuels whatsoever. My great frustration, Mr. Speaker, is that if your goal is to reduce the consumption of fossil fuels, you can have a lot of ways we can do that. We have a lot of very reasonable ways we can do that. And this proposal makes no effort to try to find the most efficient way to make that happen. It is a blanket $10 a barrel point across the board.

If you are using that barrel of oil to generate space-age plastics, Mr. Speaker, and you are going to use those
space-age plastics to build the most efficient photovoltaic cell array the world has ever known, such as is going on in my district, there is no special dispensation for you.

In the name of trying to create a better environment for the world, we need to encourage industries to do it. That is an opportunity today for all of us. We will not have an opportunity tomorrow, with one more person, one more body. I hope we will speak with one voice in supporting this rule and speak with one voice in supporting the three underlying resolutions.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am excited to be here today discussing one of these resolutions because it really means something when Members of Congress see fit—and I am talking about the Scalise resolution. H. Con. Res. 89, to say they are against a particular proposal.

Quite honestly, this is the first sign of momentum for a carbon tax cut. And you will hear me referring to it as a carbon tax cut because what it is. It is using carbon tax revenues to cut taxes for the American people, for American businesses.

You don't see these kinds of resolutions if a concept and an idea don't have momentum. For instance, my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) has long been a champion of a proposal to create a sales tax here in our country, a national sales tax of 19, 20 percent, and he is welcome to talk about it on his own time.

But I think the gentleman will acknowledge, much to his frustration, that that idea does not seem to be advancing. Now, were it advancing, you might very well see this kind of resolution saying it is not a good idea.

There are other Republicans who have ideas to raise the tax rates on low-income Americans or Americans that are so low-income they might not even be paying a Federal income tax yet. Again, those ideas don't generally have momentum, so you don't see this kind of resolution coming forward to try to stop it.

This is the first real chance that Congress has had to vote, in many ways, on the merits of a carbon tax cut and, frankly, I think that this discussion moves us forward, because I fully expect there will be bipartisan opposition to this resolution which opposes, presumably, any and all carbon tax cuts, because what you see is, the oil and gas lobby or, I should say, some segments of the oil and gas lobby because, quite frankly, many international oil and gas industry players actually support a carbon tax cut as a way of their, therefore, getting around this kind of regulatory momentum. That is why we are trying to run a strategy to try to lock people down, where, yes, maybe, 10, 5, 12 Republicans will vote for this, which is what they want to do, but they want to be able to go back and remind Republicans who vote for this now that, in the future, when we are actually moving forward with the carbon tax cut proposal, that they were already on the Record in a particular way.

That means they are worried, frankly. That is what that means in “inside the Beltway speak” and “Washington speak.”

What does that mean? It means I am excited because I ran for Congress, in part, to pass a carbon tax cut.

Let me quote some of the many prominent conservatives that have caused this resolution to come forward in many ways because of the great momentum that a carbon tax cut has.

Former Secretary of State George Shultz, Secretary of State under Ronald Reagan, said: “A carbon tax at the levels presently proposed would not unduly burden the economy, and that’s particularly true once we consider the non-climate environmental benefits that would follow from the tax as well as the benefits of any offsetting tax cuts.”

So in a moment you will hear me talk about the many benefits of this carbon tax cut concept. But what Jerry Taylor at the Niskanen Center has rightly latched onto is the economic stimulus that can actually be generated by lowering taxes on American businesses, on job creators, on middle-income families as an offset from the carbon tax cut.

Peter Van Doren of the Cato Institute says: “The obvious lesson from economics is to increase fossil fuel prices enough through taxation to account for these effects.”

My good friend, and a personal mentor of mine, Dr. Arthur Laffer, former Economic Adviser under President Reagan, said: “When you add the national security concerns, reducing our reliance on fossil fuels becomes a no brainer.” And he has spoken out in support of, again, a carbon tax cut.

Greg Mankiw, the former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to George Bush, said: “I will tell the American people that a higher tax on gasoline is better at encouraging conservation than are heavy-handed CAFE regulations,” and “I will advocate a carbon tax as the best way to control global warming.”

So, I mean, what you have is many conservatives, free market conservatives lining up to say yes, let’s cut
taxes and let’s do it by passing a carbon tax cut.

I have a letter, Mr. Speaker, that I will include in the RECORD, signed by Niskanen Center, Republican, American Enterprise Institute, R Street Institute, Evangelical Environmental Network to this resolution by Representative Scalise.

In fact, in part, this letter says, which will be available in the RECORD:

“The least burdensome, most straightforward, and most market-friendly means of addressing climate change is to price the risks imposed by greenhouse gas emissions via a tax.”

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, Later this week Congress will take up a resolution sponsored by Congressman Scalise (R-LA) that expresses the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the economy of the United States. We are concerned that this resolution offers a limited perspective on carbon taxes and is blind to the potential benefits of market-based climate policy. Legislation that incorporates a carbon tax could not only raise revenue and tax reform to make the United States economy more competitive, innovative, and robust, benefiting both present and future generations.

We recognize that a carbon tax, like any tax, will impose economic costs. But climate change is also imposing economic costs. This resolution falls short by recognizing the cost of action without considering the cost of staying on our current policy course. There are, of course, uncertainties about the future cost of climate change and, likewise, the cost associated with a carbon tax (much would depend on program design and the pace and nature of technological progress). The move forward, however, is clear. A recent survey of economists who publish in leading peer-reviewed journals on these matters found that 93% believe that a meaningful policy response to climate change is warranted.

The least burdensome, most straightforward, and most market-friendly means of addressing climate change is to price the risks imposed by greenhouse gas emissions via a tax. This would harness price signals, rather than regulations, to guide market response. That is why carbon pricing is gaining the support of free market economists, a majority of the global business community, and a large number of the largest multinational private companies in the world (the corporate entities among the most directly affected by climate policy).

In reaching a conclusion, this resolution neglects the fact that the United States already has a multiplicity of carbon taxes. They are imposed, however, via dozens of federal and state regulations, are invisible to consumers, imposed across industrial sectors, unnecessarily costly, and growing in size and scope. The policy choice is not if we should price carbon emissions, but how.

Unfortunately, this resolution also fails to differentiate between proposals that would impose carbon taxes on top of existing regulations by the Obama Administration’s Clean Power Plan, and proposals that would impose carbon taxes in place of those existing regulations. Conservatives and free market advocates should embrace the latter, regardless of how they view climate risks.

An economy-wide carbon tax that replaces existing regulatory interventions could reduce the cost of climate policy and stimulate the economy. It could also provide revenue to support pro-growth tax reform, including corporate income or payroll tax cuts, which could dramatically reduce overall costs on the economy. Revenues could be applied to compensate those who suffer the most from higher prices: the poor, the elderly, and individuals and families living on fixed incomes.

Unfortunately, none of those options are presently available. Members of Congress have negotiated options to design and debate market-friendly climate policies in legislation. Instead, they have yielded authority in climate policy design to the Executive Branch. By discouraging a long-overdue discussion on sensible climate pricing, this resolution frustrates the development of better policy.

Sincerely,

JERRY TAYLOR,
President, Niskanen Center

BOB INGLIS,
Executive Director, RepublicEn.

APARNA MATHUR,
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.

ELLIE TULKER,
President, R Street Institute.

THE REV. MITCHELL C. HUNTER,
President, Evangelical Environmental Network.

ALAN VIARD,
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.

Mr. POLIS. Now, let’s take this back to basic economics. The Supreme Court itself said something along the lines of: power to tax is the power to destroy. That is from an early 19th century case.

Whatever you tax, you discourage in the economy. Whatever you don’t tax, you encourage. So you have to look at what you tax. It’s important.

Let’s take an example from corporations. We tax corporate profits. Well, it turns out corporate profits are a good thing. We tax individual income, we turn out individual income is a good thing.

As policymakers, we shouldn’t seek to discourage activities that help people earn money or help companies earn money. That is exactly what we want people to do. That is exactly what we want companies to do on behalf of their shareholders and their stakeholders.

So why not take something that, regardless of what you think of the science on climate change—and that is not central to this debate on a carbon tax cut. So let’s even start from the assumption that you don’t want to look at the science. You have turned a blind eye to it. You are not at all concerned about climate change, or you don’t think it is manmade.

Let’s look, again, at carbon usage in our economy and the negative consequences of it: pollution, meaning air quality—not talking climate change—air quality, increased asthma, increased cancer risk.

National security’s concerns, reliant on importing it from foreign companies or, if we are producing it domestically, utilizing a resource that we know will return out in the very best-case scenario. It is a perishable resource. Once you take it out of the ground, it is gone.

So if we can find a way to say, you know what? We would rather have Americans of all income levels—whether they are earning $1 million a year, or $20,000 a year—we would rather have them keep more of their hard-earned money. We would rather have companies keep money in order to re-invest in job growth here, rather than seek elabo-rate tax shelters overseas, or inver-sions, where they move their corporate headquarters overseas because we have one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world.

The carbon tax cut presents us with the opportunity for pro-growth economic policies that make America more competitive and lets Americans keep more of their hard-earned money. That is what excites so many free-market conservatives and centrists about the concept of a free market, of a carbon tax cut. That is, frankly, why I think this great momentum, coming from the American Enterprise Institute, from CATO, from R Street Institute, from a lot of intellectual fuel, intellectual fuel for a carbon tax cut, that is why, sensing that, some Republicans—in this case, Mr. Scalise and his cosponsors—have brought forward as a response.

This kind of thing only happens in Washington when an idea has momentum.

I couldn’t have been more excited when I was back home recently to talk to several of my constituents who are strongly dedicated to a bipartisan solution on climate change.

Former Representative Bob Inglis actually came to my district and met with me, met with some of the leadership folks in my district about how we can do something to act on climate from a Republican perspective. And I am firmly of the belief that any action has to be bipartisan.

Just looking at the way our country is balanced, I mean, certainly, if the Democrats were in a position where we had 60 seats in the Senate, where we had a majority in the House, where we had the President, I would certainly encourage us to move forward and implement some kind of carbon tax cut; but, frankly, that is an unlikely scenario.

It is more likely that a solution will require support from both sides of the aisle, so we should be talking about what it takes to get that kind of support. That is the discussion, the national discussion that former Representative Bob Inglis has dedicated himself to and, frankly, it is the fear of that kind of discussion that has led this body to consider this resolution in opposition to a carbon tax cut that, I am proud to say, will likely have bipartisan support. Some Republicans will be some Republicans, I hope, I expect, who will stand up and say, wait a minute. I don’t want to go on the
RECORD saying I am against any kind of carbon tax cut because of the great benefit that this can provide to the American economy.

As articulated by Arthur Laffer, as articulated by R Street Institute, we have the ability, with some of that revenue, to reduce our pro-growth tax cuts to offset the income and the revenue from the carbon tax cut.

So the carbon tax cut can reduce the income tax for American families of all incomes, should point out. Democrats care that lower-income families spend a higher percentage of their income on fuel, on energy. And we have, in many of the bipartisan concept proposals that are out there, tracked tax credits and tax refunds for low-income families to make sure that anything we do is not regressive. I think that is a given.

I think, obviously, in the same week that the Speaker of the House put out his agenda on poverty, I am sure that he, and many others—the last thing they would want to do is burden lower-income Americans with any kind of additional tax. So of course we want to take care of that.

The good news is that is only a small fraction of the windfall from the carbon tax cut. It also provides sufficient revenue to reduce corporate tax rates currently among the highest in the world. Of all the developed countries, a 35 percent corporate tax rate. The developed country average is somewhere in the 18, 20 percent range last time I checked. It is one of the reasons that corporations are moving overseas. They are not repatriating their earnings because they don’t want to pay that American income tax.

In a global economy, you have to be competitive. It doesn’t mean we have to be the lowest. That is not the value proposition of our country. We have the rule of law. We have a highly educated workforce, but we have to be competitive.

So if we can find a way to reduce that corporate tax rate to 25 percent or 20 percent—I applaud the work of Dave Camp, the former Ways and Means chair last session, who boldly proposed a 25 percent income tax rate. The President of the United States, Barack Obama, has proposed a 28 percent corporate income tax rate. So in that range. And that is, by the way, without a cap on income, or without a cap on capital.

With a carbon tax cut you can go lower on the corporate income tax. You could run the numbers. You could probably get down to 20 percent. Maybe you could get down to 15 percent. It depends how you allocated it. But that is one of the reasons that excites many of the strong free market advocates of the carbon tax cut.

You could also reduce the individual tax burden for families across all income levels, after we make darn sure that the income families are not in any way disproportionately hit. And in no way is this regressive. In fact, Democrats’ preference would prefer this to be accretive for low-income families, and maybe that is something we can come together around. Certainly something that Democrats and Republicans care about are those who live in poverty and making sure that they, too, see the benefits of the windfall from the carbon tax cut.

But, of course, we are also very open—I am, and my Democratic colleagues—to sharing the benefits of the carbon tax cut across the entire spectrum of income earners, with a focus, we hope, on those with a focus, we hope, on those in poverty.

But it does provide an opportunity for Republicans who come to the table around climate, around carbon tax cut to say, you know what? Our priorities include job creators and other which, of course, we all care about job creators, we all about care about S Corps, we all care about all those things.

It is simply a matter of priorities. You have to get the revenues to run the government. And, separately, we have the discussion about what those appropriation levels are, how much we spend; we have that discussion.

Then we have to, somehow, get so much in taxes. It is a question of where it is from. And I believe it should be from things that, regardless of what you believe on climate, we want to discourage, rather than things that we want to encourage.

So if we can stop discouraging people from earning money and income, stop discouraging corporations from domiciling their earnings here, from growing, from expanding and, instead, discourage something that, even if you throw out the science on climate, is polluting, and runs out, and is a national security danger because it forces us to rely on other countries, that is something that we should discourage in our economy.

So let’s start with discussing the proposal, Mr. Speaker, I am going to address. It is simply about a Chamber saying. This is simply about a Chamber saying. This is simply about a Chamber saying. This is simply about a Chamber saying. This is simply about a Chamber saying. This is simply about a Chamber saying.
There are a lot of great ideas. It is clear—and this will probably pass—the Republicans don’t like a $10-per-barrel tax on oil, and that is fine. If you don’t like it, what do you like? How do we want to fund infrastructure? That is the crux of this concept come from the administration’s 2017 budget. Frankly, there are probably a lot of things in the President’s budget that my Republican friends don’t like. They could probably run a resolution every week and they could probably run 10 resolutions every week about things that they don’t like in the President’s budget, but that is not really a productive use of this Chamber’s time. That budget didn’t pass. As far as I know, I don’t think that budget got a single vote. It wasn’t put up this year because Republicans haven’t even put up any budgets for our body. They haven’t offered a budget. The last time the Republicans put budgets forward—and I believe the last budget, if I am not mistaken, I think the $10-per-barrel tax on oil. That was in the President’s budget for fiscal year 2017, but the prior one did not receive any votes from Democrats or Republicans.

So this vote, to the best of my knowledge because the Senate has rejected the President’s last budget. Were the Republicans to bring forward the President’s budget for 2017, they would likely—and, as has traditionally occurred, as far as I know, throughout history—overwhelmingly reject that budget.

So, in part, let me be clear, that is because we believe, I believe as a Member of Congress, that the budget is a legislative prerogative. I don’t think there has been a Presidential budget that has been passed. In fact, I and, I think, most, if not all, of my Democratic colleagues joined in opposing the President’s budget because we had our own congressional Democrats’ budget. Not only is there was two years ago in congressional Democratic budgets, and there were several Republican budgets, but that is a matter of legislative prerogative. We, of course, want to hear ideas from the chief executive, whoever she is, but we also want to implement our own budget because it is our prerogative as the United States Congress with the power of the purse to do that.

But considering the fact that Big Oil and Gas get huge tax subsidies every year, personally believe that this kind of modest oil fee is a reasonable way to look at and have in the mix when talking about how to fund infrastructure.

If there are other ideas—people have talked about vehicle miles driven, people have talked about a number of different ways. There is no Republican or Democratic road. We all drive on roads. We all need roads. We all need bridges. I know the Republicans in good faith, along with Democrats, know we need to fix our infrastructure. And if you don’t like a particular way of doing that, by all means, put other ideas on the table. But it isn’t productive, and it doesn’t move anything forward just to take one item from a President’s budget that you didn’t even allow to have a vote and that very few people support and say: We don’t like that.

Frankly, I think we knew that before you had the vote. I think we knew you didn’t like the President’s budget overall. You are welcome to have the vote. It isn’t going anywhere. It won’t pass the Senate. It isn’t a matter for actual consideration.

Next, we have the sense of Congress on the carbon tax cut. Again, I couldn’t be more excited. I have been feeling from my friends on the right that there has been more interest in this concept of a carbon tax cut. I really see that coming to fruition that it is actually serious enough and mainstream enough that those who don’t like the concept are putting up some kind of proactive defense. So I really think it is a matter of time. I think it is going to be great for American businesses, for job creators, and for middle income. We can make sure it is progressive and doesn’t additionally burden many of those in poverty. It can be a net benefit to low-income and people in poverty. I couldn’t be more excited about this concept of a carbon tax cut.

Frankly, it is the first discussion on the floor of that concept, I believe, since Republicans have taken control of this body and a harbinger of many things to come on something that can be great and, frankly, supported from across the ideological spectrum to make our country more competitive.

Finally, I want to move to what is being called the Ozone Standards Implementation. Now, this also feels like we have been here before and done that before. It feels a little bit like déjà vu because this bill essentially repackage a previous bill that passed the House under the name of the Clean Air Act. But what I think it is, is something that can be great and, frankly, supported from across the ideological spectrum to make our country more competitive.

Previously, I have introduced a bipartisan constitutional amendment that would help us move towards a balanced budget? How about improving our entitlement programs to make sure they are there for the next generation of Americans? How about passing comprehensive immigration reform to restore the order of law and allow 10 million people to come out of the shadows and work legally and abide by their responsibilities under American law that we can enforce with integrity?

I am glad that one of my amendments to the ozone bill was made in order. My colleague from Georgia mentioned that. He said he may not personally be supportive of it. I will certainly be making the case for my fourth time and hoping to gain his support, because what my amendment does is it would close an oil and gas industry loophole to the Clean Air Act’s aggregation requirement, which I will be talking more about today.

Currently, under current law, the oil and gas industry doesn’t have to aggregate its small air pollution sources, even though cumulatively they release large amounts of pollutants. Again, what that means in a district like mine where there are many fracking pads, there is, of course, an emission profile to each of these, but because they are small sites, they are not aggregated. We happen to have a county, Weld County, Colorado, with over 20,000 operating wells. When you get up to that kind of number, you can no longer round down to zero. In the aggregate, those wells look a lot more like a number of larger industrial sources that otherwise would fall under the Clean Air Act than simply small sites that can be rounded down to zero.

I couldn’t be more excited to have the opportunity to finally bring up my amendment and hopefully adopt it. We can improve the Clean Air Act instead of many of the other provisions of the bill which would eviscerate the Clean Air Act.

This is a serious issue. Between 1980 and 2015, the emissions of six air pollutants controlled by the Clean Air Act have dropped by 63 percent. That is good news. We should be doing more, not less, to encourage clean air with the long-term savings of the health of the American people as well as a reduction of costly diseases like asthma.

A recent peer-reviewed study estimates that the Clean Air Act will save more than 230,000 lives and will prevent millions of cases of respiratory problems and heart disease. Under the Clean Air Act, the provisions of the bill will delay the implementation of the updated 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards by States, a position that is opposed by a broad coalition of scientists and many other groups that care about public health.

The connection between air quality and asthma, of which our country has 25 million sufferers, is well established. Clean air is integral to quality of life, and the last thing we should do is tear down the protections that allow kids to play outside, and that allow adults to recreate outside and enjoy themselves while continuing to breathe clean air.

Again, I am not worried about this bill becoming law. It won’t pass the Senate, and, obviously, since it undoes some of President Obama’s actions somehow it was to reach his desk, I am confident that it would be vetoed.

The problems go on and on with this bill. I do hope that my amendment is included. Frankly, I don’t have to bring forward my BREATHE Act, which has over 50 co-sponsors to actually bring it forward.
for a vote and a discussion. We haven’t been able to get that floor time until now.

So, all in all, I think this is an encouraging week. On the one hand, we finally get to discuss a carbon tax cut— and also, we hope— and I realize that people are actually worried enough about this happening that they are running some kind of proactive strategy to try to lock people down. Wow, this is happening. We are going to have a carbon tax cut sometime in the next decade and more of stronger, pro-sense alternatives.

Second, I finally get the BREATHE Act, for it is an amendment to close a loophole for oil and gas in the Clean Air Act. Again, I don’t expect that to pass. I hope to have good support, and, of course, I call upon my friends to reject the underlying bills.

Instead of continuing the climate-debating work of the majority that these three bills kind of double down on, we should be focusing on creating jobs, tax reform, and growth economic policies letting American families keep more of their hard-earned income and encouraging American companies to stay put rather than move overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, when you turn on the television, when you open up a newspaper here in the election season, it seems like folks are pretty angry. I enjoy coming to this floor on rules to work with my friend from Colorado because I genuinely enjoy him. If we are going to get anything done across the aisle, I have no doubt that he is going to be a part of that solution. As you listen to his words down here today, you heard that. Time and time again, there are things we can do together, there are ways we can be better together. Let’s find some commonsense alternatives.

Sad, in an election year like this, oftentimes that is as far as the conversation goes. If you can’t fit it on a bumper sticker, you don’t have that conversation. You heard the gentleman say—for example, with respect to my own bill, the FairTax, the most widely cosponsored fundamental tax reform bill in the entire United States Congress, he had favorable things to say. But if you look at any Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee-run advertisement, they skewer the men and women who take a chance on growing the economy with the FairTax. They skewer the men and women who take a chance on repealing the taxes, the most burdensome tax on the 80 percent of American working families who have to pay it. In the name of politics, folks don’t get past the bumper sticker to the real substance.

I listen to my friend from Colorado. He gives me hope. He gives me hope that we can get past that line, Mr. Speaker. But the truth is, we have to get past the bumper sticker slogan. My friend from Colorado is going to be part of whatever fundamental tax reform change is made here. But we ought to be able to agree that just adding more taxes to an already broken system—as the President proposes—can’t possibly be the right answer.

My friend is absolutely right that we need to fund American infrastructure, and I would argue the user-fee system is the way to do it. Not repatriation, which takes completely disconnected dollars, but user fees which say that, if you are on the roads, you should pay for the roads. But that is a discussion we will have to have.

This is the right place to have that discussion. We will have that discussion time, and I hope that we will come to a conclusion.

My friend says that job creation is job one, but supports complete re-regulation of industries which is destroying jobs across this country. I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker, and it is what is so frustrating to folks back home.

Again, Prime Minister Modi stood up there and said, for 1.3 billion people, I only speak for about 700,000. But those 700,000 open up the newspaper when they get into their office on a Monday morning, trying to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, the ozone standard.

Those standards, released in 2008, finally got around to having the regulations for how to comply with them finalized in March of 2015. I will say that again. This crisis of human health that my friend has described, we identified in 2008, and the administration got around to telling folks what the rules were by March of 2015.

So all the job creators across the country began to scramble to comply with those rules. And then in October of 2015, the administration says: Oh, no, wait. We have a much better idea. Now let’s do ozone compliance, part two.

In 2008, we decided we had an issue we had to address. In March of 2015, the administration finally got around to addressing it. As soon as folks began to spend the money and the intellectual effort to comply with those rules, by October of that same year, the administration says: Oh, no. We have got a better idea. Scrap that.

When my friend reads from all of the conservative economists, the libertarian economists, the folks who care about making sure our limited resources do the most good for the American people and those folks support a carbon tax, they don’t support a carbon tax in addition to the nonsensical regulatory structure that I have just described. They support a carbon tax instead of that structure.

If we monetize harms in this country, we don’t have to have a bureaucracy that guesses at what the issues are; we don’t have to have a bureaucracy that moves not in a day or a week but takes years, almost decades, to move in the marketplace. We move quickly, and we maximize. For every dollar that compliance costs, for every dollar that environmental stewardship costs, for every dollar that NG exploration costs, we get the maximum return. For every American family, we identify the power to tax, the power to destroy. Stop destroying jobs creation. The power to tax, the power to destroy. Stop destroying American corporations and moving them overseas.

Golly, we have got opportunity to come together. I believe these three provisions before us, Mr. Speaker, are going to move us in that direction.

Make no mistake; our ozone bill that we have before us today makes every amendment from this body in order—
save one that was virtually exactly the same as another, and we didn’t want to be duplicative here of the Members’ time—made every discussion in order, including the one from the gentleman from Colorado.

The sense of Congress today says we don’t need to tax fossil fuels as an answer to anything, that taxes are just taxes; and in the absence of a coherent environmental policy, in the absence of a coherent stewardship policy, in the absence of men and women on the ground—balancing the needs of jobs and the needs of community, it is just a bumper sticker slogan.

Let’s reject bumper sticker slogans today. Let’s take advantage of the serious men and women that serve in this institution, like the gentleman from Colorado. Let’s get together and do the heavy lifting.

Mr. Speaker, if it were easy, they would have done it already. The reason you are here, the reason my friend from Colorado and the reason I am here is to do the hard things; it is to do the hard things.

What I have come to know in my 5 1⁄2 years in this institution is I have not met a man or a woman who is serious about anything but the difference this country wouldn’t take their voting card and turn it in tomorrow if they could make that kind of lasting difference that would serve not just this generation, but generations to come. I think that our opportunity is to be represented by Mr. Speaker. It is an election year, but let’s not squander it. We can make these next 8 months count for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the rule. I urge support for the underlying resolutions as well, but I urge strong support for the rule that will begin this discussion.

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

**AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 767 OFFERED BY Mr. POLIS**

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

**SEC. 4. 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 Further.** (H.R. 5044) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 to respond to Zika virus. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order on consideration of the bill being 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 Appropriations and the chair and ranking majority member of the Committee on the Budget. 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 Speaker shall permit the presentation of amendments to the bill at the Committee of the Whole resolution respecting the Committee of the Whole. After the completion of consideration of any such amendment, the Speaker shall place it in the record, without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without

**Mr. WOODALL. 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.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered; the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 3936; and agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 163, not voting 40; as follows:

**[Roll No. 273]**

**YEAS—230**
So the previous question was announced. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 273, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. HURT. Mrs. Virginia Foxx, Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 273 on Offering the Previous Question on H. Res. 767, for providing consideration of H. Con. Res. 89, expressing the sense of Congress that a car-

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

A recorded vote was taken and electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 163, not voting 35, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES—235</th>
<th>NOES—163</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Alcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adheroff</td>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amash</td>
<td>Amold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodei</td>
<td>Babin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (NJ)</td>
<td>Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirakis</td>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Blum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coble</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuellar</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (CA)</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLauro</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelBene</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSaulnier</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingell</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duckworth</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshoo</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing</td>
<td>Boustany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOT VOTING—40

Black | Deutch | Durbin | Fattah | Farr | Fincher | Grijalva | Gohmert | Honda |

Mr. COOPER changed his vote from “aye” to “nay.”
Mr. RIGELL changed his vote from “nay” to “aye.”
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MOUNT HOOD COOPER SPUR LAND EXCHANGE CLARIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3826) to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon, as amended, and ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. HEATON) 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 401, nays 2, as follows:

Yeas 401

Harris
Hartler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higginson
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelbskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Hutcheson
Himes
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (NV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, R. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katz
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (GA)
King (NY)
King (NV)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lahood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
LoBiondo
LoBiondo
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Griego (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
MacDermott
Mack
McAuliffe
McConnell
McCulley
McGovern
McIntosh
McMorris
McMichael
McNerney
McSally
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Molle
Molle
Moloney (NV)
Molle
Moulton
Muelvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Newbauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O’Rourke
Osowski
Palazzo
Pallone
Parrish
Pascrell
Perdue
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Peters
Petri
Pettengill
Pitts
Polis
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polito
Pompeo
Powers
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Price, Todd
Pratts
Pinheiro
Pingree
Piteo
Pitts
Polis
Polar
Polar
Polskin
Polskin
Pollard
Pollycove
Pond
Pond
Poe (TX)
Poser
Pompeo
Porter
Poulsen
Poulson
Pruitt
Preting
Pruitt
Pruitt
Pruitt
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reed
Reichert
Remillard
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rice (WI)
Richardson
Riggs
Rikert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Rooney (PA)
Ross
Ross
Ross
Ross
Ross
Ross
Roudy
Roy
Rubio
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sandifer
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shelton
Simmons
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swapping (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MI)
Thompson (PA)
Thompson (TN)
Tiber
Tierney
Tipton
Tivoli
Titus
Tootle
Trent
Trento
Trento
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velasquez
Vissicchio
Wagner
Walberg
Walder
Walker
Walorski
Walt
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Weber (UT)
Weinberg
Weinberg
Weisberg
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (OH)
Young (SC)
Young (TN)
Young (VA)
Young (IN)
Young (NY)
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Nays 2

NAY—2

Amaah
Griffith

Not Voting—30

Black
Bardenas
Camañino
Carson
Carte

Afini
Fincher
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Huffman
Hunter

Black
Bardenas
Camañino
Carson
Carte

Afini
Fincher
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Huffman
Hunter

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

OZONE STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4775.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House and took up the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) to
This thoughtful solution, this bill, retains the 2008 standard—yes, it does—but it provides additional time for States to comply with the new standard until after the current one has been fully implemented. It is common sense. Under this bill, we will have in place a more streamlined and effective schedule to ensure continued improvements in air quality in the years ahead.

The bill also has a number of sensible provisions to address practical implementation challenges that States face under the 2008 rules. It is nothing but common sense. Once again, we hear the false choice presented: jobs or clean air. But that is not the choice, and we have decades of experience with local and Federal policy to regulate air pollution as proof that we do not have to choose between being employed and being healthy.

This false choice is even more absurd when you consider that there is one choice we must make every day about 20,000 times to stay alive: the choice to breathe. That is the average number of breaths that each adult takes every day of his or her life. Children, whose lungs are smaller average more breaths than that; and if you are exercising, that number will understandably be higher as well. Think about it.

But the EPA failed to finalize the implementing regs and guidance for the 2008 rules in 2014. As a result, States are currently still in the process of implementing the rule. Although EPA had difficulty finalizing the 2008 regs, the Agency had no such problems coming up with a new standard. Meanwhile, success by setting out a program to achieve further reductions for many years to come.

The bill also has a number of sensible provisions to address practical implementation challenges that States face under the 2008 rules. It is nothing but common sense. Once again, we hear the false choice presented: jobs or clean air. But that is not the choice, and we have decades of experience with local and Federal policy to regulate air pollution as proof that we do not have to choose between being employed and being healthy.

This false choice is even more absurd when you consider that there is one choice we must make every day about 20,000 times to stay alive: the choice to breathe. That is the average number of breaths that each adult takes every day of his or her life. Children, whose lungs are smaller average more breaths than that; and if you are exercising, that number will understandably be higher as well. Think about it.

But the EPA failed to finalize the implementing regs and guidance for the 2008 rules in 2014. As a result, States are currently still in the process of implementing the rule. Although EPA had difficulty finalizing the 2008 regs, the Agency had no such problems coming up with a new standard. Meanwhile, success by setting out a program to achieve further reductions for many years to come.
Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD, for the sake of this dialogue, the verbatim 130 letters of opposition we have received.

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

MAY 10, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Clean air is fundamental for good health, and the Clean Air Act promises all Americans air that is safe to breathe. Environmental groups and medical organizations urge you to oppose H.R. 4775, the so-called “Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016.” Despite the clear evidence of the need for greater protection from ozone pollution, and the Clean Air Act’s balanced implementation timeline that provides states clear authority and plenty of time to plan and then work to reduce pollution to meet the updated standards, H.R. 4775 imposes additional delays and sweeping changes that will threaten health, particularly the health of children, seniors and people with chronic disease.

In contrast to what the bill’s title implies, H.R. 4775 reaches far beyond implementation of the current ozone standards. It also permanently weakens the Clean Air Act and future air pollution health standards for all criteria pollutants. Specifically, H.R. 4775 weakens implementation and enforcement of all lifesaving air pollution health standards including those for carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, sulfur dioxide. It would also permanently undermine the Clean Air Act as a public health law.

The Clean Air Act requires that the Environmental Protection Agency review the science on the health impacts of carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter, sulfur dioxide and other dangerous pollutants every five years and update these national ambient air quality standards according to the current science. H.R. 4775 would lengthen the review period of the air pollution health standards from once every five years to once every ten years for all criteria pollutants. As the science continues to evolve, EPA and states should have the best and most current data inform air pollution cleanup.

New research shows additional impacts that air pollution has on human health. For example, on March 26, 2016, a new study, Particulate Matter Exposure and Preterm Birth: Estimates of U.S. Attributable Burden and Economic Costs, was published that shows particulate matter exposure is linked to an estimated 60,000 preterm births per year. Under H.R. 4775, EPA would have to wait as much as a decade to consider new evidence when setting national air quality standards that protect public health from air pollution.

H.R. 4775 would also gut EPA’s ozone standards and allow unhealthy air to persist even longer. Ozone levels pose a significant threat to our health, and are especially dangerous for children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

We urge you to REJECT H.R. 4775 and will strongly consider including votes on this bill in the 2016 Scorecard. If you need more information, please call my office and ask to speak with a member of our Government Relations team.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR SENATOR/REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose the “Ozone Standards Implementation Act” (H.R. 4775, S. 2882). The innocuous-sounding bill would delay updating the nation’s ozone pollution (a.k.a. smog) and eroding a central pillar of the Clean Air Act.

The bill’s vision of “Ozone Standards Implementation Act” is a radical bill that jeopardizes the health of the American people by undermining updating the EPA’s recently-updated standards for ozone pollution and all national air quality standards allowing unhealthy air to persist even longer. High ozone levels pose a significant threat to our health, and are especially dangerous for children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

We urge you to REJECT H.R. 4775 and will strongly consider including votes on this bill in the 2016 Scorecard. If you need more information, please call my office and ask to speak with a member of our Government Relations team.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR SENATOR/REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose H.R. 4775, the “Ozone Standards Implementation Act,” a radical bill that jeopardizes the health of the American people by undermining updating the EPA’s recently-updated standards for ozone pollution (a.k.a. smog) and eroding a central pillar of the Clean Air Act.

The bill’s vision of “Ozone Standards Implementation Act” is a radical bill that jeopardizes the health of the American people by undermining updating the EPA’s recently-updated standards for ozone pollution and all national air quality standards allowing unhealthy air to persist even longer. High ozone levels pose a significant threat to our health, and are especially dangerous for children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

We urge you to REJECT H.R. 4775 and will strongly consider including votes on this bill in the 2016 Scorecard. If you need more information, please call my office and ask to speak with a member of our Government Relations team.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.
to safer air quality, and even the simple right to know if the air is safe to breathe. Corporations applying for air pollution permits would be free to ignore new ground-level ozone health standards and extend these additional ten years. For the first time the largest sources of air pollution would exceed health standards. The bill would also outright excise the parts of the country suffering the worst smog pollution from having backup plans if they do not meet health standards. The most pollution parts of the country should not stop doing everything they can to protect their citizens’ health and environment by cleaning up smog pollution.

This bill is not content to merely weaken and delay reductions in smog pollution. It also strips away right to public health standards based on human health and science. The medically-based health standards that the law has been founded on for 20 years could become a political football weakened by polluter compliance cost. This could well result in communities being exposed to unhealthy levels of smog and soot and sulfur dioxide that are known to cause lung disease. This bill would also double the law’s five-year review period for recognizing the latest science and updating health standards, which means in practice that unhealthy air would persist for longer than ten years. This weakens implementation of current clean air health standards.

The bill expands exemptions for ‘exceptional events’ that are not counted towards compliance with health standards for all years even when air pollution levels are unsafe. This will mean more unsafe air more often, with no responsibility to clean it up. Requirements meant to ensure progress towards compliance with health standards for all years means in practice that unhealthy air would persist for longer than ten years. This weakens implementation of current clean air health standards.

This bill is not content to merely weaken and delay reductions in smog pollution. It also strips away right to public health standards based on human health and science. The medically-based health standards that the law has been founded on for 20 years could become a political football weakened by polluter compliance cost. This could well result in communities being exposed to unhealthy levels of smog and soot and sulfur dioxide that are known to cause lung disease. This bill would also double the law’s five-year review period for recognizing the latest science and updating health standards, which means in practice that unhealthy air would persist for longer than ten years. This weakens implementation of current clean air health standards.

The bill expands exemptions for ‘exceptional events’ that are not counted towards compliance with health standards for all years even when air pollution levels are unsafe. This will mean more unsafe air more often, with no responsibility to clean it up. Requirements meant to ensure progress towards compliance with health standards for all years means in practice that unhealthy air would persist for longer than ten years. This weakens implementation of current clean air health standards.
The great thing about the Clean Air Act is that it is based on science. It requires the EPA every 5 years to bring scientists together and do a health check, do a check on the air quality standards all across America. Then they do not have to, they say: we are going to improve the air quality standards. And then they leave it up to States and stakeholders at home to determine how best to control air pollution. It has been extraordinarily beneficial to cleaning the air.

EPA has set air quality standards for six different pollutants: ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, lead, and particulate matter. Between 1980 and 2014, emissions of these six air pollutants dropped by 63 percent. During the same period, the Nation’s gross domestic product increased by 147 percent, vehicle miles traveled increased by 97 percent, energy consumption increased by 26 percent, and population increased by 41 percent. These emissions reductions have generated dramatic health effects. There is a balance in the law already.

A recent peer-reviewed study says the Clean Air Act will save more than 230,000 lives and will prevent millions of cases of respiratory problems like asthma and other problems in 2020 alone. It will also enhance our national pride, preventing 17 million lost workdays. These public health benefits translate into $2 trillion in monetized benefits to the economy.

Again, from the Sunshine State’s perspective, we have a booming tourist economy. Our average hotelier, Mr. Chairman, will tell you that the clean air quality makes a tremendous difference. That is not smart, and I think that is going to create a lot of lawsuits.

Prime Minister Narendra Modi from India was here today. One of his messages, besides what a great democracy America is and what a great democracy India is, is that we have to think about the future. And we can tap the American ingenuity and what we have already done to clean air and grow business at the same time.

Other nations are realizing now what we have learned long ago: unregulated emission of dangerous air pollutants is unsustainable. The Clean Air Act has helped us make dramatic improvements in air quality over the past decades. Our economy has grown at the same time.

So I would urge my colleagues, do not gut the Clean Air Act. Vote “no” on H.R. 4775.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTRON). Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his efforts on this very important legislation.

Mr. Chair, today in support of H.R. 4775, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016, so States will have the flexibility and tools to reasonably and effectively meet the new EPA ozone standards.

Since the proposal of EPA’s 2008 ozone standards, States have continually worked to implement air quality standards to comply with EPA’s clean air requirements. However, EPA’s implementation for the 2008 standards were not published until March 6, 2015, and then the revised ozone standards were issued in October of 2015. States now face the prospect of simultaneously implementing two ozone standards at the same time. H.R. 4775 remedies this problem by creating a phase-in approach to the 2008 and 2015 ozone standards, extending the final designations under the 2015 standards to 2025.

It would also make reforms to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards to provide flexibility and structure to actions taken to implementing and revising these standards. States should not have to inventory every pollutant to implement air quality standards in a way that is cost effective and efficient.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for introducing this bill. I also encourage my colleagues to support this legislation to ensure States are able to implement EPA ozone standards without harming their overall economy.
Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly, today’s fight over the new ozone standard will follow this very same pattern. Instead of trying to stall the 2015 ozone standard, which prohibits the EPA from regularly updating the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, as H.R. 4775 would do, we in this Congress should be heeding the warnings of doctors and scientists of not acting quickly enough to protect the public health.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this awful bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a cosponsor of this legislation, and a gentleman focused on energy issues.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4775, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act, of which I am a proud sponsor. I would like to focus, in particular, on what this bill really does for the 2015 standards, and also allows EPA to do the same.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and, I believe, a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WHITFIELD for allowing me to speak on behalf of this bill. As a coauthor of H.R. 4775, I rise to strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016.

Since 1980, our economy has more than tripled in growth, while ozone levels have gone down by 33 percent. The EPA predicts that ozone levels will continue to improve, particularly as the 75 parts per billion standard is fully implemented. Most importantly, the EPA states: “The vast majority of U.S. counties will meet the 70 parts per billion standard by 2025 just with the rules and programs now in place or underway.”

Mr. Chairman, this bill would ignore the Legislature, the Clean Air Act, and the scientific evidence of not just ozone, but on every dangerous air pollutant. What this legislation postpones is the compliance with both standards.

So what does this mean? It means that even though the EPA admits that air quality will improve, our States and communities now face the burden of spending scarce taxpayer resources to implement two different ozone standards at the same time.

What does this mean? It means that instead of trying to stall the 2015 ozone standard, which prohibits the EPA from regularly updating the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, as H.R. 4775 would do, we in this Congress should be heeding the warnings of doctors and scientists of not acting quickly enough to protect the public health.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of H.R. 4775.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and, I believe, a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WHITFIELD for allowing me to speak on behalf of this bill. As a coauthor of H.R. 4775, I rise to strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016.

Since 1980, our economy has more than tripled in growth, while ozone levels have gone down by 33 percent. The EPA predicts that ozone levels will continue to improve, particularly as the 75 parts per billion standard is fully implemented.

Our States and communities now face the burden of spending scarce taxpayer resources to implement two different ozone standards at the same time.

So what does this mean? It means that even though the EPA admits that air quality will improve, our States and counties now face a premature nonattainment designation, significantly limiting new job creation opportunities.

Additional bureaucratic processes and unnecessary red tape will do nothing to protect public health; however, they will export jobs to countries like China with fewer regulations, while those countries send us their ozone emissions in return.

H.R. 4775 includes a key harmonization provision from H.R. 4000, the bipartisan legislation I introduced last November.

Section 2 of today’s bill gives communities the needed time to meet the 70 parts per billion standard through 2025. It protects these areas from being subjected to unnecessary additional regulatory burdens and red tape, as these areas are already on track for compliance with both standards.

We have also heard from our State regulators that the current 5-year review cycle is overly ambitious and not attainable. This is proven by the fact that, since 1971, the EPA has taken an average of 10% years to review the standard for ozone, not 5, as is currently in effect.

Another provision I authored, section 3(a), modernizes the Clean Air Act by matching the mandatory review cycle with the actual timeline of previous EPA reviews; in other words, 10 years between reviews. This is a reasonable timeline in light of the Nation’s dramatically improved air quality over the last three decades.

Protecting both public health and the economy are bipartisan goals we all share, and the two are not mutually exclusive.

I would like to thank Mr. OLSON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LATTA, Whip SCALISE, and Leader MCCARTHY for their work on this important issue. I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman WHITFIELD for their efforts in shepherding this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bipartisan legislation.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly disagree with my friend from Texas.

The proposed changes to the NAAQS review cycle would put lives at risk by permanently delaying updates to limits on not just ozone, but on every dangerous air pollutant: carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen oxide, ozone, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide.

Mr. Chairman, the Clean Air Act requires the EPA to review the science every 5 years and to update the standards when necessary to protect the public health.

It is important to note that the EPA isn’t required to update the NAAQS every 5 years, but to just review the science.

The 2015 ozone standard, Mr. Chairman, reflects strong scientific evidence regarding the harmful effects of ozone on human health and the environment; including more than 1,000 new studies. Scientists, Mr. Chairman, are constantly researching the impacts that air pollution have on human health, and have consistently discovered that ozone, particle pollutants, and other types of air pollution covered by the Clean Air Act are, indeed, harmful in more ways and at lower concentrations than previously understood.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would ignore all this scientific work and evidence by...
Mr. Chairman, 10 years is too long to wait to protect public health from levels of ozone, particle pollution, and other pollutants that the science shows are, indeed, very, very, very dangerous. Delays in implementing the Ozone Standards Implementation Act, which I have cosponsored. I want to thank the ranking member of our subcommittee for his kind remarks. Once again, the House is considering a bill to undo one of our most successful public health and environmental laws, the Clean Air Act. And clean air isn’t a luxury, it is a necessity.

Before the Clean Air Act became law 43 years ago, thousands of Americans experienced the consequences of unhealthy air, respiratory death, severe asthma attacks, and premature deaths. This landmark legislation, for the first time, ensured that hazardous air pollution would be controlled. But in spite of the overwhelming evidence of the success of this law and its many vital public health benefits, the Clean Air Act continues to be a favorite target for my Republican colleagues. So let me reject, unfortunately, the latest in an ongoing attempt to undermine the progress we have made on cleaning the air and protecting public health.

The bill’s sponsors claim their goal is to help States to implement the National Ambient Air Quality Standards set by the EPA. Yet this bill fails to provide the one thing that would be most helpful to States in their efforts to implement air quality standards, and that is additional resources. In fact, Chairman Whitfield will be offering an amendment to the bill to ensure that EPA receives no additional funding to implement the provisions of this legislation, or any of the requirements under existing law.

As ozone continues to fall to levels that reflect naturally occurring and even foreign-source ozone, we must also insist that the EPA report on how foreign pollution affects compliance with its overburdensome regulations. This legislation will do just that, Mr. Chairman.

There is no denying that the EPA’s regulations will be costly for the States and costly, in turn, for our economy. The recent levels that are mandated, the harder it is for economic development to occur. That’s just the way it is, as Ted Poe would say.

Communities across the country will be harmed, and low-income families. Mr. Chairman, are going to be harmed the most from this overburdensome regulation. It is perfectly reasonable for Congress to insist that this regulatory boondoggle is reined in. I urge all Members to support this important legislation to do the right thing to do. You know I am right.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is left?
guidance from EPA. Mr. Chairman, they have been doing this same thing for decades now.

Most guidance evolves after a standard takes effect as States and industry raise questions that require EPA clarification, or it is unclear, Mr. Chairman, how the Agency could provide guidance on solving problems before they even know what those problems are.

Mr. Chairman, you are talking about a catch-22, and this creates an epic catch-22 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

On the one hand, the EPA could hurry to issue guidance before hearing questions from States and industry. That guidance would necessarily be incomplete, as it won’t even address issues that only emerge during the implementation process. An industry group, Mr. Chairman, that wanted to delay implementation of the new air quality standard could file a lawsuit saying that EPA’s guidance wasn’t sufficient.

On the other hand, EPA could wait to issue more robust and helpful guidance, but in the meantime, facilities would be able to obtain permits under the old air quality standard. A company, Mr. Chairman, could build a facility that is allowed to pollute more than it would under current law.

In both scenarios, Mr. Chairman, who wins? Not the American people. Who wins? The polluter wins, and our public health loses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our fellow legislators from the other side of the aisle for working with us on this legislation. One of the great things about the House of Representatives is we have the opportunity to come and talk about the issues of the day. We can have different opinions, we can talk about it, disagree, and then try to move forward.

Now, some of the speakers today, when we discussed this legislation, H.R. 4775, have described it as irresponsible, as a radical action to gut the Clean Air Act, to fundamentally weaken the Clean Air Act, and to undermine the Clean Air Act. I would say that that absolutely is not our intent.

I think a lot of the living in America understand that we do, in this country, more than any other country in the world, work to ensure clean air for our constituents and our citizens. We don’t have to take a backseat to anyone to make that statement.

I might say that the criteria of pollutants, the six of them, the emissions have been reduced by a total of 63 percent—making up the National Ambient Air Quality Standards has been reduced by 63 percent, those emissions—since 1980.

So we are committed to clean air. But many people do not realize that, today, 24 States, counties in 24 States and the District of Columbia do not even meet the requirement of the 2008 Ambient Air Quality Standards, which is 75 parts per billion. And we know that even though that standard was set in 2008, EPA did not come forth with the new standard until 2015—7 years later.

Now they have come out with a new standard in 2015 saying that States must meet that standard until 2017. This legislation is brought to the floor in response to concerns by individuals responsible in the States for implementing the Federal standards set by the Federal EPA, so that is why we are here.

So what are we doing in this legislation? Let me just point out that I mentioned the 24 States, counties in 24 States and the District of Columbia are in noncompliance with the 2008 standard. Los Angeles is never going to be in compliance. The San Francisco Bay Area is probably never going to be in compliance, and many parts of the West are never going to be in compliance because of their geographical location and because of foreign emissions coming in from other States.

If you are in noncompliance, it has a drastic impact on your ability to create jobs and to bring in new industry because it is much more difficult to get a permit. So these over 270 counties in these 24 States at a time when our job growth is stagnant are going to find it even more difficult to create jobs.

Poverty also has a tremendous impact on people’s health. Yes, we want clean air, but we want jobs so people can provide health care for their families and their children. So we need a balancing act here, and that is what this legislation is designed to do.

Under existing law, EPA at the Federal rule-making level is mandated to review the national air quality standard every 5 years. They can do it in 2 if they want to, or 3, but they must do it in 5. So, because we are now trying to implement the 2008 and the 2015 all at the same time, all we are saying is, instead of mandating EPA to do it every 5, we mandate them to do it every 10. They can do it in 4 if they want to, or 3, but they must do it in 10. Is that irresponsible? Is that trying to gut the Clean Air Act?

What are some other things we are doing here? We are also saying that we are authorizing—we are not mandating, but we are authorizing—the EPA to consider that technology is available to meet the new standard—not that it is required to, but it is authorized to. Is that unreasonable? Is that trying to gut the Clean Air Act?

Then we are also saying, before EPA revises its National Ambient Air Quality Standards, that they must get the advice of the Agency’s independent scientific advisory committee. Now they do that, but we are saying we also want you to do it to look at potential adverse effects relating to implementing a new standard as required by section 109 of the Clean Air Act.
The Acting 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 Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4775

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 "Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. FACILITATING STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF EXISTING OZONE STANDARDS.

(a) DESIGNATION.

(1) DESIGNATION SUBMISSION.—Not later than October 26, 2024, notwithstanding the deadline specified in paragraph (1)(A) of section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407(d)), the Governor of each State shall designate in accordance with such section 107(d) all areas (or portions thereof) of the Governor’s State as attainable, nonattainable, or unclassifiable with respect to the 2015 ozone standards.

(2) DESIGNATION PROMULGATION.—Not later than October 26, 2025, notwithstanding the deadline specified in paragraph (1)(B) of section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407(d)), the Administrator shall promulgate final designations under such section 107(d) for all areas within the 50 States with respect to the 2015 ozone standards, including any modifications to the designations submitted under paragraph (1).

(b) STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than October 26, 2026, notwithstanding the deadline specified in section 110(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409(a)(1)), each State shall submit the plan required by such section 110(a)(1) for the 2015 ozone standards.

(c) CERTAIN PRECONSTRUCTION PERMITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The 2015 ozone standards shall not apply to the review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application if—

(A) the Administrator or the State, local, or tribal permitting authority, as applicable, determines in a timely manner that the date of the final designations of the area under subsection (a)(2) has not been met.

(B) the Administrator or the State, local, or tribal permitting authority, as applicable, in consultation with the independent scientific review committee, determines that the area is not in attainment with the New Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard.

(2) RULES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(A) eliminate the obligation of a preconstruction permit applicant to install best available control technology and new, low-emission rate technology, as applicable; or

(B) limit the authority of a State, local, or tribal permitting authority to impose more stringent control technology, emissions limits, or any other requirements as a condition of approval to State, local, or tribal law than national ambient air quality standards.

SEC. 3. FACILITATING STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS.

(a) TIMELINE FOR REVIEW OF NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS.

(1) 10-YEAR CYCLE FOR ALL CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS.—Paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of section 109(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409(d)) are amended by striking "five-year intervals" each place it appears and inserting "10-year intervals".

(2) CYCLE FOR NEXT REVIEW OF OZONE CRITERIA AND STANDARDS.—Notwithstanding section 109(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409(d)), the Administrator shall not—

(A) complete, before October 26, 2025, any review of the criteria for ozone published under section 108 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7408) or the national ambient air quality standard for ozone promulgated under section 109 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7409); or

(B) propose, before such date, any revisions to such criteria or standards.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL FEASIBILITY.—Section 109(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409(b)(1)) is amended after the first sentence the following: "If the Administrator, in consultation with the independent scientific review committee appointed under subsection (a), finds that a range of levels of air quality for an air pollutant are requisite to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, as described in the preceding sentence, the Administrator, after considering whether the existing technology and advancements in technology and technology of the future can support the attainment of such level of air quality for such pollutant, shall request, and such committee shall provide, comments and recommendations as to the range of levels of air quality for such pollutant, and such committee may consider the range of levels of air quality for such pollutant in its recommendations as to the range of levels of air quality for such pollutant.

(c) TIMELY ISSUANCE OF IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—Section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) TIMELY ISSUANCE OF IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In publishing any final rule by which a national ambient air quality standard is promulgated, the Administrator shall make such rule effective immediately after promulgation, and the Administrator shall publish such final regulations and guidance not later than 20 months after promulgation.

(2) APPLICATION OF STANDARD TO PRECONSTRUCTION PERMITTING.—If the Administrator fails to publish final regulations and guidance that include information relating to submission and consideration of a preconstruction permit application under a new or revised national ambient air quality standard concurrently with such standard, then such standard shall not apply to the review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application under a new or revised national ambient air quality standard if the Administrator promulgates such final regulations and guidance more than 20 months after promulgation of the national ambient air quality standard.

(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude the Administrator from issuing regulations and guidance to assist States, permitting authorities, and permit applicants in implementing a national ambient air quality standard subsequent to promulgation of such standard.

(B) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude the Administrator from revising the national ambient air quality standard and promulgating a revised national ambient air quality standard that is different from the national ambient air quality standard promulgated under the new or revised national ambient air quality standard.

(C) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of a State, local, or tribal permitting authority to impose more stringent control technology, emissions limits, or any other requirements as a condition of approval to State, local, or tribal law than national ambient air quality standards.
tribal permitting authority to impose more stringent emissions requirements pursuant to State, local, or tribal law than national ambient air quality standards. 

Section 4. Definitions.—In this subsection: 

(1) The term 'best available control technology' has the meaning given to that term in section 103(3). 

(2) The term 'lowest achievable emission rate' has the meaning given to that term in section 171(3). 

(3) The term 'preconstruction permit' means a permit that is required under this title for the construction or modification of a stationary source; and 

(4) the State demonstrates to the satisfaction of less than 15 percent)''; and 

(ii) of subsection (b)(1)(A) (relating to reductions of 3 percent), the provisions of subsection (c)(2)(B) (relating to reductions of 15 percent)''; and 

(2) by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon; 

(3) in paragraph (5) of subsection (e), by striking ''lowest achievable emission rate'' after ''technological achievability''; 

and economic feasibility,'' before ''and which take into account technological achievability and economic feasibility,'' 

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting ''and economic feasibility'' after ''technological achievability''; 

(3) in subsection (e), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''and economic feasibility'' after ''technological achievability''; 

(4) in paragraph (5) of subsection (e), by striking ''. . . and economic feasibility'' after ''technological achievability''; and 

(5) in subsection (g) of section 172(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7511a) is amended— 

(i) STUDY ON OZONE FORMATION.—The Administrator, in consultation with States and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall conduct a study on the atmospheric formation of ozone and effective strategies, including— 

(A) the relative contribution of man-made and naturally occurring nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds, and other pollutants in ozone formation near areas, and the most cost-effective control strategies to reduce ozone; and 

(B) the science of wintertime ozone formation, including photochemical modeling of wintertime ozone formation, and approaches to cost-effectively reduce wintertime ozone levels. 

(ii) PEER REVIEW.—The Administrator shall have the study peer reviewed by an independent panel of experts in accordance with the requirements applicable to a highly influential scientific assessment. 

(3) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall incorporate the results of the study, including the findings of the peer review panel, into any general rules and guidance implementing the 2015 ozone standards. 

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS. 

In this Act: 

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. 

(2) BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY.—The term “best available control technology” has the meaning given to that term in section 169(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7479(3)). 

(3) HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT.—The term “highly influential scientific assessment” means a highly influential scientific assessment as defined in the publication of the Office of Management and Budget entitled “Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review” (70 Fed. Reg. 25664 (January 14, 2005)). 

(4) LOWEST ACHIEVABLE EMISSION RATE.—The term “lowest achievable emission rate” has the meaning given to that term in section 171(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7501(3)). 

(5) NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD.—The term “national ambient air quality standard” means a national ambient air quality standard promulgated under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7409). 

(6) PERCONSTRUCTION PERMIT.—The term “preconstruction permit” means a permit that is required under title IV of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407) for the construction or modification of a stationary source; and 


(8) STUDY.—The Administrator, in consultation with the States and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall—

(i) conduct the study required under this subsection; 

(ii) prepare the report on the study; 

(iii) make the report public; and 

(iv) send a copy of the report to Congress. 

(9) WINTER FORMATION OF OZONE.—The term “winter formation of ozone” includes the formation of ozone in the wintertime in areas subject to contributions from wintertime emissions, including contributions from wintertime emissions from sources located outside North America. 

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–607. Each such amendment may be considered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. 

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD 

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–607. 

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. 

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will now state the amendment. 

The text of the amendment is as follows: 

At the end of the bill, add the following new section: 

SEC. 5. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED. 

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized. 

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes. 

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4775, as I said, requires the EPA to develop two studies and reports to submit to Congress. I talked about that in my closing statement. My amendment is relating to those studies. 

The first is a study of the impacts of foreign emissions on the ability of States in America to meet new ozone standards. The second relates to ozone formation and the effective control strategies for that. 

These studies will assist EPA and State regulators in better understanding background ozone and implementing ozone standards. In its estimate for H.R. 4775— as you know, we must always consider cost—the Congressional Budget Office estimated a cost of $2 billion associated with the development of these studies. 

My amendment would clarify that no additional funds are authorized by this legislation. Developing the studies required by this bill is part of EPA’s job and can be covered by the Agency’s existing budget. 

I might point out that the President’s clean energy plan, which was implemented by EPA, never passed the House of Representatives, never passed the U.S. Senate, and was never even considered by the United States Congress. 

The Energy Plan without any additional appropriation. I can tell you, it cost millions of dollars to do it. 

This small amount to come up to reprogram funding within EPA to require those studies I do not believe is much of a burden on EPA. EPA’s budget for regulatory activity is over $2 billion annually. These are analyses EPA should have already been undertaking as part of its existing responsibilities. 

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am not appropriating additional money. EPA can reprogram some of the $2 billion that it already has to develop
these studies and provide useful information to the States and other agencies. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Budget Office identified an additional $2 million that will be needed to conduct the duplicative study required by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, that is the reason we are actually seeing this amendment. It is a Republican classic trick. It is a trick. Mr. Chairman. My colleague from Kentucky—who I respect and honor tremendously—knows that although this bill will require additional resources to implement, this amendment ensures that no new resources will be provided. It is a trick, Mr. Chairman.

My Republican colleagues have voted time and time again to cut the EPA’s budget, but that just places greater burdens on States since about one-third of EPA’s budget is distributed to the States in grants and other types of assistance. I will say on the other side that the goal is efficiency and that EPA must learn to do more with less. But, Mr. Chairman—another part of the trick—their real goal is to have EPA do less, rather than more with less. They just want them to do even less.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that just removes the environmental cop from the beat. Polluters benefit, but our constituents don’t benefit. And, ultimately, Mr. Chairman, all of us Americans will pay the enormous price.

Much of the permitting and much of the preparation of implementation plans done under the Clean Air Act is done by the States. One of the complaints that I have heard is that EPA is not providing sufficient guidance early enough in the process to assist States in meeting their obligations under the law, and that States want and need assistance.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this amendment doesn’t do anything to address that concern. In fact, it will only make a dire situation even more dire. The public expects EPA to protect their health and the environment. Resources, Mr. Chairman, are required to fulfill that expectation and that mandate.

Public health is worth paying for. It is much more cost effective to prevent health problems than it is to cure those very same problems. And make no mistake, the Clean Air Act is, indeed, a public health law. We save billions and billions of dollars in medical expenses due to asthma-related emergency room visits and other respiratory and cardiac illnesses. We save billions and billions in lost sick time at work and other productivity losses. And, most importantly, Mr. Chairman, let us not forget that the Clean Air Act saves lives. We enable people to be healthier and more productive.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Olson).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. It is real simple. This says to the EPA: Do your job. Do your job.

EPA admits half of the ozone in America comes from “uncontrolled sources,” “uncontrolled sources.” That means sources we can’t control. Sources like ozone from China, like ozone in my home State from Mexico, like ozone coming from annual crop burnings, like ozone coming across the Atlantic from Sub-Saharan Africa sandstorms, like ozone coming from all over the world.

This past Christmas, my wife and I went to the Grand Canyon—beautiful. It has an ozone problem. They have a sign there that says: Most of the Grand Canyon air pollutants come from distant sources ignoring human boundaries.

All this amendment says is: EPA, do your job. Do the research to find out where this is coming from and don’t penalize Americans for something they can’t control.

I support this amendment.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Whitfield).

The question was taken, and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RUSH. 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 Kentucky will be postponed.
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AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-607.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, 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 7, lines 24 and 25, strike “If the Administrator fails” and insert the following:

“(A) STANDARD NOT APPLICABLE—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if the Administrator fails
Page 8, after line 8, add the following:

(b) STANDARD CHAIR. The subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application by a Federal, State, local, or tribal permitting authority if such authority determines that application of such subparagraph is likely to—

(i) increase air pollution that harms human health and the environment;

(ii) increase issuance of final preconstruction permits;”
overall cost of achieving the new or revised National Ambient Air Quality Standard in the applicable area.

Mr. Chair, the new standard that the EPA recently issued already represents a measured approach that seeks to balance both public health impacts as well as the economic cost benefit, even though this is not a requirement of the Clean Air Act. On the other hand, Mr. Chair, H.R. 4775 represents the exact opposite of a measured approach as it seeks to tip the scales in favor of industry over public health.

Mr. Chair, this amendment will help to prevent some of the adverse consequences of this bill from going into effect whether they be intended or unintended, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, the intent of this bill is to end the nightmare scenario we are going through right now by which the EPA issues regulations 7 years after it announces a new rule and at new regulations months later. But don't take my word with regard to the problems that it causes in America; listen to the States.

Teresa Marks, Arkansas' Department of Environmental Quality, July 31, 2012:

Fives years may not allow enough time for new technology or science to be fully developed. With more time between review processes, the States could have adequate time to develop proper SIPs and meet Federal deadlines.

Martha Rudolph, Colorado's Department of Public Health and Environment, July 23, 2012:

This ambitious schedule for evaluating and promulgating NAAQS revisions every 5 years has created an inefficient planning process. I saved the best for last.

Michael Krancer, Pennsylvania's Department of Environmental Protection, November 29, 2012:

The development of the NAAQS on an interval of 5 years, section 109(d)(1), has created significant resource burdens for both the EPA and the States. Furthermore, the cascading standards can create confusion for the public actions because, as the State's EPA continues to work on SIP revisions and the determination of attainment for one standard alone, the air quality index is based on another. NAAQS review intervals should be lengthened to 10 years.

Section 3(d) of this bill provides that a new rule or a revised standard shall not apply to pending permit applications until the Agency has published regulations and guidance regarding how to implement the new standards in the permitting process.

If a State, local, or tribal permitting authority wants to impose more stringent standards with respect to a particular preconstruction permit application, nothing in H.R. 4775 prevents it from doing so. This amendment allows the EPA to escape its responsibility for issuing timely guidance. We should ensure the EPA has to take timely action. I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RUSH. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-607.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, strike lines 9 through 20, strike subsection (e), add the following: "The Administrator may consider as secondary a standard for which the Administrator, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, finds a range of levels necessary to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, then—and only then—"the Administrator may consider as secondary the standard for this pollutant."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, my amendment is straightforward, and it fixes one of the most egregious provisions in the bill: the consideration of technological feasibility in the NAAQS-setting process. The bill’s approach would make feasibility a factor in the scientific decision about how much pollution is safe for a child to breathe without experiencing an asthma attack.

Requiring the EPA to consider technological feasibility when setting an air quality standard is a dangerous precedent that ignores the history of the Clean Air Act. Frankly, it is not even necessary. Since 1970, the Clean Air Act has had several key features that have helped make it one of the most successful environmental laws in our country. The law’s science-based, health-protective standards keep our eye on the prize, which is healthy air for everyone. Cooperative federalism allows the EPA to set the clean air goals and States to then decide how best to achieve them.

The Clean Air Act uses regulatory standards, like the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, to drive technological innovation in pollution controls. The act recognizes that it is usually less costly to simply dump pollution rather than to clean it up, so businesses generally don’t control pollution absent regulatory requirements.

We know from decades of experience that the Clean Air Act drives innovation in pollution controls that then become the industry standard. Once an air pollution standard is in place, industry gets to work to meet it, and, along the way, we develop more effective and less expensive pollution control technologies.

Mr. Chair, section 3(b) ignores this fact. It rejects an approach that has been successful for over four decades; so my amendment would restore current law, preserving the NAAQS as purely health-based standards and leaving the consideration of costs and feasibility to the States. If you truly believe that this bill is not an attack on the Clean Air Act and its critical public health protection, then supporting my amendment should not be a problem.

In closing, almost every time the EPA proposes a significant new requirement, opponents tell us it can’t be done, that it is going to cost too much, or that it will destroy our economy. The Republicans are once again raising the specter of job losses and high economic costs to try to block the implementation of stronger ozone standards. These doomsday claims about the costs of clean air are nothing new. The history of the Clean Air Act is a history of exaggerated claims by industry that have never come true.

Section 3(b) is just the latest in a string of reckless legislative attacks on these purely health-based air quality standards which have been successful for over four decades; that have saved lives; and have been successful for over four decades. The Republicans are once again raising the specter of job losses and high economic costs to try to block the implementation of stronger ozone standards. These doomsday claims about the costs of clean air are nothing new.

The history of the Clean Air Act is a history of exaggerated claims by industry that have never come true.

Section 3(b) states that, if the EPA Administrator, in consultation with the independent scientific advisory committee, finds a range of levels necessary to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, then—and only then—"the Administrator may consider as secondary the standard for this pollutant."

It reads “may,” not “must,” not “shall”—but “may.”

H.R. 4775 does not change the Clean Air Act’s requirement that standards be health-based or protective of public health. This is a clarification for future administrations that Congress considers technical feasibility to be a reasonable part of the decisionmaking process when policy decisions in pollution controls that then become the industry standard. Once an air pollution standard is in place, industry gets to work to meet it, and, along the way, we develop more effective and less expensive pollution control technologies.

Mr. Chair, section 3(b) ignores this fact. It rejects an approach that has been successful for over four decades; so my amendment would restore current law, preserving the NAAQS as purely health-based standards and leaving the consideration of costs and feasibility to the States. If you truly believe that this bill is not an attack on the Clean Air Act and its critical public health protection, then supporting my amendment should not be a problem.

In closing, almost every time the EPA proposes a significant new requirement, opponents tell us it can’t be done, that it is going to cost too much, or that it will destroy our economy. The Republicans are once again raising the specter of job losses and high economic costs to try to block the implementation of stronger ozone standards. These doomsday claims about the costs of clean air are nothing new. The history of the Clean Air Act is a history of exaggerated claims by industry that have never come true.

Section 3(b) is just the latest in a string of reckless legislative attacks on these purely health-based air quality standards which have been successful for over four decades; that have saved lives; and have been successful for over four decades. The Republicans are once again raising the specter of job losses and high economic costs to try to block the implementation of stronger ozone standards. These doomsday claims about the costs of clean air are nothing new.

The history of the Clean Air Act is a history of exaggerated claims by industry that have never come true.

Section 3(b) states that, if the EPA Administrator, in consultation with the independent scientific advisory committee, finds a range of levels necessary to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, then—and only then—"the Administrator may consider as secondary the standard for this pollutant."

It reads “may,” not “must,” not “shall”—but “may.”

H.R. 4775 does not change the Clean Air Act’s requirement that standards be health-based or protective of public health. This is a clarification for future administrations that Congress considers technical feasibility to be a reasonable part of the decisionmaking process when policy decisions in pollution controls that then become the industry standard. Once an air pollution standard is in place, industry gets to work to meet it, and, along the way, we develop more effective and less expensive pollution control technologies.
choices must be made among a range of scientifically valid options.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have listened to what the gentleman has said. It seems to me that he is essentially making an argument as to why we don't need this change. If he is saying that the current rule—the current law, the current statute—allows for the consideration of technological feasibility and if we know that the Clean Air Act has essentially worked in protecting the environment and in putting health as a priority with these other issues as simply being something that can be considered and, as I said, is considered when the States actually decide how to carry out the law, then I do not understand why he finds it necessary to change the law, say, with regard to this issue.

It seems to me that the argument you are making, which is that this is already something that can be considered but is not a priority—health being the priority—would negate the very need for the legislation and support the amendment that I am putting forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. 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 New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114–607.

Mr. GOSAR. 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 13, line 1, after "rural areas," insert "including during wildfires."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment that will ensure that the study on ozone formation in the underlying bill analyzes the relative contribution from wildfires.

The National Interagency Coordination Center reported this year that we set a new record in terms of total acreage burned from wildfires with more than 10.1 million acres going up in smoke. This significant increase is not the result of more wildfires, as the non-partisan Congressional Research Service reported last month that "the number of wildfires has stayed about the same over the years, but the number of acres burned annually has increased by nearly double the acreage burned in the 1990s."

Timber removal is down 80 percent over the last 30 years and acreage has burned. There is a direct correlation between thinning our forest and overall forest health. As a medical professional, I know firsthand that preventive care is a much cheaper and effective treatment as opposed to dealing with an illness or disease after it has already been diagnosed. Let's not forget the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government has failed to employ such a strategy when it comes to our Nation's forests and continues to spend billions of dollars on the back end of suppression activities.

The CRS reports that the top 5 years with the largest wildfire acreage burned were 1998 to 2006 and 2015. In Arizona, we have seen the tragic results of this agency's misprioritization firsthand, as the five largest fires in Arizona's history occurred between 2002 and 2011.

Data released just a few years ago concluded that one catastrophic wildfire can emit more carbon emissions in a few days than total vehicle emissions in an entire State over the course of a year.

My commonsense amendment simply seeks to determine the overall contribution to ozone formation from wildfires. We should all want to have this information and know the extent to which ozone formation from wildfire emissions occurs.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the underlying bill and applaud Representative OLSON, Chairman UPTON, and my other colleagues who are actively involved with moving this much-needed legislation forward.

Most States are just beginning to adopt the 2008 ozone standards as the EPA didn't announce the implementation guidance and a final rule until March 6, 2015. Rather than allowing time to implement, the EPA moved the goalposts and is seeking to unilaterally implement a regulation that has been projected to be the most expensive management in our Nation's history.

The Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry recently reported that "the EPA's new ozone standard of 70 parts per billion will be virtually impossible for Arizona to meet due to Arizona's high levels of background, limited local sources, and unique geophysical characteristics. Implementation of the current rule in Arizona is not reasonable, based in sound science, or achievable."

Again, my amendment simply ensures that the study on ozone formation in the underlying bill analyzes the relative contribution from wildfires. Chairman UPTON supports my amendment, and I wholeheartedly support the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same and support my amendment and H.R. 4775.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, on its face, Mr. Gosar's amendment seems innocuous enough, having EPA also consider the contribution of wildfires in the bill's required study on ozone formation, wintertime ozone formation, and control strategies. But in reality, this study is a wolf in sheep's clothing. By adding further criteria, as this amendment would do, only makes it worse.

First, many of the aspects of this proposed study are already covered by EPA's integrated science assessment. Integrated science assessments are required to represent the scientific evaluations and synthesis of the most policy-relevant science for reviewing National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Essentially, these assessments form the scientific foundation for the review of the NAAQ Standards. All integrated science assessments are vetted through a rigorous peer-review process, including review by the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee and public comment periods.

Furthermore, the EPA is already doing a comprehensive review of wildfires and ozone, so additional study of this issue is not necessary, in my opinion.

But this study is more than a duplication of work already being done. Mr. Chairman. The bill would inject costs into this scientific review process by requiring the assessment of cost-effective control strategies to reduce ozone. While this is certainly worthy as an issue to review, EPA's scientific assessments are the wrong venue for such a discussion.

EPA has already concluded that the Agency's limited staff and resources are the result of more wildfires, as the non-partisan Congressional Research Service reported last month that "the number of wildfires has stayed about the same over the years, but the number of acres burned annually has increased by nearly double the acreage burned in the 1990s."

I ask my colleagues to do the same and support my amendment and H.R. 4775.
EPA to jump through before a more protective ozone standard can be put into effect.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, this three-word amendment simply ensures that the study on ozone formation in the underlying bill analyzes the relative contribution from wildfires. Just simply that.

This is something that I would hope would be analyzed anyway under the language in the underlying bill, but I felt the need to clarify so as to ensure such analysis occurs.

Data released from NASA a few years ago concluded that one catastrophic wildfire can emit more carbon emissions in a few days than total vehicle emissions in an entire State over the course of a year. We should all want to have this information and know the extent to which ozone formation from wildfire emissions occurs. The science is science, the whole science, nothing less, nothing more.

I ask everybody to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. POLIS in control.

Mr. POLIS. 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:

After section 3, insert the following sections:

SEC. 4. REPEAL OF EXEMPTION FOR AGGREGATION OF EMISIONS FROM OIL AND GAS SOURCES.

Section 112(n) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(n)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

(2) not later than 365 days after a final rule adopting hydrogen sulfide as a hazardous air pollutant under section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(b)); and

(2) not later than 365 days after a final rule under paragraph (1) is issued, revise the list under section 112(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(c)) to include categories and subcategories of major sources and area sources of hydrogen sulfide, including oil and gas wells.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, since this bill is supposed to be about making the Clean Air Act work better, I have offered an amendment—that is identical to a bill with 64 cosponsors that I coauthored—to close a very glaring loophole in the law that frankly harms the air in my State, across the Mountain West, and indeed across the country.

This amendment is based on legislation I first introduced in 2011 and have introduced three times, including this Congress, is called the BREATHE Act. Essentially it is very simple. It would close the oil and gas industry’s loophole to the Clean Air Act. Currently, oil and gas operators are exempt from the aggregation requirements in the Clean Air Act.

What the aggregation requirement does, it is small air pollution sources that cumulatively release as much air pollution as a major source, are supposed to be required to curb pollution by installing the maximum achievable control technology. But oil and gas is exempt, not for any policy reason, but simply because it has a lot of influence here in Washington, D.C.

This directly affects the air quality in my district. Take a county like Weld County, Colorado. There are over 20,000 operating fracking wells. Any one of those is small, but cumulatively, in aggregate, it looks a lot more like multiple emissions-spewing factories or other highly pollutive activity. And yet they are completely exempt from being aggregated.

So essentially, they are rounded to down to zero, each one of them, which is fine if there is one or three or five of them, if you have 20,000 of them, it is a gross abuse of the intent of the Clean Air Act to round it down to zero. My amendment would also add hydrogen sulfide to the Clean Air Act’s Federal list of hazardous air pollutants. It was originally on the list. Unfortunately, it was later removed.

The Clean Air Act currently exempts hydrogen sulfide from the Federal list of hazardous air pollutants, even though it is well-documented that hydrogen sulfide has been associated with a wide range of health issues, such as nausea, vomiting, headaches, irritation of eyes, nose, throat, and asthma.

Often, it is released from wellheads, pumps, and piping during the separation process, from storage tanks, and from fluids. As a percent to 25 percent of the natural gas wells in the U.S. emit hydrogen sulfide, even though, I would point out, control technologies are inexpensive and readily available to curb hydrogen sulfide emissions. All we ask is that those are looked at as part of that.

My amendment has broad support with 64 Members that have added their names as cosponsors. I am grateful this was allowed under the bill.

My amendment will simply add oil and gas operators accountable for their impact on our Nation’s air quality, as every industry should be. They shouldn’t play by special rules. They should play by the same rules under the Clean Air Act as every industry.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we all have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and know that he focuses on these particular issues and is quite familiar with them.

The reason that we are opposing this amendment is that his amendment would make changes to section 112 of the Clean Air Act by adding, specifically, hydrogen sulfide as a hazardous air pollutant.

Now, there is a well-established regulatory process for listing new hazardous air pollutants set forth in the Clean Air Act, section 112.

So for that reason alone, H.R. 4775, really is dealing only with sections 107 to 110 and part C and D of title I of the Clean Air Act. And we are not doing anything with section 112, nor have we had any hearings in the Energy and Commerce Committee on adding hydrogen sulfide as a hazardous air pollutant. On the other hand, we have had four hearings about ambient air quality standards. We have had four forums on the Clean Air Act relating to ambient air quality standards.

I should point the fact that there is an established way to add, we would respectfully oppose this amendment and ask the other Members to oppose it at this time. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Mr. POLIS in letting the Energy and Commerce Committee do it in a regular manner.

I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Polis amendment. It is common sense, and it certainly improves the bill in the way that Mr. POLIS set forth.

I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

So again, with great respect to the gentleman from Kentucky, this is the first opportunity we have had since I first introduced the bill in 2011 where the Clean Air Act has been brought to the floor and opened and allowed to have this amendment and discussion. I personally would have been thrilled if we would have been able to have a hearing in the intervening years. Of course, should this not prevail, I would be happy to continue to work to pursue a hearing in this area.

The cause of Frank AGAIN, when you have 20,000 wells in a limited area, you can’t round each one down to zero. Separately, we have the issue of hydrogen sulfide. Both are very important issues.
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Of course, we want to further the discussion. I personally am thrilled again on behalf of the 64 Members that are already cosponsors of this bill that at least we have the time to debate to the floor in a way that it is germane to a bill that we are considering in opening up the Clean Air Act.

Certainly I am appreciative of the process the committee has in place. Again, should this not prevail, I would be happy to continue to work with the committee to help deal with these small-site aggregations in a way where they are still long rounded down to zero if, in fact, they are found scientifically to have a tangible cumulative effect, just like we have the aggregation of every other type of industrial activity except for those that are particular to oil and gas.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill to simply make sure that oil and gas operators play by the same rules with regard to their impact on air quality as any other industry, as well as adding hydrogen sulfide to the list of hazardous air pollutants and listing, of course, oil and gas wells as one of the major sources of hydrogen sulfide, as they certainly are in my neck of the woods.

I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, since Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to a previous unanimous consent agreement, the amendment offered by Ms. NORTON and a Member opposed each clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Polis).

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, part of the problem is, perhaps, that EPA has never requested this particular advice from CASAC. My amendment would allow the EPA to do so. Yes, I made clear that there had been improvements in air quality, despite the fact that our own industry, our own economic growth has tripled. Would anybody say that we are now where we want to be?

We do not want, at this point of progress, to countermand the progress we have made. We should be building on that progress. No one, I think, in the world today—and certainly in the United States—would say we have finally reached where we want to be. The improvements are not nearly enough. We need to go much more rapidly. We certainly don't need to be retrograde at this point in history when the whole world now is looking at this very issue and seeking to improve.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a quote from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District executive director. He said these words before our committee: "H.R. 4775, in my opinion, provides for much-needed streamlining of the implementation of the Clean Air Act. It does not roll back anything that is already in the Clean Air Act but in the form of protections for public health, safeguarding public health, and it does nothing to roll back any of the progress that has been made, and it will not impede or slow down our progress as we move forward to reduce air pollution and improve public health."

This amendment trashes that statement.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016 that would ensure that the environment and human health aspects are protected. The amendment states that if the EPA Administrator in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, finds that application of any provision of this act could harm human health or the environment, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act shall cease to apply.

The Ozone Standards Implementation Act provides for much-needed improvements to allow the EPA to do so. Yes, I made clear that there had been improvements in air quality, despite the fact that our own industry, our own economic growth has tripled. Would anybody say that we are now where we want to be?

We do not want, at this point of progress, to countermand the progress we have made. We should be building on that progress. No one, I think, in the world today—and certainly in the United States—would say we have finally reached where we want to be. The improvements are not nearly enough. We need to go much more rapidly. We certainly don't need to be retrograde at this point in history when the whole world now is looking at this very issue and seeking to improve.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a quote from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District executive director. He said these words before our committee: "H.R. 4775, in my opinion, provides for much-needed streamlining of the implementation of the Clean Air Act. It does not roll back anything that is already in the Clean Air Act but in the form of protections for public health, safeguarding public health, and it does nothing to roll back any of the progress that has been made, and it will not impede or slow down our progress as we move forward to reduce air pollution and improve public health."

This amendment trashes that statement.
I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, we should all be grateful to the authors of the Clean Air Act for the progress we have achieved. The way to express our gratitude is to use an occasion like this to expand, not to retract, that act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. NORTON. 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 the District of Columbia will be 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 House Report 114–607 on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. RUSH of Illinois.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. NORTON of the District of Columbia.

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. WHITFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignates 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 236, noes 170, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—236

Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Cosmetic
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culbertson
Culbeto
Davis
Dent
Descalsis
DesJarlais
DiBartolo
Duncan (SC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleming
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Giaimo
Gillum
Gowdy
Graner
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MD)
Griffith
Grothman
Gustina
Guthrie
Hanna
Hartler
Harsin
Hartson
Haulmark
Haugen (MI)
Hefren
Herrero
Herrera Beutler
Herrera-Buelna
Herrington
Herron
Hill
Holt
Hopenhayn
House
Howard
Howard
Hurt (TX)
Hurt (VA)

Clay
CnO
Coffman
Colin
Colin
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culbertson
Culbeto
Davis
Dent
Descalsis
DesJarlais
DiBartolo
Duncan (SC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleming
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Giaimo
Gillum
Gowdy
Graner
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MD)
Griffith
Grothman
Gustina
Guthrie
Hanna
Hartler
Harsin
Hartson
Haulmark
Haugen (MI)
Hefren
Herrero
Herrera Beutler
Herrera-Buelna
Herrington
Holt
Hopenhayn
House
Howard
Howard
Hurt (TX)
Hurt (VA)

Price
Tom
Pelosi
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tennessee
Tenn...
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

☐ 1636

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 277 on the Rush of Illinois Amendment No. 2 on H.R. 4775. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. PallONE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PallOne) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the nos prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

A recorded vote has been ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 169, noes 242, not voting 22, as follows:

**AYES—169**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Beccera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodei</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorosa</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorsolo</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armey</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arneil</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arner</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arneson</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artlett</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artur</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (AL)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (AR)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (CA)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (ID)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (ID)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (IL)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (IL)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (IN)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (IN)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (IN)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (IN)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (IN)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson (IN)</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT VOTING—22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cárdenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulvaney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nungesser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ose (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palazzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stutzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veasey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If not, the question is on the committee 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. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. Rush moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4775 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report back the same bill, with the following amendment:

Page 5, after line 11, insert the following:

(c) LIMITATION.—If the Administrator, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, finds that application of subsection (a) could increase the incidence of asthma attacks, respiratory disease, cardiovascular disease, stroke, heart attacks, babies born with low birth weight and impaired fetal growth, neurodevelopmental delay, and other serious harms to human health, especially for vulnerable populations such as pregnant women, children, the elderly, outdoor workers, and low-income communities, then this section shall not apply.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RUSH) having assumed the chair, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) as above recorded.

NOT VOTING—23

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Republican Party has truly fallen in line behind its standard-bearer, Donald Trump, and is content to put industry profits over the public interest. Mr. Speaker, the art of the deal should not mean putting corporate welfare over the public well-being.

Mr. Speaker, our agreement is non-negotiable. Protecting the public health is absolutely why we are here in this Congress today.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4775 is a disastrous bill that will put our most vulnerable citizens, including the elderly, the young, pregnant women, and low-income communities, at substantial risk.

This bill unacceptably delays implementation of EPA’s 2015 ozone standards for another 8 years, while also delaying any new evidence regarding the health implications from ozone and other harmful pollutants for at least a decade, despite what the science may say in the interval.

In fact, under this legislation, not only will States be exempt from complying with the 2015 standards until 2016, but parents—our parents—and our loved ones, Mr. Speaker, will not even be informed if their communities were in violation of clean air standards until the year 2025.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better threat to the public interest of denying citizens information directly tied to their health and to their well-being.

The research, Mr. Speaker, informs us that breathing in dirty pollutants...
such as ozone, carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen, sulfur dioxide, and other dirty pollutants can lead to a host of problems, including asthma, inflammation of the lungs, respiratory disease, and even premature death.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, despite all of the scientific evidence, this bill will stall the new ozone standards, permanently weaken the Clean Air Act, and hamstring EPA’s ability to regulate these harmful contaminants, both now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in order to address some of the deficiencies found in this bill, I am offering an amendment that would nullify sections from taking effect if they may result in adverse public health impacts.

This amendment simply states that section 2(a) would cease to apply if the EPA Administrator, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, finds that it could increase health problems, including asthma attacks, respiratory disease, cardiovascular disease, stroke, heart attacks, babies with low birth weight and impaired fetal growth, neurological damage, premature mortality, or other serious harms to human health, especially for America’s most vulnerable populations such as pregnant women, children, the elderly, outdoor workers, and low-income communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense and compassionate amendment that seeks to put the interests of the public health above the profits of industry, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want healthy air. Everyone here in this Chamber wants healthy air. Every American wants healthy air.

Where I live in the greater Houston area, we have struggled with air quality, but we are making great progress. In fact, communities all across America have cut ozone levels by one-third in the last few decades. That progress must continue, and that is why this bill is not about blocking the path forward on clean air.

As a top air official in California said about H.R. 4775: “It does not roll back anything that is already in the Clean Air Act in the form of protections for public health... it will not slow down our progress as we move forward to reduce air pollution and improve public health.

There has never been a regulator in this country who wants to drag their feet on clean air. Our States have said for years that they face real challenges under current law. Addressing those real challenges is what this bill is all about.

That is why we need H.R. 4775. It gives our local officials the tools they need to make the Clean Air Act work. It tackles the challenges of States being asked to implement overbeneficial regulations.

H.R. 4775 will let EPA consider whether its rules are achievable, but never putting cost ahead of public health when setting a new standard.

H.R. 4775 will make sure that clean air rules are implemented fairly, and that communities like mine and yours aren’t penalized for emissions they can’t control.

In 2008, the Bush administration put lower ozone standards. In 2015, the Obama administration finally put out rules for 2008 standards. America lost 7 years of cleaner air.

Albert Einstein said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Let’s not repeat the last 7 years of ozone insanity.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the motion to recommit. Give our local communities the ozone sanity they crave and deserve. Vote “yes” for final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that motion to reconsider the bill, pursuant to the request of the gentleman from California, Mr. ROESCHLING, it is so ordered.

The Yeas and Nays were ordered taken, and the result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, the House shall not further consider the veto message.

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, the House shall not further consider the veto message.

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Making in order consideration of veto message on H.J. Res. 88.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, the House shall not further consider the veto message.

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, the House shall not further consider the veto message.

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, the House shall not further consider the veto message.

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, the House shall not further consider the veto message.

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, the House shall not further consider the veto message.

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
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(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act of 2016” or the “PIPPES Act.”

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:
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SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) GAS AND HAZARDOUS LIQUID.—Section 60125(a) of title 49, United States Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting “and $3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $7,785,000 shall be expended for making grants.” and

(2) by striking the item relating to fiscal years 2016 to 2019 and inserting the following:

“Of the amounts made available under section 60125(a)(1), the Secretary shall expend $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 to 2019 to carry out section 6106.”.

(b) OPERATIONAL EXPENSES.—There are appropriated to the Department of Transportation for the necessary operational expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration the following amounts:

(1) $21,000,000 for fiscal year 2016.

(2) $22,200,000 for fiscal year 2017.

(3) $22,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.

(4) $23,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(c) ONE-CALL NOTIFICATION PROGRAMS.—In general:

(1) of the amount made available under section 60103(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“6107. Funding

Of the amounts made available under section 60103(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PUBLICATION.—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and $3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and $7,785,000 shall be expended for making grants.” and

(2) by striking the item relating to fiscal years 2016 to 2019 and inserting the following:

“Of the amounts made available under section 60125(a)(1), the Secretary shall expend $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019 to carry out section 6106.”.

(b) PIPES AND PIPELINE INTEGRITY PROGRAM.—Section 12(f) of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 60102) is amended by striking “2012 through 2015” and inserting “2016 through 2019”.

(c) SEC. 3. REGULATORY UPDATES.

(a) PUBLICATION.—

(1) In general:

The Secretary of Transportation shall publish an update on a publicly available Web site of the Department of Transportation regarding the status of a regulated industry and the rules and regulations issued by the Secretary to implement such rules and regulations, and the implementation of such rules and regulations. The Secretary shall publish such an update within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and the Secretary shall update such an update at least annually thereafter. The Secretary shall update such a report to include the following:

(i) the number of new rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of Transportation since the previous update, including the date of issuance of each new rule or regulation

(ii) the status of implementation of each new rule or regulation

(iii) any significant changes to existing rules and regulations, and

(iv) any significant rulemakings that have been suspended, delayed, or modified by the Secretary of Transportation since the previous update

(b) SEC. 4. DECISION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS THE BILL.

The motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2276) to amend title 49, United States Code, is in order. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to bring up the bill (S. 2276).

SEC. 4. DECISION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS THE BILL.

The motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2276) to amend title 49, United States Code, is in order. The Sergeant at Arms is directed to bring up the bill (S. 2276).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the House of the report of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House assembled,
House of Representatives that such publication has been made.

(2) DEADLINES.—The Secretary shall publish an update under this subsection not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until a final rule has been published in the Federal Register for each outstanding regulation.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in each update published under subsection (a) the following:

(1) a description of the work plan for each outstanding regulation;

(2) an updated rulemaking timeline for each regulation;

(3) current staff allocations with respect to each outstanding regulation;

(4) any resource constraints affecting the rulemaking process for each outstanding regulation;

(5) any other details associated with the development of each outstanding regulation that affect the progress of the rulemaking process and;

(6) a description of all rulemakings regarding gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities published in the Federal Register that are not identified under subsection (c).

(c) OUTSTANDING REGULATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “outstanding regulation” means—

(a) a final rule required under the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–90) that has not been published in the Federal Register; and

(b) a final rule regarding gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities required under this Act or a statute enacted prior to the date of enactment of this Act (other than the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–90) that has not been published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. NATURAL GAS INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW.

(a) Report.—Not later than 18 months after the date of publication in the Federal Register of a final rule regarding the safety of gas transmission pipelines related to the notice of proposed rulemaking issued on April 8, 2016, titled “Pipeline Safety: Safety of Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipelines,” the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report regarding the integrity management programs for gas pipeline facilities required under section 60118 of title 49, United States Code.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of stakeholder perspectives, taking into consideration technical, operational, and economic feasibility, regarding ways to enhance pipeline facility safety, prevent inadvertent releases from pipeline facilities, and mitigate any adverse consequences of such inadvertent releases, including changes to the definition of high consequence area, or expanding integrity management beyond high consequence areas;

(2) a review of the types of benefits, including safety benefits, and estimated costs of the legacy class location regulations;

(3) an analysis of the impact pipeline facility features, including the age, condition, materials, and construction of a pipeline facility, have on safety and risk analysis of a particular pipeline facility;

(4) a description of any challenges affecting Federal or State regulators in the oversight of gas transmission pipeline facilities and how the challenges are being addressed; and

(5) a description of any challenges affecting the natural gas industry in complying with the high consequence area regulations and how the challenges are being addressed, including any challenges faced by publicly owned natural gas distribution systems.

(c) DEFINITION OF HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREA.—In this section, the term “high consequence area” has the meaning given the term in section 195.403 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 5. HAZARDOUS LIQUID INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW.

(a) Report.—Not later than 18 months after the date of publication in the Federal Register of a final rule regarding the safety of hazardous liquid pipeline facilities related to the notice of proposed rulemaking issued on October 13, 2015, titled “Pipeline Safety: Safety of Hazardous Liquid Pipelines” (80 Fed. Reg. 66110), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report regarding the integrity management programs for hazardous liquid pipeline facilities, as regulated under sections 195.450 and 195.452 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the work plan for each outstanding regulation;

(2) an analysis of how surveying, assessment, mitigation, and monitoring activities, including real-time hazardous liquid pipeline facility monitoring during significant flood events and information sharing with Federal agencies, are being used to address risks associated with rivers, flood plains, lakes, and coastal areas;

(3) an analysis of the impact pipeline facility features, including the age, condition, materials, and construction of a pipeline facility, have on safety and risk analysis of a particular pipeline facility and what changes to the definition of high consequence area could be made to improve pipeline facility safety; and

(4) a description of any challenges affecting Federal or State regulators in the oversight of hazardous liquid pipeline facilities and how those challenges are being addressed.

(c) DEFINITION OF HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREA.—In this section, the term “high consequence area” has the meaning given the term in section 195.450 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL SAFETY STANDARDS COMMITTEE.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—Section 60115(b)(4)(A) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “State commissioners” and inserting “State officials. The Secretary shall select the 2 individuals” and in subsection (b) changing “State officials.”

(b) VACANCIES.—Section 60115(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(5) Within 90 days of the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall fill all vacancies on the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, the Technical Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, and any other committees established pursuant to this section. After that period, the Secretary shall fill any vacancy on any such committee within 60 days after the vacancy occurs.

SEC. 7. INSPECTION REPORT INFORMATION.

(a) INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE.—Section 60108 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(5) An Inspector may enter the facilities of any pipeline company at any time for the purpose of conducting inspections of the facilities of the pipeline company.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than October 1, 2017, and each fiscal year thereafter for 2 years, the Administrator shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of—

(1) the number of times a deadline under section 60108(e) of title 49, United States Code, was exceeded in the prior fiscal year; and

(2) in each instance, the length of time by which the deadline was exceeded.

SEC. 8. IMPROVING DAMAGE PREVENTION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with stakeholders, shall conduct a study on improving existing damage prevention programs through technological improvements in location, mapping, excavation, and communications practices to prevent excavation damage to a pipe or its coating, including the adoption of technical, operational, and economic feasibility and existing damage prevention programs.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an identification of any methods to improve existing damage prevention programs through location and mapping technologies, or technologies in an effort to reduce releases caused by excavation damage;

(2) an analysis of how increased use of global positioning system digital mapping, predictive analytic tools, public awareness initiatives including one-call initiatives, the use of mobile devices, and computer-aided technologies supplemented existing one-call notification and damage prevention programs to reduce the frequency and severity of incidents caused by excavation damage;

(3) an identification of any methods to improve excavation practices or technologies in an effort to reduce pipeline damage;

(4) a description of the feasibility of a national data repository for pipeline excavation accident data that creates standardized data models for storing and sharing pipeline excavation accident information; and

(5) an identification of opportunities for stakeholder engagement in preventing excavation damage.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on...
Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives submit a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including recommendations, that include the consideration of technical, operational, and feasibility, to incorporate into existing damage prevention programs technological improvements and practices that help prevent excavation damage.

SEC. 9. WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT.

(a) REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a review of Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration staff resource management, including—

(1) geographic allocation plans, hiring and time-to-hire challenges, and expected retirement rates and recruitment strategies;

(2) an identification and description of any previous periods of macroeconomic and pipeline industry conditions under which the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has encountered difficulty in filling vacancies, and the degree to which special hiring authorities, including direct hiring authority authorized by the Office of Personnel Management, could have ameliorated such difficulty; and

(3) recommendations to address hiring challenges, and any other identified staff resource challenges.

(b) DIRECT HIRING.—Upon identification of a period described in subsection (a)(2), the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration may apply to the Office of Personnel Management for the authority to appoint qualified candidates to any position relating to pipeline safety, as determined by the Administrator, without regard to sections 3309 through 3319 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) PHASE-OUT CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration from applying to the Office of Personnel Management for the authority described in subsection (b) prior to the completion of the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 10. INFORMATION-SHARING SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall convene a working group to consider the development of a voluntary information-sharing system to encourage collaborative efforts to improve inspection information feedback and reduce the time to verify data, including dig verification data between operators of pipeline facilities and in-line inspector vendors to expand knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of in-line inspection technologies and methodologies;

(1) options to create a secure system that protects proprietary data while encouraging the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis;

(2) means and best practices for the protection of safety- and security-sensitive information and protection of data; and

(3) regulatory, funding, and legal barriers to sharing the information described in paragraphs (1) through (4).

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of any efforts underway to test a secure information-sharing system for the purpose described in subsection (a);

(2) a description of any progress in establishing common standards for maintaining, collecting, and presenting pipeline safety regulatory inspection data, and a methodology for sharing the data;

(3) a description of any inadequacies or gaps in State and Federal inspection, enforcement, geospatial, or other pipeline safety regulatory inspection data; and

(4) a description of the potential safety benefits of a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory inspection database.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In implementing this section, the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including those who have experience conducting similar efforts.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.—The Secretary shall establish a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory database—

(1) after submission of the report required under subsection (a); or

(2) in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, establishes a pipeline safety regulatory database at the end of the 1 year period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(25) underground natural gas storage facility" means a gas pipeline facility that stores natural gas in an underground facility, including—

"(A) a depleted hydrocarbon reservoir;"

"(B) an aquifer reservoir; or"

"(C) a solution-mined salt cavern reservoir;"

(3) ways to encourage the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis;

(2) geographic allocation plans, hiring and time-to-hire challenges, and expected retirement rates and recruitment strategies;

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) recommendations, including those of the Secretary, to improve inspection information feedback and reduce the time to verify data, including dig verification data between operators of pipeline facilities and in-line inspector vendors to expand knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of in-line inspection technologies and methodologies;

(2) options to create a secure system that protects proprietary data while encouraging the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis;

(3) means and best practices for the protection of safety- and security-sensitive information and protection of data; and

(l) regulatory, funding, and legal barriers to sharing the information described in paragraphs (1) through (4).

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of any efforts underway to test a secure information-sharing system for the purpose described in subsection (a);

(2) a description of any progress in establishing common standards for maintaining, collecting, and presenting pipeline safety regulatory inspection data, and a methodology for sharing the data;

(3) a description of any inadequacies or gaps in State and Federal inspection, enforcement, geospatial, or other pipeline safety regulatory inspection data; and

(4) a description of the potential safety benefits of a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory inspection database.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In implementing this section, the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including those who have experience conducting similar efforts.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.—The Secretary shall establish a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory database—

(1) after submission of the report required under subsection (a); or

(2) in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, establishes a pipeline safety regulatory database at the end of the 1 year period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(25) underground natural gas storage facility" means a gas pipeline facility that stores natural gas in an underground facility, including—

"(A) a depleted hydrocarbon reservoir;"

"(B) an aquifer reservoir; or"

"(C) a solution-mined salt cavern reservoir;"

(3) ways to encourage the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis;

(2) geographic allocation plans, hiring and time-to-hire challenges, and expected retirement rates and recruitment strategies;

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) recommendations, including those of the Secretary, to improve inspection information feedback and reduce the time to verify data, including dig verification data between operators of pipeline facilities and in-line inspector vendors to expand knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of in-line inspection technologies and methodologies;

(2) options to create a secure system that protects proprietary data while encouraging the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis;

(3) means and best practices for the protection of safety- and security-sensitive information and protection of data; and

(l) regulatory, funding, and legal barriers to sharing the information described in paragraphs (1) through (4).

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of any efforts underway to test a secure information-sharing system for the purpose described in subsection (a);

(2) a description of any progress in establishing common standards for maintaining, collecting, and presenting pipeline safety regulatory inspection data, and a methodology for sharing the data;

(3) a description of any inadequacies or gaps in State and Federal inspection, enforcement, geospatial, or other pipeline safety regulatory inspection data; and

(4) a description of the potential safety benefits of a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory inspection database.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In implementing this section, the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including those who have experience conducting similar efforts.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.—The Secretary shall establish a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory database—

(1) after submission of the report required under subsection (a); or

(2) in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, establishes a pipeline safety regulatory database at the end of the 1 year period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(25) underground natural gas storage facility" means a gas pipeline facility that stores natural gas in an underground facility, including—

"(A) a depleted hydrocarbon reservoir;"

"(B) an aquifer reservoir; or"

"(C) a solution-mined salt cavern reservoir;"
compatible with the minimum standards prescribed under this section.

(4) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the Secretary’s authority under this title to regulate the underground storage of gas that is not natural gas.”.

(c) USER FEES.—Chapter 603 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 60301 the following:

“§ 60302. User fees for underground natural gas storage facilities

(1) IN GENERAL.—A fee shall be imposed on an entity providing an underground natural gas storage facility subject to section 60141. Any such fee imposed shall be collected before the end of the fiscal year to which it applies.

(a) MEANS OF COLLECTION.—The Secretary of Transportation shall prescribe procedures to collect fees under this section. The Secretary may use a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government or of a State or local government to collect the fee and may reimburse the department, agency, or instrumentality a reasonable amount for its services.

(b) USE OF FEES.—

(1) ACCOUNT.—There is established an Underground Natural Gas Storage Facilities Safety Account in the Pipeline Safety Fund established in the Treasury of the United States under section 60301.

(2) USE OF FEES.—A fee collected under this section—

(A) shall be deposited in the Underground Natural Gas Storage Facility Safety Account;

(B) if the fee is related to an underground natural gas storage facility subject to section 60141, the amount of the fee may be used only for an activity related to underground natural gas storage facility safety.

(3) LIMITATION.—No fee may be collected under this section, except to the extent that the expenditure of such fee to pay the costs of an activity related to underground natural gas storage facility safety for which such fee is imposed is provided in advance in an appropriations Act.

(4) CERAMIC AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER 601.—The table of sections for chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“60141. Standards for underground natural gas storage facilities.”.

(2) CHAPTER 603.—The table of sections for chapter 603 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 60301 the following:

“60302. User fees for underground natural gas storage facilities.”.

SEC. 13. JOINT INSPECTION AND OVERSIGHT.

Section 60106 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) INSPECTORS.—At the request of a State authority, the Secretary shall allow for a certified State authority under section 60105 to participate in the inspection of an interstate pipeline facility.

SEC. 14. SAFETY DATA SHEETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each owner or operator of a hazardous liquid pipeline facility, following an accident involving such pipeline facility or a hazardous liquid spill, shall provide safety data sheets on any spilled hazardous liquid to the designated Federal On-Scene Coordinator and appropriate State and local emergency responders within 6 hours of a telephonic or electronic notice of the accident to the National Response Center.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL ON-SCENE COORDINATOR.—The term ‘Federal On-Scene Coordinator’ has the meaning given such term in section 311(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)).

(2) NATIONAL RESPONSE CENTER.—The term ‘National Response Center’ means the center described under section 300.125(a) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.


SEC. 15. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, after an opportunity notice of proposed rulemaking to take public comment on the petition for rulemaking dated October 28, 2015, titled “Corrections to Title 49 C.F.R. §172.336 (Identification numbers; special provisions)” (P-1667).

SEC. 16. EMERGENCY ORDER AUTHORITY.

Section 60117 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) PAYMENTS.—After notifying and considering the application of an owner of pipeline facilities to the Secretary for reimbursement under paragraph (4), and after the Secretary determines in writing on or before the last day of such period that the imminent hazard still exists.

(6) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After completion of the review process described in paragraph (4), or issuance of a written determination by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (5), an entity subject to, and aggrieved by, an emergency order issued under this subsection may seek judicial review of the order in a district court of the United States and shall be given expedited consideration.

(B) LIMITATION.—The filing of a petition for review under subparagraph (A) shall not stay or modify the force and effect of the agency’s final decision under paragraph (4), or the written determination under paragraph (5), unless stayed or modified by the Secretary.

(7) REGULATIONS.

(A) TEMPORARY REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall issue such temporary regulations as are necessary to carry out the emergency orders. Such temporary regulations shall expire on the date of issuance of the final regulations required under subparagraph (B).

(B) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this subsection. Such regulations shall ensure that the review process described in paragraph (4) contains the same procedures as subsections (d) and (g) of section 108.19 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, and is otherwise consistent with the review process developed under such section, to the greatest extent practicable and not inconsistent with this section.

(8) EMERGENCY HAZARD DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘imminent hazard’ means the existence of a condition relating to a gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facility that presents a substantial likelihood that death, serious illness, severe personal injury, or a substantial endangerment to health, property, or the environment may occur before the reasonably foreseeable completion of a formal proceeding begun to lessen the risk of such death, illness, injury, or endangerment.

(9) LIMITATION AND SAVINGS CLAUSE.—An emergency order issued under this subsection may not be construed to—

(A) alter, amend, or limit the Secretary’s obligations under paragraph (1) of section 553 of title 5; or

(B) provide the authority to amend the Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 17. STATE GRANT FUNDS.

Section 60107 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) PAYMENTS.—After notifying and consulting with a State authority, the Secretary may withhold a payment when the Secretary decides that the authority is not carrying out satisfactorily a safety program or not acting satisfactorily as an authority. The Secretary may withhold a payment under this section only when the authority ensures the Secretary that it will provide the remaining costs of a safety program, except when the authority is not carrying out satisfactorily a safety program.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) INJUNCTIONS.—State program’s certification is rejected under section 60105(f) or such program is otherwise...
suspended or interrupted, the Secretary may use any undistributed, deobligated, or recovered funds authorized under this section to carry out pipeline safety activities for that State within the period of availability for such funds.

SEC. 18. RESPONSE PLANS.

Each owner or operator of a hazardous liquid pipeline facility required to prepare a response plan pursuant to part 194 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, shall—

(1) consider the impact of a discharge into or on or off navigable water or adjoining shorelines, including those that may be covered in whole or in part by ice; and

(2) include procedures and resources for responding to such a spill.

SEC. 19. UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE AREAS.

(a) AREAS TO BE INCLUDED AS UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE.—Section 60109(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "have been identified as" and inserting "are part of the Great Lakes or have been identified as coastal beaches, marine coastal waters, or adjoining shorelines, including those that may be covered in whole or in part by ice; and"

(b) UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE AREAS (USA) ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES.—The Secretary of Transportation shall revise section 195.6(b) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to explicitly state that the Great Lakes, coastal beaches, and marine coastal waters are USA ecological resources for purposes of determining whether a pipeline is in a high consequence area (as defined in section 195.450 of such title).

SEC. 20. PIPELINE SAFETY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

(a) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION LIMITATION.—Section 60310(a)(4) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting "technical pipeline safety issues" after "public participation.

(b) AUDIT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall submit to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing the procedures and procedures implemented under paragraph (1).

"(1) compliance with the consultation requirement under subsection (d)(2) of such section;

(2) the extent to which the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration enters into joint research ventures with Federal and non-Federal entities, and benefits therefrom;

(3) the policies and procedures the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has put in place to ensure there are no significant differences concerning Federal and non-Federal entities pursuant to the program, and whether those policies and procedures are being followed; and

(4) an evaluation of the outcomes of research conducted with Federal and non-Federal entities and the degree to which such outcomes have been adopted or utilized.

(b) COLLABORATIVE SAFETY RESEARCH REPORT.—(1) BIENNIAL REPORTS.—Section 60124(a)(6) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:—

"(i) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—The Secretary shall consider the following:

(A) the ability of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to oversee grant funds and usage; and

(B) the procedures used for such oversight.

SEC. 21. STUDY OF MATERIALS AND CORROSION PREVENTION IN PIPELINE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report evaluating the grant programs and Federal and State authorities in carrying out activities pursuant to an agreement under such section.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the range of piping materials, including plastic materials, used to transport hazardous liquids and natural gas in the United States and in other developed countries around the world;

(2) the types of technologies used for corrosion prevention, including coatings and cathodic protection;

(C) common causes of corrosion, including interior and exterior moisture buildup and impacts of moisture buildup under insulation; and

(D) the training provided to personnel responsible for identifying and preventing corrosion in pipelines, and for repairing such pipelines;

(3) an analysis of the estimated costs and associated benefits, including safety benefits, associated with the use of such materials and technologies; and

(4) stakeholder and expert perspectives on the effectiveness of corrosion control techniques to reduce the incidence of corrosion-related pipeline failures.

SEC. 22. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the Senate shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce a report regarding the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's research and development project carried out under section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note), The report shall include an evaluation of—

(1) the extent to which the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration enters into joint research ventures with Federal and non-Federal entities, and benefits therefrom;

(2) the policies and procedures the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has put in place to ensure there are no significant differences concerning Federal and non-Federal entities pursuant to the program, and whether those policies and procedures are being followed; and

(3) the estimated staff and other resources used by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to carry out activities pursuant to an agreement under such section.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR DENIAL.—Section 60106(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d)(3)(C) and inserting the following:

"C) FUNDING FROM NON-FEDERAL SOURCES.—The Secretary shall ensure that—

"(i) at least 30 percent of the costs of research and development activities may be carried out using non-Federal sources;

(2) at least 20 percent of the costs of basic research and development with universities may be carried out using non-Federal sources; and

(3) at least 10 percent of the costs of research and development for purely governmental purposes may be carried out using Federal funds.
"
is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) NOTICE UPON DENIAL.—If a State authority requests an interstate agreement under section 60109, or the Secretary denies such request, the Secretary shall provide written notification to the State authority of the denial that includes an explanation of the reasons for such denial.

SEC. 25. REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE FACILITIES.

Section 60109 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE FACILITIES.—

(1) INTENSITY ASSESSMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the pipeline operator and the Secretary shall conduct an analysis of the consequences and the potential impact of a release of hazardous liquid pipeline facilities on rate payers and end users of natural gas products of such release, and make it available to the public.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study pursuant to subsection (a), the Transportation Research Board shall consult with Federal, State, and local governments, private sector entities, and consumer and pipeline safety advocates, as appropriate.

(3) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a) that includes the results of the study and any recommendations for harmonizing and improving the accuracy of reporting.

(4) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Administrator determines that the recommendations made under subsection (a) would significantly improve the reporting and measurement of lost and unaccounted for gas and safety of natural gas distribution systems, the Administrator shall, not later than 1 year after making such determination, issue regulations, as the Administrator determines appropriate, to implement the recommendations.

SEC. 26. STUDY ON PROPANE GAS PIPELINE FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall enter into an agreement with the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies to conduct a study examining the safety, regulatory requirements, techniques, and best practices applicable to propane gas pipeline facilities.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study pursuant to subsection (a), the Transportation Research Board shall consult with Federal, State, and local governments, private sector entities, and consumer and pipeline safety advocates, as appropriate.

SEC. 27. REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS PIPELINE FACILITIES.

(a) NATIONAL SECURITY.—Section 60109(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking "; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(?) national security.

(b) UPDATE TO MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other relevant agencies, shall review and update the minimum safety standards prescribed pursuant to section 60103 of title 49, United States Code, for permit requirements, small-scale liquefied natural gas pipeline facilities.

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the Secretary's authority under chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, to regulate liquefied natural gas pipeline facilities.

SEC. 28. PIPELINE ODORIZATION STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a) and recommendations on Federal or State policies or best practices to improve safety by accelerating the implementation of methods for denoting leaks in natural gas pipelines or systems that are leaking or releasing natural gas.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a) and recommendations on Federal or State policies or best practices to improve safety by accelerating the implementation of methods for denoting leaks in natural gas pipelines or systems that are leaking or releasing natural gas.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Administrator determines that the recommendations made under subsection (b) would significantly improve pipeline safety, the Administrator shall, not later than 1 year after making such determination, and in coordination with the heads of other relevant agencies as appropriate, issue regulations, as the Administrator determines appropriate, to implement the recommendations.

SEC. 29. REPORT ON NATURAL GAS LEAK REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration shall submit to Congress a report on the amount of lost and unaccounted for natural gas.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In determining the metrics provided to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and other Federal and State agencies related to lost and unaccounted for natural gas from distribution systems, the Administrator shall—

(1) take into account the accuracy of the reporting and the measurement of lost and unaccounted for natural gas from distribution systems.

(2) analyze whether current or alternate reporting structures could better measure the accuracy of reporting.

(3) determine whether separate or alternative reporting could better measure the amount and location of lost and unaccounted for natural gas from distribution systems.

(4) determine whether separate or alternative reporting could better measure the amount and location of lost and unaccounted for natural gas from distribution systems.

(5) consider the reasons for any discrepancies, and recommendations for harmonizing and improving the accuracy of reporting.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Administrator determines that the recommendations made under subsection (b) would significantly improve pipeline safety, the Administrator shall, not later than 1 year after making such determination, and in coordination with the heads of other relevant agencies as appropriate, issue regulations, as the Administrator determines appropriate, to implement the recommendations.

SEC. 30. REVIEW OF STATUTE POLICIES RELATING TO NATURAL GAS LEAKS.

(a) REVIEW.—The Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration shall conduct a State-by-State review of State-level policies that—

(1) promote the repair and replacement of leaking natural gas distribution pipelines or systems that pose a safety threat, such as pipelines that leak and cause property damage, or pose a health threat, such as pipelines that leak and create odors.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the House of Representatives and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a) and recommendations on Federal or State policies or best practices to improve safety by accelerating the implementation of methods for denoting leaks in natural gas pipelines or systems that are leaking or releasing natural gas.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Administrator determines that the recommendations made under subsection (b) would significantly improve pipeline safety, the Administrator shall, not later than 1 year after making such determination, and in coordination with the heads of other relevant agencies as appropriate, issue regulations, as the Administrator determines appropriate, to implement the recommendations.

SEC. 31. ALISO CANYON NATURAL GAS LEAK TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK FORCE.—Not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall establish and establish an Aliso Canyon natural gas leak task force.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF TASK FORCE.—In addition to the Secretary, the task force established under subsection (a) shall be composed of—

(1) 1 representative from the Department of Transportation;

(2) 1 representative from the Department of Health and Human Services;

(3) 1 representative from the Environmental Protection Agency;

(4) 1 representative from the Department of the Interior;

(5) 1 representative from the Department of Commerce;

(6) 1 representative from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and

(7) 1 representative from local government entities, as determined appropriate by the Secretary and the Administrator.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

**GENERAL LEAVEL**

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 2276, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

I thank the Chair for the time to express my support for the Protecting Our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Energy Act, PIPES Act of 2016. This is the PIPES Act of 2016.

The United States has the largest network of energy pipelines in the world—over 2.6 million miles of pipe. Pipelines are a part of our energy infrastructure, with over 64 percent of our energy being transported by our pipes within this country. The sustained oversight of the Department of Transportation’s pipeline safety programs is critical for pipelines to continue to safely transport our energy products.

This bill was developed in a bipartisan manner over the past several years. My subcommittee held a number of hearings and roundtables to hear from stakeholders on the need for reauthorization. On April 20, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee unanimously approved our bill. Similarly, the Energy and Commerce Committee, with which we share jurisdiction, passed its version on April 27. Since then, both House committees have worked on a bipartisan basis to meld this version with the Senate’s version, which passed in December. This collaborative, constructive process has resulted in the bill we are considering today, which we believe is a solid safety improvement.

First, we require PHMSA to set minimum Federal standards for underground natural gas storage facilities—a critical issue for my home State of California after the Aliso Canyon leak. We make sure PHMSA is focused on finishing outstanding issues from the last reauthorization, by requiring PHMSA to update Congress every 90 days on its progress.

The bill also authorizes emergency order authority for the pipeline sector but with important preorder requirements to be met. Just as DOT uses such authority, it does it right.

This legislation promotes the better use of data and technology to improve safety, including studying the latest innovations in pipeline materials and corrosion protection.

Ultimately, our goal is to make sure that we have the safest pipeline network in the world.

We have worked in a bipartisan, bicameral manner to develop this bill. I believe that this bill will improve the safety of our pipeline infrastructure.

I thank Messrs. CAPUANO, SHUSTER, and DeFAZIO for their work on this bill. I also thank Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON, who has worked tirelessly on this with Ranking Member PALLONE. Lastly, I thank the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, & Transportation for its hard work. Together, we have put a great bill that will create a safer infrastructure for our pipelines.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As you have just heard, this is a great piece of legislation. This is exactly the way that Congress is supposed to work. We had our differences, but we worked them out because everybody gave a little bit to get to the middle—to get something good for America. This is the kind of bill that, on an average day, will not get any of us elected or unelected, but it is something that is good for the safety of America on pipelines and hazardous materials.

I would like to point out just a few items that, I think, are particularly important.

For the first time, we have added an emergency order authority so that our regulators, when there is a problem, can quickly address it as opposed to having to wait around and let it burn out on its own.

We added some provisions in there to boost funding to the States and the localities so that they can train their own people on how to deal with these things, because they are, after all, the first responders.

We added some information relative to oil spill response plans. For me, I thought it was very important that we added a section that makes sure that there are no conflicts of interest on the standards done by PHMSA, on which we rely.

There are many other provisions in this bill that are deserving of our support—as always, like with any bill. Any one of us can point out things that we don’t like or that we wanted more on, but that is what compromise is all about. I am proud to be here again with another bill that comes out of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and for the traditional way that we have worked for many, many years in a bipartisan way.

I thank Messrs. DENHAM, SHUSTER, and DeFAZIO, all of the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

This particular bill is more difficult than usual because there were two committees involved. It makes four different sides and eight different sides on the House, plus the Senate; yet we did it in a reasonable fashion and in a relatively quick way. It proves the system can work when you have people at the table who want it to work.
I thank everybody who has been involved with this, and I look forward to the passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to support this legislation today and to commend the committees for their work on pipeline safety and pipeline safety improvement. I also have to take this opportunity, because the committee has done very good work on the FAST Act, to talk about rail safety.

This rail accident occurred over the weekend just 7 miles from my home in the national scenic area of the Columbia River Gorge. I was there not long after it happened. I met with the incident commanders. I met with the fire chief. I met with city officials and county officials. Let me just say that, while you are protecting pipelines—and that is really important—we need to continue to make progress on rail safety and to make sure that the new cars that were ordered by this Congress get put into service, especially in these critical waterway areas, as soon as possible. We need to make sure that track improvements are required—that new fasteners are used to deal with issues where, in this case, perhaps, it is a track separation issue. We need to make sure that our first responders get all of the training that we need and that the Department of Transportation finishes its work on its rule for spill response and for safety.

This is a critically important issue for the people I represent on both the Oregon and Washington sides of the Columbia River because these trains are going through, and we are having these kinds of situations. We need to make sure we have the most up-to-date safety, the most up-to-date training, and the safest cars and tracks possible. We are going to stay on this until that happens.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what Mr. WALDEN said about the bipartisan nature of our working together between the two committees to achieve success.

The vast network of energy pipelines in this country is essentially out of sight, out of mind for most Americans, but when something goes wrong, these facilities can make themselves known in devastating and sometimes deadly ways.

This is something that both Representative CAPPS and Representative SHERMAN, unfortunately, have experienced since the start of this Congress. My own district experienced the devastation of a pipeline failure in 1994 when a pipeline exploded in Edison, New Jersey, and destroyed about 300 homes.

Ever since then, I have sought to make our Nation’s pipelines safer by making the law and its regulator stronger.

The legislation before us, while not the bill that maybe we would have written, as Mr. CAPUANO said, is a good bill. I yield 3 minutes forward on safety. It is the result of a number of weeks of bipartisan, bicameral negotiations. While some compromises were made, this is a product that in many ways is greater than the sum of its parts.

I am particularly pleased that it includes new pipeline safety provisions that were authored by a number of Energy and Power Subcommittee members, including Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. GREEN, ENGEL, MCEINNEKEY, and WELCH, and Ranking Member BOBBY RUSH.

In particular, the House amendment gives the Secretary of Transportation, for the first time ever, emergency order authority to address the threats to public health, safety, and the environment that are posed by dangerous pipelines. This provision improves national PHMSA's pipeline safety program in a comprehensive, industryscale fashion. It also changes the existing pipeline safety information grant program, which helps ensure adequate funding of pipeline safety technical assistance grants to communities and nonprofit organizations. I am pleased that the legislation improves the protection of coastal beaches and marine coastal waters—areas that are vital to my district and to the districts of many others—by explicitly designating them as areas that are unusually sensitive to the environmental damage that is caused by pipeline failures. It also contains a provision that establishes a program for regulating underground natural gas storage facilities.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the full committee chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, pipeline safety is especially personal for me. Back in 2010, we experienced a bad spill just outside of my district in southwest Michigan that impacted the Kalamazoo River. Ask anyone who was directly affected. Seeing the aftermath firsthand smacks the senses and leaves a lasting impression. While a spill can happen in an instant, the solution can take decades and, in fact, more than $1 billion to fix. Underscoring the need for strong safety laws is what this bill does.

Congress asked the Department of Transportation’s Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration—that is PHMSA for short—to develop and enforce pipeline safety regulations. PHMSA doesn’t do the job by itself. It relies heavily on partnerships with States and local governments to inspect the pipelines and, yes, to enforce the law. What is needed is that more can be done to prevent accidents from occurring and to mitigate spills when the unthinkable happens.

The amendment to the Senate bill before us today, this bill, incorporates texts from two House bills, which were both approved unanimously in committee: H.R. 5050, the Pipeline Safety Act, which passed the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and H.R. 4937, the PIPES Act, which passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

This important legislation will reauthorize PHMSA’s pipeline safety through 2019, press PHMSA to conduct overdue impact assessments and additional new safety requirements for pipeline operators. I have often said that pipelines should be subject to greater scrutiny and more frequent inspections, and that those that cross the Straits of Mackinac are a perfect example. The Straits of Mackinac is a narrow waterway that separates Michigan’s two peninsulas. It connects Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. The exceptionally strong and complex currents hundreds of feet deep make this area tremendously sensitive. If a spill were to occur, the consequences would be unthinkable.

Our solution improves protections for the Great Lakes and other areas around the country where the threat of a spill poses the greatest risk to public safety and the environment. It also requires pipeline operators to consider a worst-case discharge into icy waters and conduct more frequent and transparent inspections, in some cases, annual inspections of deep underwater crossings. This bill does that.

We also update and improve PHMSA’s pipeline safety program in a number of other ways by closing the gaps in Federal standards for underground natural gas storage and liquefied natural gas facilities. It promotes better use of data and technology and improves communication with pipeline operators to incorporate the lessons learned from past incidents.

We promised action, and today that is what this bill does. I am proud of the bipartisan agreement that will make a real difference. I am proud of the relationship that our committee has with Chairman SCRUTER and the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and all the good work that everyone has done—Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, and our colleagues in the Senate. This is a bipartisan bill. Let’s get ’er done.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act, the PIPES bill.

I thank the chairmen of the subcommittee, the full committee, and the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Representative MIKE CAPUANO, and members of the Energy and Commerce Committee on
I would say with respect to funding, the bill is funded at current baseline levels. We should have provided them additional funds to carry out their numerous pipeline safety missions, but unfortunately, we couldn’t reach bipartisan agreement on providing additional funding.

This bill does, however, increase grants to States to help them carry out their intrastate pipeline safety programs. It reauthorizes funding for pipeline safety information grants to communities, which are important to my constituents.

There are pipelines in places that no one is aware. There is one that runs down the middle of the Willamette Valley, all the way down, that supplies the Eugene Airport and a storage facility down in Eugene. A number of years ago, there was a news story, like: what pipeline? There are new developments going in. The signs are buried under blackberry bushes, and people aren’t aware of them. We have to make certain those pipelines are safe.

The new provisions for coastal areas are absolutely critical to make sure those are maintained at the highest standard and built to the highest standard in other critical resource areas.

All in all, I congratulate my colleagues and recommend this bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Transportation Committee who have put into this bill. I also want to thank Chairman FRED UPTON from the Energy and Commerce Committee, including Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE, and the Senate for their work and their leadership on this bill.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power—which, of course, I love that name—from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge some of my colleagues who worked together diligently with my office to draft this bipartisan PIPES Act that will help to modernize and secure our Nation’s vast network of energy pipeline infrastructure.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I recognize my colleagues from the Energy and Commerce Committee, including Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE, as well as the Energy and Power Subcommittee Chairman ED WHITFIELD.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge my colleagues from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, including Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OF FAZIO, as well as Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee Chairman DENHAM and Ranking Member CAPUANO, the fine gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan piece of legislation improves safety by closing gaps in Federal standards and improving protection of coastal areas, including the Great Lakes.

Additionally, this bill will enhance the quality and timeliness of Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration rulemakings, promote better use of data and technology to improve pipeline safety, and leverage Federal and State pipeline safety resources to assist State and local communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fine piece of bipartisan legislation, and I am honored
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and privileged to stand before the House and ask all of my colleagues to support this outstanding bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan, Ms. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise in strong support of this legislation, which really includes some critical protection of one of our Nation’s most precious assets. And that, of course, is the Great Lakes. Mr. Speaker, we absolutely need energy in all transparency. We need the energy, but we need to be sure that we are transiting in a very safe and environmentally secure way because there is zero room for error in the Great Lakes.

There is a 62-year-old pipeline that is called line 5 that runs under the Straits of Mackinac, which is right in between Lake Huron and Lake Michigan. Any rupture there would be very, very difficult, if not impossible, to contain. This bill has a number of provisions in regards to line 5, for instance, that would add PHMSA workforce management language at least once a year.

This bill also designates the Great Lakes as a USA ecological resource, which is very important. As well, it also makes sure that we have emergency spill response plans if, in the case of ice coverage, which really considers the unique environment of the Great Lakes.

In regards to Embidge, there is also a line 6B which runs under the Saint Clair River, which is in my district. A number of years ago—and Chairman URTON was talking about this particular line that had a spill just outside of his district—but this part of 6B runs under something called the Saint Clair River, again, a very environmentally sensitive artery for the Great Lakes.

We talked to Embidge. And long story short, they came to the right conclusion there. They actually completely replaced almost 3,600 feet of this in an environmentally sensitive way. I think this bill today goes a long way to address many of the concerns that we have had in the Great Lakes.

I thank Chairman DENHAM again for yielding the time and for taking these issues into consideration.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my friend who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for letting us Energy and Commerce forum this time.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the United States has more than 2.9 million miles of pipelines in our vast network. According to the Texas Pipeline Association, Texas has more than 220,000 miles of intrastate pipelines.

As a lifelong Houstonian, there has never been a time in my life when I haven’t lived along a pipeline ease. Needless to say, in Texas, we know pipelines, but we also know about the importance of safety.

Every day, industry moves millions of gallons of domestically produced and refined product without any problems. Since 2005, the United States has seen a general decline in the number of pipeline releases or accidents that result in environmental damage or property damage.

We understand that the compounds moved via pipeline pose a risk, and we must effectively manage and mitigate risk that protect our citizens and the environment. Today I think we are taking another step in the right direction.

The bill before the House today is a good bill that attempts to lay down concrete rules of the road for the next 5 years. For the sake of our constituencies, we need to pass this bipartisan bill in a bipartisan way. I would like to voice my support for this bill and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Four years ago we gave PHMSA a job to do. Our work has been completed, there is still work to do. That is why this bill directs PHMSA to prioritize rulemaking and complete the work before them. We should not continue to add requirements on their plate. We should allow PHMSA the time and, most importantly, give them the resources required to finish this important job. I would like to express support for the PHMSA workforce management language.

We need inspectors in the field working closely with our industry partners to avoid another emergency situation. In my opinion, robust inspection is the best option available for everyone involved. If we reach the enforcement stage, that means something has gone wrong and we are too late. Industry, PHMSA, and the workers support this provision.

The second provision I would like to support is the emergency authority for PHMSA. While this provision may not be perfect, it provides a strong balance between enforcement and review. It is important to keep in mind that this is emergency authority. Unfortunately, when there is an incident involving a pipeline, we need to act with speed, efficiency, and resolve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want our executive agencies on the scene ensuring we are protecting the people and the environment. We must ensure that people have confidence in the pipeline system, and effective crisis management will help build that belief.

I appreciate the hard work that went into crafting this provision. Compromise is not easy, so I want to thank both sides for drafting these provisions. I know there is more work ahead, but I look forward to supporting the current bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT).

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, a gas leak was discovered at one of the 115 wells at the Aliso Canyon natural gas storage facility located in my district near Porter Ranch, California. I want to thank Congressman CAPUANO for his leadership. I was a part of that effort, and was a great partner in this terrible tragedy, making sure that people were taken care of and we could move past this and move quickly to getting this taken care of.

This leak persisted for 118 days and was recognized as one of the largest disasters of 2015. During this time, residents of the surrounding neighborhoods suffered. Some temporarily relocated their families. Two schools were permanently relocated, at least for that semester, and many businesses were put on hold.

As the Representative for Porter Ranch, my immediate priority was to protect my constituents who live there and then ensure that this situation was resolved as quickly as possible. At the same time, I wanted to make sure that a crisis like this can never happen in our communities again.

Today we take a giant step forward in doing just that. In February, I introduced the Natural Gas Leak Prevention Act, which would require the Secretary of Transportation to issue adequate safety standards for natural gas storage facilities like Aliso Canyon in Porter Ranch and another very large facility, Honor Ranch in Valencia, which is also in my district.

The SAFE PIPES Act contains the language from the Natural Gas Leak Prevention Act as well as provisions to create an Aliso Canyon task force that would investigate the causes of the leak and recommend further actions to prevent such disasters in the future.

This is the type of swift and effective action that we need in order to prevent our communities and our families from tragedies like the Porter Ranch gas leak.

I want to thank many people who were involved in this situation. A special thanks to Paula Cracium and the
Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just like to close out by simply repeating what I said earlier. I am very happy, very proud to have worked on this bill. I am very happy and very satisfied with the way we worked cooperatively. I want to thank the staff on our side who worked on it, Jennifer Esposito Homendy and Steve Carlson on my staff. I want to thank all the staff on the Republican side.

I know that America has this view that we hate each other and we never talk to each other and we do nothing but legislate. I have done that in private, of course, but the truth is this is exactly the way it is supposed to work. Absent not getting a few things I wanted, this was actually a pleasure to work on. I am very proud of the work product. I am very proud of the work environment that we have. I think this is a bill that the American people can be proud of. I think it is a bill that the Congress can be proud of.

Again, I want to thank everyone who worked on this. I look forward to the President’s signature.

Again, I want to thank the staff. Let’s be honest, we take all the credit. We do the big speeches and all that kind of stuff, but without the staff, we couldn’t get this done. I want to thank everybody involved with it for their professionalism, for their enthusiasm, for their long nights and difficult time.

I look forward to doing this again in 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I, reserve the balance of my time.
coastal areas, including coastal beaches, marine coastal waters, and the Great Lakes, by explicitly designating them as “unusually sensitive areas.” This will bring more stringent safety requirements to these particularly vulnerable areas like my community. Finally, this legislation would require a report examining ways to strengthen hazardous liquid pipeline safety through integrity management actions, including an analysis of risk factors that may warrant more frequent inspections.

While nothing can take us back to prevent the Plains spill, this bill as a whole is an important bipartisan effort to protect my and other communities going forward. And that is why I support it. We must embrace this opportunity for the sake of the health and safety of our constituents and the environment.

I would like to thank Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Upton and Ranking Member Pallone as well as subcommittee Ranking Member Rush for working with me to craft a bill that addresses the failures that led to the Plains spill. I would also like to commend staff from both the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for working in a bipartisan and bicameral way to get to this final product.

Our constituents are relying on us. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I hope we are able to send S. 2276 to the President for his signature in the very near future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Denham) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2276, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DuBois Area Middle School on Being Named a “School to Watch”

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the students and staff at the DuBois Area Middle School on being named a Pennsylvania Don Eichhorn School to Watch. This is the 12th consecutive year that the middle school to receive this distinction, one of only two middle schools in the State to do so.

The Schools to Watch program was started in 1999 as a national program to identify exceptional middle schools across the country. As part of the program, State teams observe classrooms; interview administrators, teachers, parents, and students; and look at achievement data, suspension rates, quality of lessons, and student work.

DuBois Area Middle School was formally recognized at an event coming up on June 25 in Arlington at the national Schools to Watch Conference. Maintaining this level of excellence over more than a decade is hard work. I have the highest respect for the students, the staff, and the administration at the DuBois Area Middle School. I wish them the best of success in the future.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MUHAMMAD ALI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Yarmuth) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the great joys of representing Louisville in the House of Representatives is that I get to constantly claim that I represent Muhammad Ali and the home of Muhammad Ali. It has always been a source of pride not just to me, but to all of my fellow Louisvillians that we could say that the Louisville Lop, the greatest of all time, called Louisville home.

Now one of the brightest lights in the world has extinguished. Muhammad Ali passed away last Friday after a long and courageous battle with Parkinson’s disease, and the world has experienced a collective grief period. The joy of his accomplishments, the recognition of his commitment to peace, to tolerance, to love, all of those things, have come from all over the world.

So tonight, some of my colleagues and I have come to the floor to talk about Muhammad Ali, his life, his legacy, personal stories, the impact that he has had on our lives and on this country’s life and on the world. He will be laid to rest this Friday in Louisville. Former President Clinton will eulogize him, and many leaders from around the world will be there to pay their respects.

But I go back many, many years. When I was 16 years old, living in Louisville, having watched him—then, Cassius Clay, an 8-to-1 underdog—upset the great, terrifying Sonny Liston in Miami, and then going to the airport the next day to welcome him home.

I stood outside the airport. There weren’t a lot of people there that day. And as Cassius Clay emerged from that terminal and looked around and drew himself up, I said I had never seen a more beautiful human specimen in my life.

So when he called himself not just the greatest of all time, but the prettiest of all time, I was not going to argue with him. Of course, I wasn’t going to argue with him about much.

That was my first personal exposure to Muhammad Ali. He was a man who gained fame in a violent game, but he earned his immortality as a kind, giving, and courageous man. In the years that I got to know him better and spent more time around him, that is the one thing that always came through: his wonderful soul.

I don’t know that I have ever known a person or seen a person who got more joy out of making a child smile as Muhammad Ali. And there was never a time when he was in the presence of children where he didn’t make an effort to stop, joke with them, play with them. That was a source of incredible joy for him.

So, as we remember Muhammad Ali tonight, we remember not just his boxing prowess. We remember the courage he showed outside the ring.

Muhammad Ali was in the prime of his life, a very turbulent period in American history: during the civil rights demonstrations, when America was experiencing a convulsion over how to deal with the issue of race. And then the Vietnam war—a war he opposed. He refused to pay the price for in 1967—refusing to be drafted into the armed services, knowing that it would cost him his boxing career, understanding that he might well go to jail and never fight again, but willing to stand up and put his life on the line for that, I think he turned the country around and made them view the Vietnam war in a different light. It wouldn’t have happened, but for Muhammad Ali. He was not the only one, of course, but he was the most prominent one.

Later, who can forget lighting that torch in the Atlanta Olympics in 1996, shaking from the Parkinson’s disease that he had, but inspiring millions. And, again, making a statement about disabilities that meant so much to so many.

So tonight, as we hear from various Members about Muhammad Ali, I think what will come through is not just, again, his skills as an athlete, but his contributions as a citizen of the world and someone who has left a lasting legacy, not just on people’s lives individually, but on the civilization as a whole.

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank Mr. Yarmuth for putting together this hour. I think it is important that we recognize icons in our society and people who have contributed so much, as you stand up and proud to our culture and to the thinking in our country about war, about race, and about people with disabilities. Those are three very, very major areas that Muhammad Ali had a great impact on.

You related back to when you were 16 years old. I was not quite 15 years old. At that time, my family had moved to Coral Gables, Florida. We lived there.
from 1961 to 1964. During that period, Muhammad Ali’s second home was Miami Beach and the 5th Street Gym. During that period is when Ali, as Cassius Clay, had won the Olympic gold medal—and I remember him winning the Olympic gold medal in 1960, in Rome—and when his professional career started. He probably started in Louisville, but he was quickly in Miami Beach fighting.

So Ali was on the beach all the time in Miami Beach and on the sports shows and whatever else, but always on TV and a personality in Miami Beach.

My granddad gave me $20, which was a lot of money, on February 25, 1964, if I remember—and I went to that fight. I was sitting probably in the highest seat in the Miami Beach Convention Center and watching that fighting by myself. My dad wasn’t so much into it, but my grandfather gave me that $20 and I went.

I have got my docket. It’s a great looking Clay-Liston ticket, in good shape, and a couple of programs from that event, which I am proud to have. I have been a fan of his, and I know how much of an impact he had on our world. I was also a boxing fan of Floyd Patterson. Floyd Patterson was a previous champion. The first time that Floyd fought Muhammad Ali, I have to admit that I was cheering for Floyd. Floyd didn’t do too well. He hurt his back and was taunted by Ali. He wanted him to say his name. And he punished him pretty good through 12 rounds.

But when they fought, which was in the early seventies, Patterson did a lot better. They stopped the fight at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh. And it was closer to even. After the fight, as I understand it, Ali told the referee not to stop the fight because Patterson is fighting so well and he should be able to continue fighting and it wasn’t fair to stop it.

I sat in an interview with then-Cassius Clay with Steve Allen from 1963 that is on the Internet. In that interview, they said something about Floyd Patterson. First, Clay made a joke and he said that Liston knocked him out twice in one round. And Floyd’s jaw was somewhat challenged. He said his leg should sue his body for lack of support. And then he kind of stopped and laughed and chuckled and said: I shouldn’t say that; I like Floyd. Of course, that was before. Floyd didn’t recognize his new name.

Louisville was the home of Cassius Clay/Muhammad Ali. One of the great attractions in Louisville is the Muhammad Ali Center, which I have had the opportunity to go through. You can sit and watch all of Ali’s fights, any one of them. Sit in a chair and push a button and there it is. And just watch any fight. I watched that second Patterson-Ali fight. Floyd was doing pretty good through those six rounds.

It is more than for boxing. It is a center. And it is about what he did for children and there are a lot of displays about what he did for children and what he did for peace and his efforts around the world. I think that is the great thing about Muhammad Ali. They didn’t build a boxing museum.

They built up his desire for freedom and for helping people around the globe and showing we are all one.

As he said back in I think January of this year, his religion of Islam was not about the men in Brussels or Paris or any other place there have been attacks. Islam was a religion of love, and it should be that way. And it was not the religion he knew. Anybody who thought it was that way and wanted to discriminate against people based on their religion were wrong, because it wasn’t that type of religion.

So he was still, up until this year, taking positions of conscience to try to stop people in that fight direction.

I keep under my desk a quote from Muhammad Ali. It is on a postcard that I got at the Muhammad Ali Center. It shows Muhammad Ali in the ring kind of dancing around.

And the poetry. He was ahead of his time in terms of rap, but he also was ahead of his time in terms of what he brought to the sport.

As the distinguished gentleman from Louisville pointed out, when he stepped into the ring with Sonny Liston, we all feared for his life. But as it turned out, he had that speed and that endurance and his incredible skills. He did everything that a boxer shouldn’t do, but he was able to do it because of the exceptional ability.

How do I know this? We are fortunate to have in this Chamber somebody who was in the ring with Muhammad Ali. He was in the ring with him, Sonny Liston, and Joe Frazier. BOB BRADY of Philadelphia was a sparring partner and used in the ring.

As you all know, Bob Brady is a pretty big guy. And he also can move. He might not look so nowadays, but he still looks pretty fierce. I wouldn’t want to get in the ring with Bob Brady.

But I asked him once to explain what that might have been like. And he was doing freestyle with Joe Frazier. He said: But you wouldn’t get in a ring with Sonny Liston unless you had a lot of people around you. He said he was the meanest person he ever met or got in the ring with in his life.

And I said: What about Muhammad Ali? He said: There is nothing like him. He said he was a freak. I said: What do you mean, a freak? He said: A freak of nature, because of what he was able to do with his speed, with his grace, and whatever else, but always on TV and a personality in Miami Beach.
Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEeks).

Mr. MEeks. I thank the gentleman from Louisville.

Mr. Speaker, when I heard of the greatness of all time's passing, my heart was filled and heavy because he was very significant in my life. When you just think of him—and I got to meet him first as a young boy. I was about 10 years old.

Mr. MEeks was a professional boxer. He is one of 49, one of 49 individuals to get knocked out by Rocky Marciano. But that also brought him into the area where he got to know many of the boxers in training, et cetera. He would train in the same gym in New York, where Sugar Ray Robinson was, and where Bundini Brown and Youngblood were, who were always in Ali’s corner. So I got to see Ali, this Cassius Clay train at an early age, and fell in love with him immediately.

Number one what you could do when you saw Muhammad Ali, at that time you saw a young man who was confident. And yes, as I hear my colleagues talking about his athletic ability, and skills, he had all of that.

But what I would like to talk about briefly tonight, what was the highest of esteem for Muhammad Ali was his brain. There is nothing that Ali did that he didn’t think about. Everything that he did, there was a reason for it.

When he first saw this wrestler and how people hated him, this George guy, but he saw how all the people were coming to watch and paying all of their money because they were talking, he was talking. He said here’s a good way to promote myself and to make sure that he could make some money, and so he did that.

Then he thought about calling and naming the round that he was calling the name Muhammed Ali. It was even a greater honor when he received the most votes from my colleagues, and he received one of our Phoenix Awards, named after Ralph Metcalfe.

So when I stood on that stage before thousands and thousands of individuals, including the President of these United States, President Barack Obama, and watched the video that his family sent because he wasn’t able to attend that dinner, I sat there, honored and proud because this Black man made a difference in the lives of so many young children, so many adults. And today, we come here and we salute and we honor a great legacy.

So I want to thank you, Congressman YARMUTH, for allowing me the opportunity to share that reminiscence about The Greatest.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman so much for allowing me the opportunity to share that reminiscence about The Greatest.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank my colleague, Congressman YARMUTH.

Mr. Speaker, to the rest of my colleagues, it is indeed an honor for me to come tonight to share in the life and the legacy of The Greatest, of the champ, of Muhammad Ali.

Like my colleagues, I followed his career and was mesmerized by his wit, his poetry, and, more specifically, his boxing skill.

But for me tonight, it was a special honor when I became a Member of this United States Congress. It was during the 113th Congress and the 44th Congressional Black Caucus Foundation’s Annual Legislative Conference.

During that conference, each member of the Congressional Black Caucus can submit the name of someone they think has impacted the lives of others, whether it was for health care, whether it was for civil rights, or making a difference through philanthropy.

As I thought about all of the individuals that I could submit, I was very proud that I submitted the name Muhammad Ali. It was even a greater honor when he received the most votes from my colleagues, and he received one of our Phoenix Awards, named after Ralph Metcalfe.

So when I stood on that stage before thousands and thousands of individuals, including the President of these United States, President Barack Obama, and watched the video that his family sent because he wasn’t able to attend that dinner, I sat there, honored and proud because this Black man made a difference in the lives of so many young children, so many adults.

And today, we come here and we salute and we honor a great legacy.

So I want to thank you, Congressman YARMUTH, for allowing me to make this small contribution.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentlewoman.
Mr. Speaker, I have used enough time this evening. I will simply close. I cannot close like my friend, Congressman Greg Meeks, did a moment ago. That was a masterpiece, and I cannot wait to see the video of his closing on another day. It was extraordinary.

I will conclude by saying that Muhammad Ali, the greatest of all time, was not only a champion in the boxing ring, but a champion of human rights and civil rights, who, during a difficult time in our Nation’s history, stood on principle to end racism and stereotypes and the bigotry in this country.

Muhammad Ali, we love you. May God bless you, and may God bless your family.

To the fans of Muhammad Ali all across the world, I thank you for supporting this great American, and I thank you for allowing us to come into your homes and be a part of this tribute this evening.

Mr. Yarmuth. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Butterfield).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

Mr. Rush. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both of my colleagues for allowing me to come before this body to speak on behalf of the people of the city of Chicago, the people of the First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that although Muhammad Ali was and is a native of Louisville—that is his birthplace—I must also claim that Chicago is his adoptive city. He spent many, many years in Chicago. He bought a home on South Kenwood Avenue in my district.

Mr. Speaker, as a young man, a young civil rights activist myself, I can’t even express the pride that I had when I would travel down the street and point out to my young sons and anybody else who was with me that that is where Muhammad Ali lives. He was a man of the neighborhoods in Chicago. He touched many people—young people, old people, and people who didn’t necessarily share his same political or religious ideas, but he touched them anyhow.

Mr. Speaker, Muhammad Ali was a man for all seasons. Yes, he achieved prominence in the boxing arena, in the sweet science of boxing, but he

encouraging them to do good things. I know because when you listened to all of the stories afterwards, individuals were giving personal stories. Never would you see an individual as popular and well known as Ali where an individual could actually talk about a personal story, because Ali wasn’t one that was hidden behind bodyguards or this one or that one. He was one that always wanted to be the man on the street involved with people to make a difference in their life. He set an example for individuals.

So I think of the example, too, because of the size of Ali, I heard somebody talking about the rumble in the jungle, going up to the camp and watch them train in Deer Lake. I was there when he was training for George Foreman. I was there, stayed up there for about a week. There, again, talk about consciousness, he had these huge rocks, talking about all of the great African American fighters before him because he never forgot who he was or where he came from, but he had these rocks there, and he was in the gym training. I can remember he would get up on the ropes. He put his hands up, and Angelo Dundee would say: Get off the ropes, champ. Get off the ropes. Get off the ropes, champ. You are going to get killed on those ropes.

About the second round of training, he went over, and he said to Angelo: Shut up. I know what I am doing. Nobody knew what he was doing, but he knew what he was doing. He always outthought everyone. He outthought them. That was the key to this thing, the greatest of all time.

So, Ali, I say this—I say this because I remember you saying this one time to someone:

If you want some gin, I’ll get you in 10.

If you like wine, it will be round number nine.

If you can’t do it, you’re great, you’ll fall in eight.

If you want to go to heaven, it will be round number seven.

But if you want to mix, I’ll get you in six.

Talk that jive, you’ll fall in five.

If you want to go like old Moore, I’ll get you in four.

Mess with me, I’ll reduce you to three.

If that won’t do, you’ll fall in two.

If the crowd wants some fun, you’ll fall in one.

Why? Because I float like a butterfly, and I sting like a bee. That’s why nobody mess with Muhammad Ali.

Ali, we love you. We thank you for your contribution not only to Louisville, not only to the United States of America, not only to African Americans and to Africa, but to everyone on this planet. You are, indeed, God’s gift to this great planet. We thank God for your life and times. You will live on forever as the greatest of all time—and the prettiest.

Mr. Yarmuth. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Butterfield).

Mr. Butterfield. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Yarmuth) for yielding this evening.

I am absolutely embarrassed to come after my friend, Congressman Greg Meeks.

Why in the world would the gentleman put me on the podium to come to the podium at this very moment?

But I thank the gentleman, in any event, for his friendship, and I thank the gentleman for his extraordinary leadership. I was in the gentleman’s hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, a few weeks ago and thoroughly enjoyed going to church with him and meeting many of his friends there in Louisville. The gentleman is a great Member of this body, and I thank the gentleman so very much.

But, Mr. Speaker, I stand with Congressman Meeks and Congressman Cohen and all of my colleagues today to recognize and to remember a great American, a true American hero. We honor and we remember this extraordinary man and the accomplishments and the countless contributions of Muhammad Ali.

Born just 5 years before me in 1942 in Louisville, Kentucky, Cassius Marcellus Clay, Jr., was born to Cassius Marcellus Clay Sr., and Odessa Lee Grady Clay. Those were his parents. On March 6, 1964, when I was a junior in high school, after joining the Nation of Islam, Cassius Clay became known as Muhammad Ali.
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Mr. Cohen, I remember it like it was yesterday.

His interest in boxing began at the age of 12 after he reported a stolen bicycle to a local police officer named Joe Martin, who was also a boxing trainer. In 1959, Muhammad Ali was the National Golden Gloves Light Heavyweight Champion and National Amateur Heavyweight Champion. After winning his first 19 fights and that was absolutely incredible, winning his first 19 fights—including 15 knockouts, Muhammad Ali defeated Sonny Liston on February 25, 1964, to become the World Heavyweight Champion.

Muhammad Ali would then become the World Heavyweight Champion in 1964, 1974, and 1978, making him the first fighter to capture the heavyweight title on three separate occasions. In 1981, Muhammad Ali retired from professional boxing and dedicated his life to promoting world peace, fighting for civil rights, hunger relief, and just basic human values.

His humanitarian work included helping secure the release of 15 U.S. hostages. Many of my colleagues may have forgotten about that, but Muhammad Ali helped to release 15 U.S. hostages in Iraq during the first Gulf War, four hostages held in Lebanon, and conducted goodwill missions to Afghanistan and to Cuba. Muhammad Ali also started a new wave of traveling to South Africa to meet Nelson Mandela’s release from prison.
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achieved greatness because of the life that he led both inside of boxing and outside of boxing.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoons, many of us who had few heroes would gather around television sets and watch Muhammad Ali fight in the heavyweight division against other fighters and other boxers. One of his predictions came true when he defeated and knocked out his opponent in the time that he said he would, and there was a collective cheer that you could hear throughout the neighborhoods of Chicago.

He meant something to me. He meant something to others. Muhammad Ali not only achieved, worked hard, and sacrificed for excellence, but he also inspired excellence in others.

Muhammad Ali would walk down some of the main thoroughfares in Chicago: 47th Street, 79th Street, and Madison Avenue. He would walk down those streets, and the crowds would just gather around him and follow him. His beam in his eyes, the halo and the charisma that he had just made for an exciting time, a grand time for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Muhammad Ali not only was a great boxer, but he was indeed a man for all times. Look at his following not just in Louisville, not just on the south and west sides of Chicago, but all across the Nation, all across the world, foreign countries, African countries specifically. The same kind of enthusiasm that he inspired, the same kind of reverence that he inspired to the young men and young women in Chicago, you could see the same kind of inspiration ran up in the Congo, in Nigeria, in Zaire, and in other places all across the world.

Mr. Speaker, when I retired, I remember as a freshman here in Congress when we had a session and we honored the 50 greatest athletes of the century. Here was the selection — that athlete that we all knew that we wanted to be with, the one who I wanted to be with, the one who I was most excited about, the one who I wanted to be photographed with was none other than Muhammad Ali. But Muhammad Ali was here, and he of course was the only one that we knew that would come. He was the one that we knew that he would come. Muhammad Ali was here, and he of course was the only one that we knew that he would come.

Another great memory of Muhammad Ali was when he refused to go to fight in the Vietnam war. I think, in my humble opinion, had he just been a boxer, he didn’t just inspire others to take up boxing.

I was a political activist in the sixties, and Muhammad Ali spoke to the quintessential aspect of all my activism when he said: Hell no, I won’t go. Hell no, I won’t go. No Vietnamese have ever called me the N word. And he said it. I don’t want to say it on the floor, but he said it.

Mr. Speaker, from that moment on, he solidified his appeal, his essence, his relationships; he solidified himself with all of the struggling people of the Nation, of the world.

Let me just say this: I thought about Muhammad Ali when I heard of his death, and I thought of trying to recapture some of my memories of him — how he walked, his gait, how he talked. I remember the face that was also a beautiful face. He was proud of how he looked.

But, Mr. Speaker, I guess what inspired me most about Muhammad Ali was how he did not surrender his faith, his beliefs, how he did not surrender his belief, surrender his core values to the U.S. Selective Service which drafted him.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t remember the names of the men who were on that Selective Service committee. I don’t remember anything about them. They thought that they were destroying The People’s Champion, but they could not destroy The People’s Champion. He rose even above all of those people who were officially appointed to bring him down. Nobody could knock out Muhammad Ali, in a real sense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding, and I thank all of my friends.

We are friends when we come to celebrate someone as potent and powerful and, certainly, symbolic. But we should really recognize that The Greatest, Muhammad Ali, who had many homes — many of us can claim having had the privilege of him walking through many of our streets — was a husband, father, grandfather, and son to all of his family members that loved him.

Today I offer my deepest sympathy to his beautiful wife who worked so hard to create the Muhammad Ali Center, all through his magnificent talents in many different forms and capacities, to be able to now not only suffer this loss, but mourn someone who probably in their life created such a space for so many years.

I rise today to join in celebrating — for that is what I would like to do — The People’s Champion. He was truly the voice of a generation, advocating for the ending of inequality regarding African Americans, but as well, I believe he stood and opposed injustices all around the world.

The three-time world heavyweight boxing champion helped define the turbulent times in which he reigned as the most charismatic and controversial sports figure of the 20th century. We all know that he was born Cassius Marcellus Clay, Jr. Over the past 30 years, he had his own personal battle with Parkinson’s disease because he lived with it, he let others know that they could live with it, and he worked every day to support the advocacy groups who were trying to battle Parkinson’s.

He reminded me of a gold medal at the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome and being crowned the World Heavyweight Champion so many times. As I had watched him over these past years, the admiration and affection and respect grew much more looking at him as the iconic figure, the real spirit of can-do, the best of America, a man whose faith was very special to him, so much so that he was a conscience objective which was not understood. That Selective Service committee was right in putting him in that category. He walked those streets, his case was tried there, and victory came because he refused to yield on his principles.

As one of his noteworthy opponents, Floyd Patterson, in a book written by author David Remnick some years ago: “I came to see that I was a fighter and he was history.”

Ali traded banter with United States presidents and world leaders alike, versus bally sparring with musical greats — The Beatles — and shaking hands with Mother Teresa.

His greatest triumph lies in his leg- acy as a champion, leader, social activism, and humanitarian, but also a mentor by distance of so many boys and girls, particularly our young men.

In my own hometown, a young boxer by the name of Eric Carr, first met him with one of our great sports figures, Lloyd Wells, down at the Hyatt Regency. He said that when the champ walked in the room, the champ met him, the champ treated him like a long-time friend. He played around with him, maybe joked around with him. I may be adding something to it. But Eric Carr, as the day went on — it was in the boxing beginnings of his life — told him he wanted to be a champ just like him.

Eric Carr went on to win boxing championships, but he will always remember how real Muhammad Ali was.

Let me say that as we fought for the future, he envisioned that we all would enjoy. I love to hear the bantering because it was wisdom of a philosopher. His greatest triumph, as I indicated, was a humanitarian. At the apex of his career, lauded for his unparalleled physique and mesmerizing moves — I wish I could do a few of those right now — but he is more than a sum total of his athletic gifts.

His agile mind, buoyant personality, brash self-confidence, wouldn’t you love him? I often remember some of those words that he said: Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee. His hands can’t hit what his eyes can’t see.
Now you see, now you don’t. George thinks he will, but I know he won’t. Don’t count the days; make the days count. I’m young; I’m handsome; I’m fast. I can’t possibly be beat.

But then he said:
Service to others is the rent you pay for your room here on Earth.

And so his inspiration continues. I would often say that as he lived his life, we took joy.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, let me offer you but two words, and let me thank him for the life that he has lived. Let me borrow from Shakespeare and say of Muhammad Ali:

He was a man. Take him for all in all. We shall not look upon his like again.

May The Greatest rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me. I still see that “float like a butterfly, sting like a bee.”

Muhammad Ali, again, rest in peace. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of boxing legend and social activist Mr. Muhammad Ali, whose words floated like a butterfly and punches stung like a bee, who died Friday at the age of 74.

The people’s champion, was truly the voice of a generation, advocating for the African American fight against racial and class barriers.

The three-time world heavyweight boxing champion helped define the turbulent times in which he reigned as the most charismatic and controversial sporting figure of the 20th century.

The man who would come to be known as the “Greatest of All Time,” was born Cassius Marcellus Clay Jr. on Jan. 17, 1942 in Louisville, Kentucky.

Despite baffling Parkinson’s disease for 30 years Muhammad Ali would live a full and consequential life, winning the Gold Medal at the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome and being crowned the world Heavyweight champion an unsurpassed three times.

As one of his noteworthy opponents, Floyd Patterson, told author David Remnick some years ago, “I came to see that I was a fighter, while he was a boxer.”

All traded banter with United States presidents and world leaders alike, verbally sparring with musical greats the Beatles, shaking hands with Mother Teresa.

His greatest triumph lies in his legacy as a champion, leader, social activist and humanitarian.

At the apex of his career, lauded for his unparalleled physique and mesmerizing moves.

He carried into the ring a physically lyrical, unorthodox boxing style fusing speed, agility and power that was seamlessly than any boxer before him or since.

But, he was more than the sum total of his athletic gifts; he was a man of uncompromising principles.

His agile mind, buoyant personality, brash self-confidence and evolving set of personal convictions fostered a magnetism that the ring alone could not contain.

A masterful entertainer, Ali captivated audiences as much with his mouth as with his fists, narrating his life with a patter of inventive doggerel.

He was targeted by his country when, in 1966, he exercised his First Amendment right voicing political dissonance and concern for humanitarian observation.

Ali was a purposeful fighter, and even more so, a principled human being, once reminding us all that he would, “Fight for the prestige, not for [himself], but to uplift [his] little brothers who are sleeping on concrete floors today in America . . . living on welfare, . . . who can’t eat, . . . who don’t [have] knowledge of themselves, . . . who are sleeping on concrete floors today.”

All fought for the future he envisioned and that we all enjoy today.

As a conscientious objector to the Vietnam War, he refused to be inducted into drafting leading him to be banned from the sport he loved at the height of his life.

His inspiring courage and anti-war stance helped spearhead the growing anti-war movement of the 1960s.

The press called him the Louisville Lip. He called himself the Greatest.

Ali was the most important political-cultural figure to survive the deadly tumult of the 1960s and flourish during the 1970s.

All reawakened the American consciousness stating, “Champions are made from something they have deep inside them—a desire, a dream, a vision.”

He eventually retired for good in 1981 and after being diagnosed with Parkinson’s disease in 1984 as the only fighter to be heavyweight champion three times.

In 2005 Muhammad Ali was presented with the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President George W. Bush.

Ali received the President’s Award from the NAACP soon after Obama’s inauguration in 2009.

In 1996, he was trembling and nearly mute as he lit the Olympic caldron in Atlanta, but his smile induced a thunderous roar in what was one of the most celebrated Olympics moments ever.

His post-boxing humanitarian endeavors include putting his name to many initiatives for peace and humanitarian aid as well as anonymous donations of millions of dollars to a variety of individuals and organizations surpassing race and class barriers.

Despite battling with Parkinson’s disease for three decades, he has inspired millions of people with his work as a humanitarian has been immortalized in the Muhammad Ali Centre.

Explaining his resolve later in life, Ali said that, “All my life, growing up as a little boy, I always said that if I got famous I’d do things for my people that other people wouldn’t do.”

“I am an ordinary man who worked hard to develop the talent I was given,” he said. He was truly a legend—a statesman of the people.

Muhammad Ali was a product of America but a citizen of the world, at first hated and misunderstood but eventually beloved for the way he carried himself in dignified decline.

He will remain one of the most well-known and respected sports figures of all time—may his legacy be revered.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me borrow from Shakespeare and say of the Muhammad Ali: “He was a man.
Take him for all in all.
We shall not look upon his like again.”

May the “The Greatest” rest in peace.

The Sayings of Muhammad Ali—The Greatest of All Time.

Muhammad Ali, considered to be the greatest heavyweight boxer, died June 3, 2016 in a Phoenix-area hospital.

He was 74 years old. Here is a list of some of his best quotes (in no particular order):

1. “I’m the greatest, I’m the double greatest.”
2. “I’m so mean, I make medicine sick.”
3. “I’m young; I’m handsome; I’m fast. I can’t possibly be beat.”
4. “Don’t count the days; make the days count.”
5. “If my mind can conceive it, and my heart can believe it—then I can achieve it.”
6. “It’s hard to be humble when you’re as great as I am.”
7. “It isn’t the mountains ahead that wear you out; it’s the pebble in your shoe.”
8. “If you ever dream of beating me you’d better wake up and apologize.”
9. “Braggin’ is when a person says something and can’t do it. I do what I say.”
10. “I am the greatest, I said that even before I knew I was.”
11. “Only a man who knows what it is like to be defeated can reach down to the bottom of his soul and come up with the extra ounce of power it takes to win when the match is even.”
12. “I’m mean, I make medicine sick.”
13. “A man who views the world the same at 50 as he did at 20 has wasted 30 years of his life.”
14. “If they can make penicillin out of moldy bread, they can sure make something out of you.”
15. “I shook up the world. Me! Whee!”
16. “I hated every minute of training, but I said, ‘Don’t quit. Suffer now and live the rest of your life as a champion.”
17. “At home I am a nice guy: but I don’t want the world to know. Humble people, I’ve found, don’t get very far.”
18. “A man who has no imagination has no wings.”
19. “He’s (Sonny Liston) too ugly to be the world champ. The world champ should be pretty like me!”
20. “I am the astronaut of boxing. Joe Louis and Dempsey were just jet pilots. I’m in a world of my own.”
22. “Hating people because of their color is wrong. And it doesn’t do any good, so why do it? It’s an opinion. Impossible is not a declaration. It’s a dare. Impossible is potential. Impossible is temporary. Impossible is nothing.”
23. “The only way I’ll ever get licked.”
24. “A man that ever dreams of being beaten will never be great as I am.”
25. "Float like a butterfly, sting like a bee. His hands can’t hit what his eyes can’t see. Now you see me, now you don’t. George thinks he will, but I know he won’t.”
26. “Service to others is the rent you pay for your room here on earth.”
27. “I’m young; I’m handsome; I’m fast. I can’t possibly be beat.”
28. “I’m the greatest, I am the double greatest.”
29. “I’m not the greatest, I’m the double greatest.”
30. “Live everyday as if it were your last because someday you’re going to be right.”

Mr. ARMYUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

I yield once again to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).
Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, there is so much that has been said appropriately about Muhammad Ali that people in this era might not realize that when he was fighting, all of America really looked forward to his fights and watched him on television. At the heart of that was the fact that we were glued to the television to see him fight and to see afterwards Howard Cosell speaking the sports talk to him and reviewing those fights.

He was a lot about Louisville. There is a neighborhood in the city named after him, Muhammad Ali Boulevard, and the Muhammad Ali Center.

Nobody carries on and will carry on Muhammad Ali’s love of Louisville more than Muhammed Yarmuth. Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you having this hour. He was to Louisville in such a great way, and he was a great man to America. I thank you for putting this hour together.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. YARMUTH for hosting this hour.

Muhammad Ali was a good friend. He was someone that I had known that I had worked on some projects with. But more than that, my husband was one of those athletes. My husband was then the linebacker for the Cleveland Browns when Bill Russell and my husband, Sidney Williams, and Jim Brown all got together to support Muhammad Ali when, of course, he was not allowed to be a conscientious objector and was threatened with prison.

I got to know him sometime after that. We used his home for a very special event. I got to know his former wife, Veronica, and his children. One of his children worked in one of my programs.

This comes at a very difficult time for all of us. I loved him because he had courage. He had the courage to give up his career, had the courage to threaten to be imprisoned, and had the courage to fight. The Nation of Islam stood with him, and these athletes all stood with him. He was a great man. When he said he was The Greatest, he really meant it. We used his home for a very special event. I got to know him sometime after that. We used his home for a very special event. I got to know his former wife, Veronica, and his children. One of his children worked in one of my programs.

It comes at a very difficult time for all of us. I loved him because he had courage. He had the courage to give up his career, had the courage to threaten to be imprisoned, and had the courage to fight. The Nation of Islam stood with him, and these athletes all stood with him. He was a great man. When he said he was The Greatest, he really meant it.

Beyond his work in the ring and as part of the civil rights movement, Muhammad Ali was also an advocate for peace. He grew into his faith in a way that shows that Islam is a religion of peace and America is a place of tolerance and an advocate for peace. He grew into his faith in a way that shows that Islam is a religion of peace and America is a place of tolerance and acceptance—of all, we will continue to draw strength and inspiration from a man who knew the true meaning of being a Champion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSSELL) is recognized for 60 minutes. Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am slow to come to the floor because you can’t compete with a Muhammad Ali commemorative Special Order. That is too much passion to follow. I just have little little left. I’ve been in my mind. I am not talking about changing the world. I am just talking about changing our little part of the world.

I don’t know if you remember, Mr. Speaker, when you first got here, you had to go downstairs and sign your name so that we could use that instead of a postage stamp on every piece of mail that you sent out the door. It is called the franking privilege.

I have a bill—it is H.R. 1873—that TAMMY DUCKWORTH and I introduced together to abolish that franking privilege. It is not going to take a lot to get that done. It is something that is within the complete control of us here in this institution, but it has been a challenge that is hundreds of years in the making.

I put mine on here, Mr. Speaker. This is my signature there on the front of every envelope I send out. If you want to know how to forge a check in my name, all you need to do is look at any envelope I send out the door.

Back in the day, had we been here in 1817, it might have been hard to find a postage stamp. In the name of getting congressional business done, the law of the land, carried over from England, was that you could name on all of your government documents in order to get that important government business done. You couldn’t just walk down to the local grocery store and buy stamps. You had to have a mechanism for getting your constitutional responsibilities accomplished.

We do that still here today. In these cynical times, Mr. Speaker, I would tell you that I hear most often from folks that they think one of two things is going on with the franking privilege: one, that we are involved in some sort of incumbent protection plan—self-promotion here in this institution, self-glorification—by sending our names out on the front of all of the mail that goes out the door. If not that, I hear the second criticism, which is, Rob, why do Members of Congress get free mail? The Postal Service is in dire straits—free mail for all Members of Congress.

It is not free mail. For every letter that goes out the door that reads “Rob Woodall” up at the top, I get a bill. I get a bill from the Postal Service for whatever the bulk rate would have been for the large amounts of mail that I send out the door. It is not free mail for Members of Congress. I want to dispel that myth.
I get all of the emails that I know so many of my colleagues do, which read: "Go and serve one term in Congress, and get your pension for life." Nonsense. Not true. I do get the emails that come in and that talk about the special health care privileges that Congress has. Nobody else can have access to. Come on down, and join the ObamaCare exchange. You can have the same health care privileges that I have. Of all of the myths that go on out there, the myth of free mail is the one that I go out and combat today. It is not free mail. We just don’t put a stamp on it. Why don’t we end this confusion once and for all?

I would like to tell you that this was my brilliant idea—a small idea but my brilliant idea. Not true. We, actually, went down this road in the 1800s. I hold here—Mr. Speaker, you can’t read it—an article from The New York Times on March 3, 1875.

It reads:

By a vote of 113–65, the House has concurred in the Senate amendment to the postal appropriations bill partially restoring the franking privilege. The precise extent of this restoration and the mode of its transmission through the mail on a Congressional frank of the Congressional Record, agricultural reports and seeds, and all public documents now printed or authorized to be printed.

The New York Times, as it is still known for today, goes on to editorialize just a bit:

So far, as our observation goes, there has never been any demand for the restoration of the franking nuisance except on the part of Congressmen. The new men, especially, long for a taste of the sweets of privilege.

This the New York Times in 1875. The “sweets of privilege” is how they described the signing of one’s name to a constituent’s response so you can tell your constituents how it is that you feel about the war in Iraq, so you can tell folks how you feel about the FCC’s new regulations, so that you can respond to that young Eagle Scout applicant who wants to get the Citizenship in the Nation merit badge.

We knew in the 1800s that something just didn’t seem right about not using stamps like everybody else did. We knew that something didn’t feel quite right. For several years, we abolished the franking privilege, and then we brought it back.

I don’t have any problem finding stamps. Mr. Speaker, if anybody in this institution has problems finding stamps, I have several local locations that are here by the Capitol. You can send a staffer down to pick up stamps in bulk. For me, I am in the Longworth House Office Building, up on the seventh floor, so I have got to go all the way down to the basement in order to buy my stamps. It is about seven floors away.

They don’t do that anywhere else in Washington, D.C. They don’t do that at the IRS, or at the IRS if you need to send out a tax form, you don’t sign your name at the top of the letter. If you work over at the Department of Agriculture and if you need to send out a newsletter, you don’t sign your name at the top, because everybody else in government uses what is called “penalty mail.” It is the same stamp up at the top of a corner that any business person would use. It only cost that any bulk mail we would use. It is called “penalty mail.”

It reads:

Subject to limitations imposed by sections 3204 and 3207 of this title, there may be transmitted as penalty mail official mail of officers of the Government of the United States, the Smithsonian Institution, the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, the United States Employment Service, and the system of employment offices operated by it in conformity with the provisions of section 4949(c).

Understand that we have a special section in the United States Code that deals with how mail gets out the door, because it is very difficult. We have only been doing it for a couple of hundred years. It requires some special attention from the Federal Register.

I have a special section of the Code that allows officers of the Government of the United States, of the Smithsonian Institution, of the Pan-American Union, of the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, and of the United States Employment Service some special dispensation so they can get mail out the door.

But was that good enough for Congress? The answer is “no.” Congress has yet another special exception beyond the special exception, as is highlighted in section A, “officers of the Government of the United States other than Members of Congress,” because what we have is our special signature program.

Mr. Speaker, we have got big things we have got to solve in this country—big things we have got to solve. You can’t solve those big things when folks believe that you are telling them the truth about the little things. You have got to build trust with one another. You have got to build trust with one another not just here in this institution but with our constituencies back home. You see what they think is free mail that is going out the door, it undermines that trust.

I refer now to the House Manual, Mr. Speaker:

Postal expenses incurred only when the frank is insufficient, such as certified, registered, insured, express, foreign mail, and stamped, self-addressed envelopes related to the recovery of official items, are reimbursable. Postage may not be used in lieu of the frank.

I got to Capitol Hill, Mr. Speaker, and I thought: Do you know what? I know what it is like not to be on Capitol Hill. I am going to go get a bulk mail permit

They said, No, Rob. You can’t get a bulk mail permit to send out mail on Capitol Hill.

I said, Most of what I don’t do is bulk mail. I will go buy stamps to send that out.

They said, No, Rob. You can’t buy stamps to send out mail. You have to sign your card. You have to put your signature on it. We have to have a special congressional mail privilege for you.

TAMMY DUCKWORTH and I—one Republican, one Democrat—say we can do better than that. It is an election year. We have got to build trust. How about a special election year? The law of the land is: you can’t send out mail anymore. If I have a town hall meeting that is going on next week, I couldn’t have sent out an invitation last month to have invited you to come meet your Congressman. I couldn’t have sent out a letter last month to have told you what we were doing with the National Defense Authorization Act. I couldn’t have sent out a newsletter last month to have told you about an employment and jobs fair program that was going on, because the law of the land so recognizes this privilege as something that incumbents use to boost their election prospects that it is banned in the 90 days before any election.

So I ask you: If this practice is so offensive that we ban it within 90 days before any election, why don’t we just do away with it altogether? If it is so offensive that it must be banned for 180 days out of the year, why don’t we do away with it for the other 180 days, too?

I don’t need my name on the front of every letter that goes out the door, and I don’t need someone to protect me from the challenges of buying stamps; but I have rules in place that prevent postage from being used in lieu of the frank.

I serve on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker. I want to balance the Federal budget. We are not going to do it with this bill. I am the lead sponsor of the FairTax. It is the most fundamental reformation of our tax code that has happened since the income tax came into being in the early 1900s. It is the most prominently cosponsored piece of fundamental tax reform legislation in this body. Those are serious pieces of legislation. This is something minor—this is around the edges—but the National Taxpayers Union has seen fit to say that repealing the so-called “franking privilege” is a simple reform to introduce pay-as-you-go budgeting. It is absolutely right. Public Citizen hardly supports the Woodall-Duckworth legislation to rein in the abuse of taxpayer-funded frank mail.

I want to do the big things together, and I want to do the things that matter together. When silly things like this undermine the sacred trust that we have with our constituents, they need to go. Our colleagues who served in this body in the 1870s knew it. They abolishes it, but they just couldn’t let it go, and they brought it back. Even The New York Times asked: Where was the outcry for free congressional mail? Why was it brought back yet again?

I tried to get this done on my own. I say to my colleagues that I didn’t want to waste your time in this way. I tried
to go to the Chief Administrative Office to see if I could just get an exception so I didn’t have to send out this mail. I tried to go through the House Administration Committee to see if there was some sort of dispensation so that I could omit out of this system. I tried to go through the Office of the Speaker to see if my MRA could be spent in a different way so I didn’t have to perpetuate this. Again, it is a practice that is, apparently, so hideous it is outlawed for 180 days out of the year; but I couldn’t get any of those things done.

Now it has come down to us to pass that simple line of code. It is a bipartisan bill—Rob Woodall, Tammy Duckworth, a host of other cosponsors. I invite you to join me to abolish the franking privilege. You are welcome to use our hashtag of “Stop the Frank” any time you feel like you can move that forward. We are not going to reestablish trust overnight, but with one little bit of action at a time, we can do it. Let’s do this little one today. Let’s show up again and do another one and tomorrow and do another one and the next day and do another one and the next day and do another one. Then we are going to wake up a year from now or a month from now or a week from now, and we are going to find out that we have really made a difference together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Duckworth), a host of other cosponsors. I invite you to join me to abolish the franking privilege. You are welcome to use our hashtag of “Stop the Frank” any time you feel like you can move that forward. We are not going to reestablish trust overnight, but with one little bit of action at a time, we can do it. Let’s do this little one today. Let’s show up again and do another one and tomorrow and do another one and the next day and do another one and the next day and do another one. Then we are going to wake up a year from now or a month from now or a week from now, and we are going to find out that we have really made a difference together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Duckworth), my friend from the Rules Committee.

SKILLS GAP
Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I frequently hear from employers who are struggling to find employees with the right experience and technical skills to meet workforce needs.

The passage of the bipartisan Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act was an important step for the millions of Americans who are looking for work and for the employers who have 5 million-plus job opportunities that remain unfilled due to the skills gap. However, great jobs are still going unfilled. Americans are still missing out on rewarding careers, and many businesses are still suffering.

For example, in the AED Foundation’s 2016 Workforce Survey Report, more than 50 percent of equipment distributors indicated that the skills gap hindered company growth and increased costs and inefficiencies while nearly 75 percent said the lack of skilled technicians made it difficult to meet customer demand.

It is imperative that the Department of Labor finalizes regulations for WIOA and that Congress strengthens the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

I would like very much my friend from Georgia and my colleague on the Rules Committee for yielding to me in order to discuss this important issue to so many of us.

Mr. WOODALL. If my colleagues don’t know, one is used to seeing the gentlewoman from North Carolina leading on the Education and the Workforce Committee. All day today, she has been leading on the Rules Committee—chairing those actions that are going on over here to file a rule to tell us that that process had been moved right along, but we will have to wait for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

FLOODING IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE
Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on their Special Order. That subject, Mr. Speaker, will be flooding in the State of Texas.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I and a good many of my colleagues will speak tonight about circumstances that are occurring in Texas more often than we would care to see. In a sense, Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of a mission of mercy that we embarked upon earlier this year when we were having flooding in Houston, Texas.

These floods that we are having across the length and breadth of our State are catastrophic damage, and that is worthy of a lot of consideration and it is worthy of being addressed on the floor of the House of Representatives. But we also have a good many lives that have been lost across the length and breadth of our State, and these, of course, are of paramount importance to us. So while we may make some references to the property damages and there will be some things said about possible solutions, I believe that we will say a good deal about the lives that have been lost.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas’ 27th Congressional District (Mr. FARENTHOLD) to give his comments.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas’ 27th Congressional District (Mr. FARENTHOLD) to give his comments.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to be here. A little over a year ago, there were some horrible floods just outside the district I represent in Wimberley, Texas, that took the lives of several constituants. Vacantioning there in Corpus Christi, Texas. In fact, some of the bodies of the young children who perished in that horrible flood have yet to be recovered. My family’s prayers and the prayers of the Nation go to those grieving families and the survivors and for the repose of the souls of those who perished.

There has been a lot of flooding in Texas over the past year or so, just as recently as last week. I represent Wharton, Texas. The river in Wharton rose just as it had gotten repaired from the previous flood a few months earlier. All the Sheetrock was newly installed and ready to go; and sure enough, another flood comes and the damage to the property continues. Unfortunately, the floods of last week and the previous weeks did not result in loss of life in the district that I represent. Thank the Lord for that.

I tell you, in the past 14 months, and over the past week, I have experienced the worst flooding it has seen in 35 years. It is currently dealing with $2.5 million in damaged infrastructure, and 20 roads still remain closed today. Of the 100-plus homes damaged in the past year, more than half were determined to be unlivable, and four families still remain in temporary housing.

Earlier, in Wharton County, more than 1,000 people were evacuated and 150 homes flooded. It has really been tough.

I was driving through and visited with the emergency management folks in Wharton. You look at the fields I posted on Facebook as a picture of a milo field. It said, “Amber waves of flooded grain.” Cotton fields are under water as well.

In addition to the property damage, I think our farmers in Texas may suffer from an overabundance of water. As I grew up in a farming family, our complaint was it either rained too much, too little, or at the wrong time. I will tell you that these floods have just been horrible in Texas.

I do want to thank the folks from FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for their quick response.

What it has told us is that we are taking way too much time for projects to stem the flooding, levees and the like, to get approved by the Army Corps of Engineers and the other Federal agencies. The funding for it is difficult to come by and end up spending all this money with FEMA. If some of that money were redirected to preventive maintenance or preventing these floods, we might save lives and certainly save property as well. I think it is something that this Congress should look at: preventing problems rather than just reacting to them.

I also want to commend the first responders and the emergency management personnel throughout Texas who have been damaged in the past 14 months. I also want to offer my thoughts and prayers to those brave servicemen who perished in Texas in the training exercises as well.
It has been a tough few months here back in Texas. But you know what? We are Texans, and we will survive. We will mourn those we have lost, and we will rebuild, and we will continue to reflect that which is the greatest of the American spirit: perseverance through adversity.

I thank Mr. AL GREEN of Texas for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for the unity that is engendered by his being here tonight.

It is important for people to know that this is not a time for Democrats or a time for Republicans. This is a time for Texans to come together and to talk about some of the concerns that we have and to remember those who have lost their lives in these floods.

At this time, I am honored to yield to a neighbor who is from the 22nd Congressional District of Texas. He is south of me. Of course, I speak of the Honorable PETE OLSON. We are honored to have him with us tonight, and we welcome your commentary about some of the concerns in your district and, indeed, across the State.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and neighbor to the east, Mr. AL GREEN, for holding this very Special Order about floods we have had in Texas.

It has been a rough year in Texas' 22nd Congressional District. Last Memorial Day, we had the 100-year flood and lost one life, one who drove into a flooded small creek and died in their vehicle.

Tax day 2016, there was lots of street flooding. I had to move my pickup truck off my street before it was taken over by the water.

The worst came 2 weeks ago, the 500-year flood. The Brazos River overflowed most of its banks like never before. That river cuts through the heart of my district. It first hit Simonton, a small town in the northwest part of Fort Bend County. They had a mandatory evacuation on May 29. Every home, except for 12. Left. Almost all the homes have been flooded.

Next, was Richmond and Rosenberg. Two days after Simonton, they, too, had mandatory evacuations and had homes north of the railroad track flooded.

Next came my hometown of Sugar Land. We had to cancel our Memorial Day celebration because our park was flooded.

Next came Missouri City, Sienna Plantation, floods there. It crossed over Brazoria County and went down to Rosharon, and that place was flooded out as well. Luckily, God willing, we lost no lives these past couple of weeks.

I saw the greatest in Texans this past week. I put 500 miles on my pickup truck in 8 days. At our Fort Bend emergency command operations center, people from all over the region had taken pizza, Chick-fil-A, coffee, Shiplley Do-Nuts, kolaches, making sure these people who were working 24/7 are fed.

I saw an old-fashioned cattle drive. Sheriff Troy Nehls led other sheriffs on a cattle drive, moving some cattle down flooded 90, away from the threat of floods.

But the best, my friend, was 2 days ago. My wife drove over the river and went down to Rosenberg, Texas, to be with B.F. Terry High School. There was a recovery center giving out goods to people in need. This effort was started by what is called The Church, Second Mile Ministry, and Lamar Consolidated Independent School District, who opened up B.F. Terry High School. Every single day they said, "We need more rooms. We have to have more space," and they got it.

Nancy and I were assigned to stuffing small bags with one roll of toilet paper, a toothbrush, some toothpaste, some shampoo, some soap, and a razor. We were supervised by three young ladies: Rachel, Isabella, "the weapons officer." Don't mess with Isabella "the executive officer" because she was number two in making sure everything worked well. And Layla was "the weapons officer." Don't mess with Layla. I failed my inspection the first two times. I could not get the bag closed. They got on my back and made sure that I closed that bag so people could have all they needed in times of crisis.

That is what makes Texas so great, my friend: not waiting for D.C., but neighbors helping neighbors in need. Those ladies know what the Bible says: love thy neighbor more than thyself.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for not only what he has said tonight, but for what he has been doing in his district to help its people. That is greatly appreciated by his constituents, and I greatly appreciate you coming to the floor tonight to let people know that we in Texas are standing together, and we are going to work together and we will get through this, but it won't hurt if we can get a little bit of help.

I am honored to have another colleague, who has a district that is in Houston. Of course, he has been in Congress for many years, and I consider him a very dear friend, the Honorable GENE GREEN, from the 29th Congressional District in Houston, Texas.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and namesake from Houston, Congressman AL GREEN. I appreciate his effort, both on the legislation that we are cosponsors of, but also setting up these Special Orders. It is great to have bipartisan support.

As we found out in Houston, it doesn't matter if you are a Democrat or a Republican. If your house gets flooded, your cars get flooded, in some cases, the lives of your family and your neighbors are in jeopardy, as Texans, we work together.

I have watched this over the years because we have had some terrible floods over the years, whether it be Tropical Storm Allison in 2001, Hurricane Ike in 2008, or what we are seeing now in May of 2015, which we called the Memorial Day flooding that was devastating and included more than 11 inches of rain and oil spillage.

But in April of 2016, this year, Houston and areas experienced what we call the devastating tax day flooding on April 18 that claimed lives and caused hundreds of millions of dollars in damage.

In the last 3 weeks, just before Memorial Day, we also have seen historic rainfalls and subsequent flooding. The rain in the Houston area has ceased, but downstream in Brazoria County is our colleague from Fort Bend, just upstream from Houston, which has continued. An estimated 200,000 residents, nearly two-thirds of the population of Brazoria County, have been affected by the flooding. Once again, I stand before this body while southeast Texas is under water.

Once again, I stand with my Houston colleagues and ask the House of Representatives to give our constituents the resources we need to protect lives and property in the future.

I have worked with my colleague, AL GREEN, on H.R. 5025, to appropriate $311 million to complete our bayou system. These projects are not imaginary. They are ideas that would help, and these projects during the process would save lives. These are projects that the Corps of Engineers have said that they have approved. We just don’t have the money to complete them.

In the Houston area, we have a number of bayou systems that actually start in Congressman OLSON’s, Congressman AL GREEN’s, Congressman CULBERSON’s, and Congressman McCaul’s districts. But it runs through my area because I have the eastern side of Harris County, where Buffalo Bayou and the Houston Ship Channel are located. We are downstream from those, and we see that flooding ourselves. I ask the House to bring our bill to the floor and to help mitigate the suffering of these thousands of Texans.

Earlier this month, my office received early notification that the United States is entering hurricane season as of June 1. Once again, the problem could be expanded. Like I said earlier, in 2001, Tropical Storm Allison hit the Texas Gulf Coast and devastated my area of east and north Houston. In 2008, Hurricane Ike caused citywide flooding and hundreds of millions of dollars in damage. Again, it came over our district in east Harris County.

Now we face another hurricane season with the possibility of extended damage and no protection for our vulnerable citizens. Houstonians continue...
to suffer the effects of Mother Nature, and we have the ability to help them. The President has declared Houston a disaster area a number of times.

Again, with hurricane season upon us, we would like to see that Congress responds and acts on H.R. 5025 as the best option now.

Mr. Speaker, all the recent rains in Texas have devastated parts of up to 31 counties in our beloved State. Governor Greg Abbott has declared them a disaster area. I happen to represent the lower half of Brazoria County, from the south side of Alvin going south, and it has been the recipient of a lot of flooding.

On Monday, I toured the Emergency Management Office Command Center in Angleton, Texas, which is the county seat for Brazoria County. I was privileged to meet with County Judge Matt Sebesta and others as I was introduced to the Brazoria County first responders who work day and night to take care of our citizens, our citizens’ animals and their livestock, and their property as much as we could.

I was also privileged, Mr. Speaker, to go up in a Texas DPS helicopter with two of our great DPS public safety pilots. Wow. What devastation, Congressman Green, in Brazoria County. I have pictures on my iPhone. I mean, it is just unbelievable the flooded areas. The devastation and destruction is astounding. Waters from the Brazos River, the San Bernard, and other creeks and bayous are out of their banks and wreaking havoc in our area.

Mr. Speaker, I want my constituents to know that our office is already on the ground in the area, already working to ensure that FEMA is in gear, and that our constituents are taken care of. I would like to give a shout out to my great staff, Ms. Dodie Armstong, Ms. Carmen Galvan, and Jed Webb, who have been on the ground there at the Emergency Management Center monitoring this almost night and day and interfacing with the county to provide them any assistance needed. We have assured Brazoria County that anything we can do, as my good friend Joaquin Castro was saying, from our end to assist, we would be glad to do that.

Let me just add that we, too, mourn the loss of the Fort Hood soldiers. Our thoughts and prayers go out to them and their families.

Mr. Speaker, we will bounce back from this. Our great Brazoria County first responders are on top of the situation, and our great Brazoria County folk are resilient. I have to tell you that about Congressman Green’s Houston constituents as well, our Texas people.

I have lived on the Gulf Coast of Texas almost 63 years. In fact, it will be 63 years this July 2nd coming up. I wrote about seeing the magnitude in flooding in our area, but I have seen a lot of hurricanes, a lot of disasters. Texans are a resilient people.
Mr. Speaker, he served with honor. He Angel Colonvazquez, 38 years of age. Hood, nine soldiers. persons who lost their lives in Fort lost their lives, some 16 persons in the special. I came to the floor earlier, and important for us to make some special now, to be quite candid with you. After thing that we can do to help the people We are Texas tough. But there is some- here tonight to let the country know This flooding is causing great harm lives of all of them note that they may ask that we engage in such at this all of those who have lost their lives Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the ong- flooding in my home state of Texas. Texas has experienced numerous incidences of heavy rain and extreme weather events since last summer, which have resulted in extensive flooding, property damage, and tragic loss of life.

Flooding and heavy rain has affected much of our vast state this spring. Flood warnings continue throughout Dallas County along the Trinity River this week, while my district has been the focus of flash flooding and severe weather for the better part of this year. Further throughout Texas, rain gauges at the Austin-Bergstrom International Airport, College Station-Bryan, and San Angelo have recorded the past year by not only improving our response to current events, but also by taking deliberate steps to mitigate future risks.

Mr. Speaker, the extreme weather events that we are experiencing in Texas are em- blazoned more than ever the potential devastating consequences of climate change and this is only the beginning. As we continue our efforts to assist the people of Texas, I urge for more federal assistance in our fight to address the recent rain and flooding while also mitigating future flooding concerns throughout the state.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on April 17–18, 2016 Houston experienced a historic flood event that claimed the lives of eight people; damaged over 1,150 households; disrupted hundreds of businesses; closed community centers, schools, and places of worship due to flood waters.

On Monday, April 25, I led a tour and held a press conference with the Army Corps of Engineers, local and state elected officials to focus on the damaged caused by the flood that continues to impact my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 2016 President Obama granted the request for federal Individual Assistance for Harris County residences and business own- ers who were affected by severe weather and flooding. I would like to thank all the local, state and federal officials who helped in mak- ing this possible.
On May 3, 2016, I held a town hall for the residents of Houston, which includes my constituents in the 18th Congressional District so that they could learn from FEMA what resources were available to assist them with recovery.

Unfortunately, that was not the end of the story of flooding in Houston for 2016—in early June another record setting rainfall led to catastrophic flooding throughout the Houston area. At the beginning of this month Houston once again was flooded and another Disaster Assistance request was submitted to the White House.

I am grateful to the House and the great work of those at the Department of Homeland Security who worked tirelessly to help people after both events.

I spoke on the House Floor several times over the last six weeks about the floods and the suffering caused by the waters that came through our communities—damaging homes, our schools, places of business, and our places of worship.

I am gratified that the House approved my amendments to The Energy and Water Appropriations Act which will help facilitate the $3 million needed to fund the Army Corps of Engineers’ Houston Regional Watershed Assessment flood risk management feasibility study.

The Energy and Water Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (H.R. 5055) provides that the Secretary of the Army may initiate up to six new study starts during fiscal year 2017, and that five of those studies are to consist of studies where the majority of the benefits are derived from flood and storm damage reduction or from navigation transportation savings.

My discussion on the House floor about Jackson Lee Amendment with Chairman Simpson and Ranking Member Kaptur of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee made a compelling case and legislative record that the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment Flood Risk Management Feasibility study is most deserving to be selected by the Secretary of the Army as one of the new study starts.

The Energy and Water Appropriations Act is still under consideration in the House, and I continue to work with my colleagues in moving this important effort forward.

The Houston Regional Watershed Assessment study is critically needed given the frequency and severity of historic-level flood events in recent years in and around the Houston metropolitan area.

The purpose of the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment study is to identify risk reduction measures and optimize performance from a multi-objective systems performance perspective of the regional network of nested and intermingled watersheds, reservoir dams, flood flow conveyance channels, storm water detention basins, and related Flood Risk Management (FRM) infrastructure.

Special emphasis of the study, which covers 22 primary watersheds within Harris County’s 1,756 square miles, will be placed on extreme flood events that exceed the system capacity resulting in impacts to asset conditions/functions and loss of life.

The Federal government should not run every aspect of our lives—but it is an umbrella on a rainy day—it is a shelter in a powerful storm.

The Federal government is help when no other source of help can meet the challenges we may be facing is sufficient.

It takes all sectors of a community to effectively prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate against any disaster.

We come together as community—we come together as Houstonians—we come together as Texans and yes—we come together as Americans to provide support, help and assistance to each other during difficult times.

This is a difficult time for many in our city of Houston.

Some of those who were hit hard by the flood are here tonight, but there are many others who suffered losses who were not able to be here.

I ask that you take material with you to share with your neighbors, friends, family, and co-workers who had flood damage or economic impacts due to the flood, but were not able to join us tonight so that they can get the help they may need to recover from the historic flooding.

You may qualify for FEMA Individual Assistance grants of up to $33,000 from the federal government, and low-interest disaster loans from the U.S. Small Business Administration.

An estimated 240 billion gallons of water fell in the Houston area over a 12 hour period, which resulted in several areas exceeding the 100 to 500 year flood event record.

The records on floods are based upon the time period of rain fall, the location of the rain fall, and the duration of the event over a watershed.

The areas that experienced these historic rain falls in April were west of I-45, north of I-10, and Greens Bayou.

An estimated 140 billion gallons of water fell over the Cypress Creek, Spring Creek, and Addicks watershed in just 14 hours. The flooding problems in the Houston area are frequent, widespread, and severe, with projects to reduce flood risks in place that are valued at several billion dollars.


In 2015, the Houston and surrounding area experienced widespread historic flooding; and again two weeks ago we saw significant flooding damage and loss of life during the 12 hour flood event from April 17–18, 2016.

On June 6, 2016, I held a tour of the flood damage in Houston, Texas with the President and CEO of The American Red Cross Gal Gail McGovern:

Following the flooding in April I worked with FEMA and the city of Houston to provide housing to those left homeless by the flooding in April.

Organized a Houston area delegation letter to appropriators to fund a study.

Sent letters to appropriators on the impact of flooding on the region and requested that a similar effort to deal with storm surge be undertaken for the upper Texas Gulf Coast.

On March 10, 2016, I held what is likely one of the first Congressional events to raise public awareness regarding Zika Virus and to ascertain the needs of local and state agencies who would be responsible for responding to the threat.

On June 1, 2016, CDC reports are there are 1,732 confirmed Zika cases in the continental United States and U.S. Territories.

Cases of the Zika Virus have been reported in every state in the United States except Alaska, Idaho; North Dakota; South Dakota; and Wisconsin.

At that meeting I called for the following directives to happen:

1. Establish a national task force to discuss the Zika virus;

2. Conduct a Houston/Harris County Public service campaign to inform the community about traveling to Zika Virus mosquito borne infected regions around the world; and

3. We must make sure that untreated mosquito bed netting is available to women and girls in high risk areas;

4. Post posters in all public hospitals highlighting the dangers of the Zika virus and how one can protect themselves from the Zika virus;

5. Hold a MAJOR briefing in Houston with officials from the CDC regarding the Zika virus;

6. Conduct a Houston/Harris County Public service campaign to inform the community about traveling to Zika Virus mosquito borne infected regions around the world; and

7. We must secure public and private funds to cleanup illegally dumped tires and other debris where mosquitoes may breed near people.

We must also rethink how testing is conducted for the Zika Virus.

Dr. Peter Hotez, Dean of the School of Tropical Medicine at Baylor College of Medicine recommends that an aggressive testing and disease surveillance approach be adopted for areas of greatest risk along the Gulf Coast like the city of Houston.

Sub-tropical climate;

Areas of Extreme Poverty;

Presence of the most threatening Zika Virus carrying mosquitoes the Aedes Aegypti;

Mosquito breeding conditions that are supportive of spread of the disease from travelers who come to the Houston area with the illness.

The CDC guidance for persons who seek testing for the disease should allow for greater testing in areas that have these conditions along the Gulf Coast from Texas to Florida.

Mosquito surveillance along the Gulf Coast is not even nor as well-resourced as it once was due to budget cuts and a lack of concern regarding mosquito borne disease, which has greatly reduced capacity and competence in this critical area.

The mosquito that carries Zika Virus is known as the greatest killer of people—it is also known as the yellow fever mosquito.

This Aedes mosquito is the real threat and it must be battled from the neighborhood level up to the county or parish level.

President Obama’s request for $1.9 Billion in Zika Virus Emergency Response Funding.
The Senate passed a Zika Virus Appropriations of $1.1 billion, but unfortunately the House only provided $622 million.

The Senate has called for a conference to reconcile the differences between the two bills.

The CDC reported on May 30, 2016, that it has confirmed cases of the Zika Virus include 279 pregnant women in the United States or U.S. Territories.

This number is double the number of cases reported the previous week.

The CDC is reporting all pregnant women who have "any laboratory evidence" of possible infection, no matter what.

The CDC made the change after seeing reports of asymptomatic pregnant women—women with no symptoms who delivered children with known Zika Virus birth defects.

These are sobering and troubling numbers this early in our mosquito season.

These cases of Zika Virus include both travel related and those that were contracted from mosquito bites.

The 13 Local Cases of the Zika Virus are all travel related thus far.

Seven cases of the Zika Virus recorded by Harris County Public Health Environmental Services.

Six reported by the City of Houston Public Health Department Reported cases of the Zika Virus.

We know that 4 in 5 people who contract the Zika Virus have no symptoms.

This is especially problematic for pregnant women who may become infected with the Zika Virus and have no symptoms.

Although the contracting of the disease is most associated with mosquitoes it has been transmitted sexually.

This presents other challenges to Zika Virus public education and preparedness.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5325, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-611) on the resolution (H. Res. 771) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HARDY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. JEFFRIES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 7 and today.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of being in district.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 9, 2016, 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:

5627. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of the Equal Employment Opportunity; Policy, Procedures and Programs Regulation [Docket No.: FR-5665-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD78) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5628. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Form 10-K Summary [Release No.: 34-77969; File No.: S7-09-16] (RIN: 3233-AL89) received June 3, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5629. A letter from the Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision to the Manual of Regulations and Procedures for Federal Radio Frequency Management [Docket No.: 160523450-6450-01] (RIN: 0660-AA32) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5630. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Chromium Propionate [Docket No.: FDA-2014-F-0232] received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5631. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Nutritional Labeling and Education Act; Trans Fat Disclosure, Final rule — Food Labeling; Revision of the Nutrition and Supplement Facts Labels [Docket No.: FDA-2012-N-1210] (RIN: 0910-AF22) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5632. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to Definitions in the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 141016858-6004-02] (RIN: 0969-AG32) received June 3, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5633. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulations (GSAR); Rewrite of GSAR Part 515, Contracting by Negotiation [GSAR Case 2008-G006; Docket 2008-0007; Sequence No.: 14] (RIN: 0910-AA22) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5634. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulations (GSAR); Rewrite of GSAR Part 517, Special Contracting Methods [GSAR Change 71; GSAR Case 2007-G560; Docket No.: 2008-0007; Sequence No.: 3] (RIN: 0910-A014) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5635. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulations (GSAR); Purchasing by Non-Federal Entities [GSAR Change 73; GSAR Case 2010-G511; Docket No.: 2014-0008; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 0910-AJ44) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5636. A letter from the Acting Chief, Unified Listing Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Zuni Bluehead Sucker [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0002; 4500030114] (RIN: 1018-A223) received June 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions in the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):
H.R. 5403. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to liability under State and local requirements respecting devices to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ZINKE):
H.R. 5404. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require physicians and physician’s offices to be treated as covered device users required to report on certain adverse events involving medical devices and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. DINGELL):
H.R. 5405. A bill to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):
H.R. 5406. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve access to tribal health care by providing for systematic Indian Health Service workforce and funding allocation reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:
H.R. 5407. A bill to prohibit title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Labor to prioritize the provision of services to homeless veterans with dependent children, including caregivers in carrying out veterans integration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Ms. DELAUBRO (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):
H.R. 5408. A bill to provide for the treatment and extension of temporary financing of short-time compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORES:
H.R. 5410. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to better align the grace period required for non-payment of premiums before discontinuing coverage under qualified health plans with such grace periods provided for under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNE DY (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. MATSUO):
H.R. 5411. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide under the State plan for periodic and annual screening, diagnostic, and treatment services to individuals under age 21 who are receiving services in institutions for individuals with intellectual disabilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. STEFANIEK, and Ms. DELL’EKEN):
H.R. 5412. A bill to provide the right of American Indians born in Canada or the United States to pass the borders of the United States to any individual who is a citizen of Canada, or is eligible to be a member, of a Federally recognized Indian tribe in the United States or Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):
H.R. 5414. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for establishment of one or more Intercenter Institutes within the Food and Drug Administration for a major disease area or areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CONyers, Mr. CUMINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):
H. Res. 769. A resolution terminating a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TAKANO, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):
H. Res. 772. A resolution encouraging the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3738. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to improve the transparency of creation of venture exchanges to promote liquidity of venture securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4638. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the creation of venture exchanges to promote liquidity of venture securities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 770. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 3737 to establish an Oversight Board to assist the Government of Puerto Rico, including instrumentalities, in managing its public finances, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-610). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 771. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 3738 (mak ing appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-611). Referred to the House Calendar.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 770. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 3738 (making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-611). Referred to the House Calendar.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ZINKE):
H.R. 5404. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to liability under State law and local requirements respecting devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ZINKE):
H.R. 5404. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to liability under State and local requirements respecting devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. DINGELL):
H.R. 5405. A bill to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):
H.R. 5406. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve access to tribal health care by providing for systematic Indian Health Service workforce and funding allocation reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:
H.R. 5407. A bill to prohibit title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Labor to prioritize the provision of services to homeless veterans with dependent children, including caregivers in carrying out veterans integration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Ms. DELAUBRO (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):
H.R. 5408. A bill to provide for the treatment and extension of temporary financing of short-time compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
252. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 26, urging the United States Congress to provide funding for the West Virginia National Guard to sustain and enhance its capabilities in its role in a regional catastrophe and to modernize the antiquated avionics of its fleet of CH-47 and other aircraft to meet global airspace requirements for 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

253. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution 118, calling upon the Congress of the United States, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the President of the United States, this country’s future President of the United States and administration, to continue to support the RFS in order to encourage American energy production and to strengthen rural communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

254. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 119, to recognize May 2016 as “Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month” and to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide additional funding for research for the treatment and cure of Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

255. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to House Joint Resolution 16-1013, condemning atrocities and discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

256. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 66, memorializing the United States Congress and the Louisiana Congressional Delegation to take such actions as may be necessary to rectify the revenue sharing inequities between coastal and interior energy producing states; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

257. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 90, to memorialize the Congress of the United States to designate the Louisiana Highway 8/Louisiana Highway 28 corridor as Future Interstate 14; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

258. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 91, designating Wednesday, April 27, 2016, as the fourth annual Liquefied Natural Gas Day at the state capitol; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Foreign Affairs.

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. FITZPATRICK:
H.R. 5406: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8
By Mrs. NOEM:
H.R. 5406: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sections 7 and 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mrs. BROWN of Florida:
H.R. 5406: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DeLAURO:
H.R. 5406: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HILL:
H.R. 5409: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. FLORES:
H.R. 5410: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
H.R. 5411: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By M. KILMER:
H.R. 5412: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 Clause 18 ‘‘To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper . . .’’

By Mr. SALMON:
H.R. 5413: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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. UPTON:
H.R. 5414: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 188: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 244: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 250: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 302: Mr. SCHADLER.
H.R. 339: Mr. GARRETT and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 391: Ms. KAPUR, Mrs. LOEBSACK, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 415: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 448: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 452: Miss Rice of New York.
H.R. 605: Mr. LOBONDO.
H.R. 612: Mr. HARDY.
H.R. 711: Mr. THORNHILL.
H.R. 769: Mr. RENACCHI.
H.R. 836: Mr. TROTT and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 921: Mr. BARTON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DE SANCTIS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 967: Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 969: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 1062: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 1130: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1134: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 1151: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. MERHAN.
H.R. 1197: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 1213: Ms. DELEUCO.
H.R. 1258: Mr. GUTTIERREZ and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1427: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. LOBONDO.
H.R. 1516: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1549: Mr. MISSEER.
H.R. 1559: Mr. TROTT and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1581: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1605: Mr. POLKIN.
H.R. 1652: Mr. MERHAN.
H.R. 1655: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1706: Miss Rice of New York and Mr. PELOSI.
H.R. 1717: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. LOBONDO.
H.R. 1849: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 1900: Mrs. HARTFORD.
H.R. 1904: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 1905: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2411: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2344: Mr. LABSON of Connecticut and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2500: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2512: Mr. THOEKENER.
H.R. 2598: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 2737: Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COLE, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ISAAC, Mrs. BOUSTANY, Ms. PINOKE, Mr. RUZ, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2739: Mr. DOLD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POSTER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2752: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2759: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 2889: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2903: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DESHAN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2911: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2982: Mr. ROKITZA, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. COLE, Mr. TOUCHE of Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MOUTON, Mr. HANNA, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3094: Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3099: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MAC ARTHUR, and Mr. CUBELLO of Florida.
H.R. 3180: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3222: Mr. CHAMBER.
H.R. 3323: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. MERHAN.
H.R. 3328: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3329: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3328: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3316: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3333: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3338: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3430: Mr. RANCILL of Illinois.
H.R. 3433: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 3632: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 3720: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3765: Mr. MCCOLLIN.
H.R. 3796: Mr. RUSSELL.
H.R. 3861: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 3880: Mr. RENACCHI.
H.R. 3957: Mr. GROEGER.
H.R. 4013: Ms. LOPHORE.
H.R. 4019: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4061: Mr. LANGBEIN.
H.R. 4074: Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. PEARCE.
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H. Res. 48: Mr. Conyers.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. Barr and Ms. Schakowsky.

H. Con. Res. 132: Mr. Dingle and Mr. Takano.

H. Res. 494: Mr. Granger and Mr. Rouzer.

H. Res. 500: Mr. Coffman and Mr. Lipinski.

H. Res. 625: Mr. Meek and Mr. Calvert.

H. Res. 650: Mr. Hunter.

H. Res. 660: Mr. McCaul and Ms. Kelly of Illinois.

H. Res. 667: Mr. Meehan.

H. Res. 668: Mr. Gene Green of Texas.

H. Res. 703: Mr. Langevin.

H. Res. 712: Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico.

H. Res. 729: Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Gorak, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Ms. Royal-Allard, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Walberg, Mrs. Roby, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Mulvaney, and Mr. Webster of Florida.

H. Res. 730: Mr. Poliquin.

H. Res. 759: Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, Mr. Young of Indiana, Mr. Schifff, and Miss Rice of New York.

H. Res. 759: Mr. Costa.

H. Res. 766: Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Bechra, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Deutch, Mrs. Dingle, Mr. Gallaio, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Hek of Washington, Mr. Higgin, Ms. Norton, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Langevin, Ms. Lee, Mr. Levin, Mr. Loeb recession, Ms. McGovern, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Pielmutter, Mr. Pieluishi, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Ms. Sablan, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Bordallo, and Mr. Jeffries.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists of statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows.

The amendment to be offered by Representative Rob Bishop, or a designee, to H.R. 3278, the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.
The Senate met at 9:30 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.

Almighty God, who blesses us beyond what we deserve, we place our trust in You. Because of You, our future is brighter than we can imagine. Thank You for Your unfailing love and compassion, which You have shown from long ages past.

Continue to protect our Nation and world. Lord, give our lawmakers the grace to cherish and cultivate the virtues and values that make a nation great. Save our Senators from those transgressions that bring national ruin. May they keep ever before them Your vision for the people they serve and strive to leave the world better than they found it.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

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

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

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

**ZIKA VIRUS**

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, we all agree that the Zika virus is a real threat and needs to be addressed. Republicans and Democrats worked together to pass a bill here in the Senate to provide funding and resources. The House passed its own version. We are now ready to go to conference and complete a final bill. I will have more to say on that soon, but I appreciate the hard work of Members on both sides of the aisle in crafting the Senate’s response.

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG CHEMICAL SAFETY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, after months of hard work and collaboration between both Chambers, last night we were able to pass the first major environmental reform bill in two decades. I know Bonnie Lautenberg has waited for this day for a very long time. The Lautenberg act bears her husband’s name and will go a long way toward modernizing our Nation’s chemical safety regulations. It will look out for public safety, enhance transparency, and help support manufacturing and our economy. It is good legislation that languished for years until a new Senate majority made it a renewed priority. I want to thank Senators Inhofe and Vitter for all their work with Senators Udall and Markey to move this important measure forward. Its passage represents the latest example of how the Senate is back to work for the American people.

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL**

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, on another important matter, the issue before us today, there are an array of threats facing our country. As the chairman of the Armed Services Committee recently observed, “[Instead of one great power rival, the United States now faces a series of trans-regional, cross-functional, multi-domain, and long-term strategic competitions.]” There are the conventional military challenges, such as adversaries who have been developing and modernizing their missiles, airframes, ships, and ground forces; there are the asymmetric threats, such as cyber warfare, propaganda, and espionage; and there are nations, such as China, Iran, and Russia, which represent both conventional and asymmetric threats at the very same time.

If we are going to keep Americans safe, we have to prepare for all of these challenges. We have to modernize our defenses, keep up with technological advances, and recognize threats. Passing the National Defense Authorization Act before us would put our country on the path to doing these things. It is a reform bill that will encourage defense innovation. It is a forward-looking bill that will upgrade our missile defenses and modernize our military equipment. It is a responsible bill that will ensure that America’s men and women in uniform receive more of the resources they need to confront the challenges of today and the threats of tomorrow.

As I have said before, we should use the remaining months of the Obama administration to prepare the next administration, whether Republican or Democratic, for the variety of challenges it will inherit. These are complex challenges without simple answers. Passing a pro-reform, pro-innovation, pro-modernization defense bill such as this one will leave us better equipped to solve them. It will leave us better equipped to keep Americans and our allies safe in the face of ever-evolving security challenges.

**WELCOMING THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA**

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, later today we will welcome the Prime Minister of India as he visits the Capitol. Although this is Narendra Modi’s fourth trip to the United States as Prime Minister, it marks the first time he will address a joint meeting of Congress. It also marks the fifth time an Indian Prime Minister has done so.

---
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since the 1980s. It shows how far our relationship has come in recent decades. Mutual misgivings have given way to mutual benefits in both the economic and security spheres. We are now key trading partners. We are the two largest democracies in the world, our relationship is vital to one, and there are more benefits that can be shared from future cooperation.

Today’s address by Prime Minister Modi provides an important opportunity for all involved—an opportunity to hear his perspective on India’s economic growth and how he feels we can strengthen the strategic partnership between our countries, an opportunity to learn more about his ideas for pursuing areas of common ground and advancing shared interests, and an opportunity to better understand his view of the challenges currently facing India and his outlook for overcoming them.

We welcome Prime Minister Modi. We are interested in learning more about his vision, both for India and for the country’s continued partnership with the United States in the years ahead.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

WELCOMING THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I join the Republican leader in welcoming the Prime Minister from India to America.

Mr. President, in my office I have a wonderful memento of my first meetings with Indians. I went to school at Utah State University in Logan, UT. It was so cold. My wife and I lived off campus, and we would drive a couple miles up a hill to the Utah State campus. I would see Indian students walking to school. They were engineering students and agricultural students at the college. I would give them rides. I did that for a couple of years.

When it came time for me to graduate, one of the Indians I had gotten to know asked if Landra and I would be willing to stay over an extra day and they would make us a traditional Indian feast. We did that. It was a feast. They were dressed in their Indian garb. They had worked a lot on that food. It was the first Indian food we had eaten. We have eaten a lot of it since. It was a wonderful, warm occasion that we will always remember.

They gave us some presents, and with five children and moving quite a bit, most of those presents are history. I don’t know what they were. But one that I have always protected is a little bone-carved statue of Gandhi that they gave me. He is in his regular clothes, and he has a staff in his hand like he had most of the time. It is finely carved. You can pull that staff out even today. It is a miracle that it made it through my five children, but I have done everything I could to protect it. Now I have it in my office in a little glass enclosure, and I show my Indian guests that meaningful momento of mine.

The other reason I am going to have the opportunity in an hour or so to meet with the Prime Minister with Senator McCONNELL, the Speaker, and Leader PELOSI—I hope I have the opportunity to tell him of my fondness for Indians but especially those named Modi because the spokesperson’s name from the group of Indians that I met was Modi. I have come to the realization in recent years that that was his last name. Everybody called him Modi. He was an engineer. He moved to New Jersey, and we kept in touch.

I am happy that the Prime Minister is going to be able to address our Nation in the House of Representatives, and I am sure his people look forward to that.

Again, I tell everyone here about my warmness for India, this great democracy. The second largest Muslim population in the world is in India. So it is a friend that we have, and we must maintain that friendship.

ZIKA VIRUS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I just left a meeting, a stunningly important meeting where every one of the guests were prominent, but the two I want to refer to briefly are Dr. Frieden, head of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Dr. Fauci, head of one of the health institutes at the National Institutes of Health, Infectious Diseases, among other things. What they told us was very frightening. As we speak, there are three confirmed cases of babies born in the United States with the Zika virus. Of course, they are all very sick. The life expectancy is not very long.

They said in unison how vitally important it is and has been for months to get them some money so they can do the research needed to stop the spread of this virus. They have borrowed money from malaria research. TB research—all terribly difficult problems we are having in the world and the United States—to take care of the immediate funding for research on Zika. They have taken huge amounts of money more than half a billion dollars—out of the Ebola fund, which is still a very serious problem. There are active cases as we speak.

This is not an effort we can just walk away from. This money has been needed for a long time, and it is sad that the Presidential request of $1.9 billion has been opposed.

The senior Senator from Florida was at the meeting today talking about how every day there are new cases in Florida. Yesterday there were five new cases. What do we need to do something on that yesterday, not wait until the fall, as has been suggested by my Republican colleagues.

DONALD TRUMP AND FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senate Republicans are waiting with gleeful anticipation for Donald Trump to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court. Donald Trump, who last week attacked a Federal judge because of his Mexican heritage—even though the judge was born in Indiana—said that District Judge Curiel shouldn’t be allowed to preside on his case because of his ethnicity. Donald Trump, moments later, said that the judge should feel the same way if the judge were Muslim.

This is the man—Donald Trump—for whom Senate Republicans are blocking a supremely qualified nominee for the service—to march in in the footsteps of our Supreme Court. Donald Trump—for whom Republicans are abdicating their constitutional responsibility. This is the man—Donald Trump—whom Senate Republicans want to determine the makeup of the Supreme Court for at least the next generation.

The Senate Republicans are united in blocking Judge Merrick Garland’s nomination to the Supreme Court. Republicans are united in refusing to provide their advice and consent to President Obama’s nominee to the Supreme Court. The Republicans are united in doing it for Donald Trump. They say so. They should be ashamed.

It is hard to imagine anything more humiliating than holding a Supreme Court seat open so that Donald Trump can fill that seat. Is this why my Republican colleagues entered public service—to march in lockstep behind a man who spews hate and attacks the basic rule of law in America?

The Republican leader says: “We know that Donald Trump will make the right kind of Supreme Court appointments.”

This is sad for the Republican Party. If my Republican colleagues aren’t embarrassed, they aren’t thinking very well.

President Obama has nominated a moderate, experienced, brilliant jurist to the Supreme Court, but instead of giving Judge Garland the impartial treatment he deserves, Republicans are refusing to do their jobs. And for what? So Donald Trump, a man who routinely insulting, a man who insults Judge Merrick Garland. This is the man—Donald Trump—for whom Republicans are blocking Judge Merrick Garland. This is the man—Donald Trump—for whom Republicans are blocking Judge Merrick Garland's nomination to the Supreme Court. Republicans are united in refusing to provide their advice and consent to President Obama's nominee to the Supreme Court.

This is sad for the Republican Party. If my Republican colleagues aren’t embarrassed, they aren’t thinking very well.

President Obama has nominated a moderate, experienced, brilliant jurist to the Supreme Court, but instead of giving Judge Garland the impartial treatment he deserves, Republicans are refusing to do their jobs. And for what? So Donald Trump, a man who routinely insults Republican Senators to their faces, among others, denigrates Senator McCain's heroism, says people's heritage makes them unable to perform their jobs, and all the terrible stuff about women, handicapped people—we want this man to appoint someone to the Supreme Court? The Republicans should come to their senses. It is time to drop the charade and give Garland a fair hearing and a vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 4549

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on another subject, Americans share many common values, and one of the most fundamental is this: If you make a commitment, you should keep it. If you reach
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an agreement, abide by it. Simply put, a promise is a promise. Unfortunately, the pending amendment from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee would undermine this basic tenet.

Last year, Democrats and Republicans made an agreement. Democrats were committed to helping the middle class. Republicans were focused only on the Pentagon. Ultimately, we reached a compromise that was based on the principle of parity. We want to help the military, and they should be helped, but there should also be help for programs that are also important for our national security that are not the Pentagon. We provided additional resources to the Pentagon, as I said, but we also provided the same level of help for the middle class. That included improving our security through efforts of domestic agencies like the FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Homeland Security, and others. That was our agreement, but now some Republicans want to break their word. Senate Republicans are demanding billions more from the Pentagon but refuse to provide an extra penny for the middle class, and that is wrong. It is completely inconsistent with last year’s agreement, and it is blind to the many serious needs here at home that Republicans continue to ignore, and Zika is one. That is why I support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Jack Reed, along with the leader we have on the Appropriations Committee, BARBARA MIKULSKI.

The Reed-Mikulski amendment would provide the same extra support for our middle class that Senator MCCAIN is demanding for the Pentagon, and it recognizes that our security depends on more than just the Defense Department. The Reed amendment includes more funding to address the dangerous Zika virus and fight the scourge of opioids. It also would help mitigate lead contamination, which is long overdue, in Flint, MI.

This amendment strengthens domestic security through support of the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security. It will improve airport security and community policing, and it will address the threat of cyber crime and terrorism.

The amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Maryland will create jobs and address our Nation’s crumbling infrastructure. It will not only improve our transportation system but medical facilities for our veterans and our National Park System.

The Reed amendment is also an investment in our future. The legislation will promote science and innovation through support for the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, among others, and it will support education.

I urge my colleagues to support this important proposal which will make America a better and stronger country.

The bottom line is this: A promise is a promise. The middle class needs help at least as much as the Pentagon. Republicans should keep their promise to hard-working American families.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2943, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2943) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Mccain amendment No. 4229, to address unfunded priorities of the Armed Forces.

Reed/Mikulski amendment No. 4549 (to amendment No. 4229), to authorize parity for defense and nondefense spending pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 4549

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss my amendment, which will provide partial relief from the caps imposed by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 on both the defense and nondefense portions of the budget for fiscal year 2017. The chairman has offered an amendment that will provide relief for the Department of Defense activities. My amendment will provide a comparable amount for activities that are beyond the Department of Defense but critical to our national security and critical to our national economy.

It is long past time to replace the senseless sequester with a balanced approach that keeps America safe and strong at home and abroad. Senator MCCAIN and I both believe that sequestration has to be eliminated. What I would suggest is that it has to be done in a balanced way. It has to keep the intent of the Bipartisan Budget Act and the Budget Control Act by treating defense and nondefense spending equally.

Let me also be clear. The bill before us provides the amount outlined under current law as well as the budget request of the Secretary of Defense who, along with the Service Secretaries and Chiefs, has testified in support of this amount. They certainly would like more, but they have testified that for this year these resources are at least adequate. Now they have also made it very clear that if we do go into sequestration in the next year, it would be absolutely devastating to the Department of Defense. As a result, we share—the chairman and I—the same commitment to ensuring that sequestration is eliminated and we move to a more rational budget process.

These military professionals would like to have the certainty of year-long funding at the committee level reported at least. That certainly is extremely important. I don’t think they want to roll the dice. They recognize that this lengthy fight for parity could last all the way through this year. I believe what they would like to see do is what they said in their testimony. We can operate under the budget as proposed by the President, as recognized in the underlying budget committee mark, and that will give us the certainty we need.

The bill reported out of the Senate Armed Services Committee includes $523.9 billion in discretionary spending. Furthermore, the BBA split the $58.9 billion for overseas contingency operations, or OCO account. It includes $19.3 billion for Department of Energy-related activities resulting in a top-line funding level of approximately $602 billion for discretionary national defense spending.

While these funding levels adhere to the spending limits mandated by the Bipartisan Budget Act, or BBA, concerns have rightly been raised that the Department may require additional resources to carry out the missions it has been assigned and to adequately maintain the readiness of our military forces. As my colleagues are aware, when the Senate considered the BBA last fall, it established the discretionary funding level for defense spending for fiscal year 2017. That agreement passed this Chamber with support from Senators from both political parties. Furthermore, the BBA split the increase in discretionary spending evenly between the defense and nondefense categories.

It is important to remember that we have repeatedly made incremental changes to the discretionary budget caps for both defense and nondefense accounts. We have done so in order to provide some budgetary certainty to the Department of Defense and our domestic agencies. These spending caps were first revised with the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, and most recently with the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015.

In each instance, bipartisan majorities in Congress voted to increase the spending caps and provide additional resources, even split between defense and nondefense accounts. Unfortunately, providing relief to the budget caps in defense spending under the underlying amendment by the chairman proposes, while taking no action on nondefense spending, would renege on those bipartisan agreements and the sense of common purpose that motivated us in the last several years. Therefore, I am strongly opposed to such an amendment and urge my colleagues to vote against it.

In contrast, my amendment, would keep the pressure on for a permanent
solution to the budget caps and sequestration by treating defense and non-defense discretionary funding equally. We can’t afford to miss any opportunity to make progress on this issue of sequestration relief. It also reinforces the underpinning sense of the Senate passage by the committee that states “sequestration relief should include both defense and nondefense relief.” Again, that is a concept that has motivated all of us or the vast majority for many years. Specifically, my amendment would revise the budget caps to allow for an additional $18 billion in nondefense and defense-focused domestic spending to match the additional $18 billion in defense spending.

The additional nondefense funds are intended primarily to help address security challenges facing our Nation that do not fall within the purview of the Department of Defense, including funds to implement the integrated counter-ISIL plan, enhance Federal cyber security, and provide additional resources for border security, first responders, counter-narcotics, refugee assistance, Zika prevention and treatment, and infrastructure vulnerabilities.

True national security involves more than just the activities of DOD, and so non-DOD departments and agencies should also receive relief from the budget caps. The Pentagon simply cannot meet its mandated set of national security challenges we face without the help of other government departments and agencies, including State, Justice, and Homeland Security.

There is a symbiotic relationship between the DOD and other civilian departments and agencies that contributes to our national security. It has to be recognized that providing security for the American people requires a truly whole-of-government approach that goes beyond just a strong DOD.

The budget caps are based on a misnomer, that discretionary spending is divided into security and nonsecurity spending. But Members need to be clear, essential national security functions are performed by government departments and agencies other than the Department of Defense.

As retired Marine Corps General Mattis said, “If you don’t fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy a gun.” General Mattis’s point is perhaps best illustrated in the administration’s nine lines of effort to counter ISIL. Of these nine lines of effort, only two fall squarely within the responsibilities of the Department of Defense and intelligence communities, i.e., traditional security activities. The remaining seven elements of our counter-ISIL strategy fall primarily on the State Department and other civilian departments and agencies.

My amendment includes $1.9 billion to support this counter-ISIL strategy, including supporting effective governance in Iraq. No amount of military assistance to the Government of Iraq will be effective in countering the ISIL threat in Iraq if the Abadi government doesn’t govern in a more transparent and inclusive manner that gives Sunni hope that they will participate politically in ways that could lead to defeat ISIL. Those resources will come through the State Department, primarily.

Building resilient capacity. The coalition is building the capabilities and capacity of our foreign partners in the region to wage a long-term campaign against ISIL. While the efforts to build the capacity of the Iraqi security forces and some of our other foreign partners—those led by the Department of Defense, the State Department and USAID are also responsible for billions of dollars in similar activities and across a broader spectrum of activities. Under the underlying amendment, none of the State and USAID programs will receive additional funding for these purposes.

We have to disrupt ISIL, particularly their finances. Countering ISIL’s financing requires the State Department and Treasury Department to work with their foreign partners and the banking sector to ensure our counter-ISIL sanctions regime is implemented and enforced. These State- and Treasury-led efforts are the very simple dichotomy that has been drawn under the budget caps. It is also notable that the Office of Foreign Asset Control, OFAC, and the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, TFI, Treasury Department programs are also categorized as nonsecurity activities under the budget caps. The Republican funding strategy not only means that our counter-ISIL efforts will be hampered, so, too, will our efforts to effectively cooperate against Iran, Sudan, and individuals who support their illicit activities.

We also have to continue to expose ISIL’s true nature. Our strategic communications campaign against ISIL requires a truly whole-of-government effort, including the State Department, Voice of America, and USAID. The Republican approach to funding our strategic communications strategy is a part-of-government plan, not a whole-of-government plan, since the additional funds that could be used by State, USAID, Voice of America, and other agencies would not be there.

We have to stop the flow of foreign fighters. This is the life-blood of ISIL. Without the efforts of our diplomats around the world, the efforts of our foreign partners to pass laws and more effectively enforce the laws on their books, the efforts of the coalition to stem the flow of foreign fighters will never be successful.

Of course, we have to protect the homeland. While a small portion of the Department of Homeland Security is considered security-related activities under the budget caps, the vast majority of the Department falls into the nonsecurity portion of the budget. Providing no relief from the budget caps to the Department of Homeland Security shortschanges efforts to secure our communities and borders against ISIL threats.

Again, we have to provide support because of the huge humanitarian crisis that the United States, working with our partners, particularly in areas of concern, has motivated all of us or the vast majority of us for many years. The administration’s two remaining lines of effort against ISIL—namely, denying ISIL safe havens and enhancing intelligence collection—are under the so-called defense or security accounts. However, the continued presence and activities of our diplomats overseas significantly enable both of these lines of effort. Therefore, our amendment would also authorize additional funds to provide for improved Embassy security to help keep these personnel safe.

The importance of adequately funding other security-focused civilian departments and agencies was also underscored by the former commander of U.S. Northern Command ADM William Gortney when he testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee earlier this year. Admiral Gortney stated:

Our trusted partnerships are our center of gravity and are critical to the successful implementation across the spectrum of our missions. Homeland partnerships... underscore every one of our mission areas, and are best represented by the work we do in our relationships with nearly 60 DOD and non-DOD federal agencies, department representatives, and liaison officers. I view homeland defense as a team effort, and I rely on partnerships with my fellow combatant commands, the Services, and our interagency partners to accomplish this mission.

Recognizing this reality, my amendment also includes additional funding for critical domestic security efforts, including $2 billion for cyber security. Cyber attacks are a real threat to our national security. Cyber threats are increasing as our country and government become more digitally connected. There is no question the Federal Government must do a better job of protecting its systems. This amendment provides an additional $2 billion to address our cyber security vulnerabilities in nondefense agencies.

I was particularly struck in hearings we had with the Department of Transportation IG and Department of Housing IG. When asked to give their major
concerns, both indicated the potential for cyber attacks and cyber security within their Departments. So this issue of cyber security certainly transcends the Department of Defense, and funding cyber security is a critical primary objective included in the amendment that I propose.

We are also asking for $1.4 billion for law enforcement and the Department of Homeland Security. This money will help State and local law enforcement and first responders. It will also allow the Department of Homeland Security to hire 2,000 new Customs and Border Protection officers and reduce wait times and improve security.

It is a good sign for our economy that more and more people have been using air travel since the economic recovery started in 2009. We have seen, particularly at many of our larger airports, passengers experiencing significant delays trying to clear security. For instance, BWI Airport is advising passengers to plan for 2 hours for domestic flights in order to clear security. The flight to Providence is 1 hour 15 minutes, and I take it often. So it is possible that people flying to Rhode Island will spend more time in the security lines than on the plane. We all know how much that affects the people we represent.

It is also important we have an adequate number of Customs officers not only at the southern border but all ports of entry across the country. T.F. Green Airport in my home State has a growing international service, but it has become a challenge for the existing number of Customs agents and inspectors to meet new demands for service. One of the areas we talked about extensively on both sides of the aisle over the last several months has been the opioid epidemic. The amendment I propose would provide resources in the amount of $1.1 billion to help with this epidemic. United States drug overdoses have exceeded car crashes as the No. 1 cause of injury death. Two Americans die of drug overdoses every hour. In my State of Rhode Island, there were more than 230 opioid overdose deaths in 2014. We acted earlier this year on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act to help deal with this issue, but so far the funding efforts have been blocked. So we have a situation where there is authority but no funding. I think we need both, and I think we have to continually ensure we have both authorities and funds. It is critical that we provide real resources to States and local entities to confront this epidemic and to ensure that people have access to the treatments they need.

Another issue which threatens our national security that is not a traditional Department of Defense issue by any means is the threat of the Zika virus. It is on every front page and on every news show at almost every event. This legislation would authorize $1.9 billion for Zika prevention and treatment.

The threat of the Zika virus is a serious public health issue. It has been over 2 months since the administration asked for funds to speed up the development of vaccines and for a comprehensive response to the Zika virus. This threat, and what we have continued inaction leaves us more susceptible to this serious public health emergency. Already, there are over 1,700 cases of the Zika virus in the United States and U.S. territories, including many pregnant women. We have seen seven cases so far in my home State of Rhode Island. The virus is spreading. It is not going away on its own, and we will certainly see these numbers increase as we approach the summer months. Again, I think we have to see this as a threat to our national security and deal with it as we are trying to deal with other threats to national security. But our national security is not just about being strong at home. A growing, vital economy allows us to meet the fiscal challenges we need to fully fund defense and to fully fund our nondefense security activities. So, as Secretary Carter said, underfunding the nondefense portion of the budget, in his words, "disregards the enduring long-term connection between our Nation's security and many other factors. Factors like scientific R&D to keep our technological edge, education of a future all-volunteer military force, and the general economic strength of our country."

The words of the Secretary of Defense, I think, are right on target. Furthermore, the men and women of our military volunteer to protect and are fighting overseas for American ideals, including a good education, economic opportunity, safe communities, and functioning communities. There is a reason why our past budget agreements have provided budget parity between defense and nondefense spending. We have done so because we all recognize that what we provide for our national security is as well as keep our Nation worth protecting.

Our servicemembers and their families also rely on many of the services provided by non-DOD departments and agencies. Efforts to support all these goals will be hampered unless civilian departments and agencies also receive relief from the budget caps.

Therefore, my amendment also revises the budget caps to allow for additional spending on important programs carried out by civilian agencies, including $5.1 billion for infrastructure improvement. President Eisenhower understood the importance of a strong highway infrastructure to our national defense. In fact, I think, at least colloquially, his legislation was referred to at times as the "national defense highway system." But it was the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 which led to our interstate transportation system.

Today, many elements of that transportation system, both roads and bridges, have fallen below acceptable standards. We need to take action now to prevent further decline in that vital system. The unrealistic and arbitrary budget caps will result in deep cuts to critical infrastructure programs. We need the resources to invest in our transportation and infrastructure systems—less.

In response to these shortfalls, my amendment would provide $5.1 billion to help meet critical infrastructure needs for roads, bridges, affordable housing, VA construction projects, water infrastructure, and funds to mitigate lead contamination.

Here are a few facts for the consideration of my colleagues. Barely one-third of our roads are in good condition, and one-quarter of our bridges need significant repair. In my State, we have the highest percentage of structurally deficient bridges. Without incrementally increased funding, that number could double in the next decade.

The Department of Transportation has identified an $86 billion state-of-good-repair backlog for bus and rail transit. That backlog continues to increase at a rate of $2.5 billion per year due to inadequate Federal funding. Amtrak’s busy Northeast corridor has a $28 billion state-of-good-repair backlog and relies on bridges and tunnels that are over 100 years old.

The Federal Aviation Administration’s maintenance backlog has grown to $5 billion, and the FAA has identified over $400 million in needs for immediate facilities repairs that we are not equipped to meet until the next allocation. If we do not invest in our transportation system, efficiency and safety will be compromised.

Meanwhile, we have also an affordable housing crisis. Nearly 8 million low-income Americans are paying more than 50 percent of their income on rent, living in substandard housing, or both. In fact, for every four families that are eligible to receive HUD assistance, only one can be served within the current budget because our Nation cannot pay for higher education or get ahead if the majority of income goes to simply keeping a roof over their heads. It is also important to continue to adequately fund the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and to work to mitigate lead contamination. State revolving fund resources are critical to modernize our water infrastructure, reducing pollution, and protecting public health.

As the tragic events in Flint, MI, illustrate, when water quality is compromised, it becomes a public health crisis. Water quality oversight isn’t just about pipes and pipes and pipes. It is also about preserving an ecosystem and keeping our sources of drinking water free from harmful contaminants. Inadequately funding these basic necessities means that we cannot meet the needs of our communities.

We also understand, particularly as we look across the globe at our competitors—our military competitors—
that our technological edge is narrowing. One reason is that they are investing a great deal in their research infrastructure and we are not investing as we were in the past, again, partly as a result of these budget caps.

So, what would authorize an additional $3.5 billion for science and technological investment. Federal research centers like NIH, the National Science Foundation, NASA, and ARPA-E, all provide hope for treatments and cures like threatening and debilitating diseases, generate new technology, and make scientific breakthroughs. They are also key in helping to strengthen our economy and maintain our competitive edge—the foundation of our national security.

Again, the technological edge that we enjoyed over our near-peer competitors in the past is narrowing. Every defense official will say that. We are not simply going to fix it by putting some more money into defense-directed DOD research. We have to put money throughout our entire research enterprise. One other area is increasing our basic education. This funding would support full implementation of several bipartisan legislative efforts, including the Next Generation Science Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, and efforts to improve college affordability.

We can never be fully secure if we are not fully providing for the development of the children of this country, because they will eventually rise to positions of leadership, not just in the military but in other critical areas that will make this Nation strong and continue our ability to provide the finest military force in the world.

We have tried to articulate throughout that our national security is much more than simply the funding we give to the Department of Defense. A well-trained and productive workforce contributes to our economy, and that contributes to our defense. Innovation through scientific research is important to our national security.

The agencies that I cited, particularly the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, and all of these agencies have a critical role overseas. They will not be able to play that role if we simply increase funding of the Department of Defense and not for these other agencies. For some time now, the President and Secretaries of Defence, Carter, Hagel, Panetta, and Gates have implored Congress to end the arbitrary spending caps and sequestration.

During last year’s debate, I repeatedly and forcefully argued that using the OCO account as a way to skirt the budget caps set a dangerous precedent. That was the reason why I reluctantly had to vote against last year’s bill. I was deeply concerned that if we used this OCO approach for 1 year, it would be easy to do it next year and every year after that, ensuring an enduring imbalance between security and domestic spending. Such an approach would be completely counter to the original rationale of the Budget Control Act, which imposed proportionally equal cuts to defense and nondefense discretionary spending to force a bipartisan compromise.

Ultimately, we must return to an era of budget deliberations in which all discretionary spending, both defense and nondefense, is judged by its merit and not by arbitrary limits. We need to begin working together now to remove the budget caps and the threat of sequestration, not just for the Department of Defense but for all Federal agencies that contribute to national and economic security. Providing relief from the caps to only the defense portion of the budget, while ignoring the very real consequences of continuing to underfund the nondefense portion of the budget, moves us farther away from that goal.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll. The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair. Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:30 a.m., took a recess subject to the call of the Chair, and the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Julie E. Adams; the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, James Morhard; and the Vice President of the United States, Joseph R. Biden, Jr., proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address delivered by His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of India.

(The address delivered by the Prime Minister of India to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the Proceedings of the House of Representatives in today’s Record.)

At 2:20 p.m., the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. Ernst).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer. What is our parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering S. 2943.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I asked unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

INDEPENDENCE OF OUR FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I wanted to speak based on my experience over the years as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, as the ranking member, as the chairman—on something very public that has happened.

Many Senators in both parties have appropriately condemned the racist comments recently made by the Republican Party’s presumptive Presidential nominee about Judge Curiel. Sadly, these baseless allegations he has made against a distinguished Federal judge come as no surprise. We have seen for the past few years the calling card of the Republican standard bearer. But I would say, similar to what many in both parties have said, anyone seeking the highest office of this great Nation has to understand the fundamental role that judges play in our democracy. The rule of law protects all of us, but only when administered by an independent judiciary.

I am deeply troubled by this attack on a sitting Federal judge, but make no mistake—it is not the first, nor will it be the last Republican attack on the independence of our Federal judiciary. This may be the most extreme example, but it is just the latest in a series of Republican actions that seek to undermine and compromise a coequal branch of government.

For more than 7 years, Senate Republicans have tried to block judicial nominations through stalling and delaying. They have even distorted the records of the men and women nominated to serve on the Federal bench. This systematic—and it has been systematic—obstruction has hurt courts across the country. But it is not just the courts I am worried about; it is the American people who go to those courts seeking justice. Judicial vacancies have soared under Republican leadership, even though we have dozens of nominations that have bipartisan support, and they are languishing on the Senate floor.

Earlier this year, Senate Republicans took their obstruction one totally unprecedented step further. Within hours of the news of Justice Scalia’s passing, the Republican leader declared his unilateral refusal to allow anyone to be confirmed to the Supreme Court until the following year, even though he said this in February. It was an extraordinary partisan decision. There is no precedent for it in the United States Senate under either Democratic or Republican leadership. Since confirmation hearings began a century ago, never, never has the Senate denied a President his Supreme Court nominee a hearing.

Recently, two law professors extensively analyzed the history of the Supreme Court. They concluded that...
there is no historical precedent for this refusal to consider Chief Judge Garland’s nomination. In fact, according to their report, there have been 103 prior times in history when an elected President has filed a Supreme Court vacancy. The election of our next President and has done so with the advice and consent of the Senate—103 times. The Republicans’ unprecedented obstruction—and I quote here—“threatens to damage the appointment of the future in risks significant harm to the Court.”

The Senate Republican leadership has chosen to put the functioning of our highest Court in jeopardy for more than a year. That is the partisan attack on our independent judicial system that more Americans need to understand. When the dust settles on this latest series of accusations by the Republican’s standard bearer, I hope the American people will remember what this is all about. It is not about those who fail to hold him accountable.

Our Founders understood that this great Nation needs an independent judiciary. They designed our courts to be insulated from the political whims of the moment. They designed our judiciary to serve as a check on the political branches, including on the power of the President. Can you imagine a future President who does not respect the role judges play? A President who thinks judges should be disqualified from doing their jobs simply based on their race or their gender?

For the good of the country, I call on my Republican friends to stop diminishing our Federal judiciary. It is too important to be treated like an election-year pawn. Our Federal courts, from the Supreme Court all the way down, deserve to be at full strength, and the Senate needs to treat fairly dozens of nominees before us, all of whom have earned bipartisan support.

It is not fair to attack sitting judges for political gain when they cannot even respond to the attack. It is also not fair to make allegations against judges who, as nominees, cannot respond because Senate Republicans refuse to have a public hearing.

If the Republican leaders of this body want to defend themselves from the rhetoric of the campaign trail, they should change course here in the Senate. Actions speak louder than words. They should allow Chief Judge Garland a public hearing and a confirmation vote this month. They should allow an up-or-down vote on the 22 judicial nominees who have been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee and who just sit here, waiting for a vote.

The American people deserve leaders who respect and support our Federal courts and have the courage to take action.

Let me say from a personal point that I remember the day I stood before the Vermont Supreme Court as though it was yesterday. I took my oath as the newest lawyer in Vermont, and I was the youngest lawyer in the State of Vermont. I was very conscious of that, being both 28 and being half new.

But I remember the senior partner of our law firm, who was a well-known conservative Republican throughout the State, and as a young lawyer he told me: Do the best job you can. Always remember that you do not criticize the judges. You might not like their decisions. You can always appeal them. Maybe you will win; maybe you will lose. But protect the integrity of our courts. They are above politics. They should not be brought into it.

Frankly, the attacks against a judge born in Indiana, a man who has defended our Constitution, the people of this country, even when his life was threatened—to attack him, to make racist comments about him, to demean the courts, to demean our judiciary, our Federal system, the best in the world—it made my skin crawl. It was puerile; it was wrong. I hope that all of us in both parties will stand above that and protect the integrity of our Federal judiciary.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak about my amendment No. 4299.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, not a lot of Americans know this, but we are at war in the Middle East. We are part of the Saudi-led coalition that is in the middle of a very dangerous and catastrophic war inside Yemen. The Saudi-led campaign inside Yemen began on March 26, 2015. The Houthis, a group led campaign inside Yemen began on March 26, 2015. The Houthis, a group led campaign inside Yemen began on March 26, 2015. The Houthis, a group...
operations. The coalition has made a very purposeful decision to target the Houthis instead of targeting ISIS, which had virtually no footprint in Yemen before this bombing campaign and now is growing by the day.

Here is how the State Department's annual counterterrorism report states about the civil war inside Yemen:

AQAP benefitted during 2015 from the conflict in Yemen by significantly expanding its presence in the southern and eastern governorates. The group was able to increase its recruiting and expand its safe haven in Yemen. It also insinuated itself among multiple factions on the ground, which made it difficult to target.

I almost want to read that again because what our own counterterrorism report has told us is that the U.S. intervention in Yemen has resulted in the dramatic growth in the strength of AQAP, an element of Al Qaeda, a named enemy of the United States.

We don't have a resolution that commits the United States to war against the Houthis. We have never given the administration the power to fight the Houthis. We have given the administration the power to fight Al Qaeda. There is still no effective authorization of war against Al Qaeda. Inside Yemen, there are the Houthis and there is Al Qaeda. A Saudi-led campaign, with participation from the United States, is fighting the Houthis—not a named enemy of the United States—while largely ignoring AQAP, which has grown in scale and scope.

The State Department further affirms that both AQAP and ISIL have "carried out hundreds of attacks" in Yemen last year, including suicide bombings, car bombings, assassinations, et cetera, et cetera.

So why are we doing this? Why is the United States relatively quietly facilitating a Saudi-led bombing campaign in Yemen that is in contravention to our national security interests? Well, there are a lot of guesses as to why.

One is that as a consequence of the Iran nuclear agreement, we have to make a renewed commitment to the Saudis to push back on Iranian influence in and around the region. There is no doubt that there is a very direct connection between the Houthis and the Iranians. Houthis are not an Iranian proxy, but there is a link, and there are going to be times where I would support U.S. efforts to push back on Iranian influence in the region. But in this instance, there is an indirect connection between the Houthis and the Iranians and all sorts of damage done to U.S. credibility and national security interests by participating in this coalition in the way that we are today.

The second argument is that if the United States weren't involved, the targeting would be even worse. There would be 3,000 civilian deaths in Yemen, which would be 20,000 civilian deaths if the United States were not helping. Well, that may be true, but that is not an invitation to be involved in a civil war, because U.S. intelligence and targeting could probably always mean that fewer civilians would be killed. The fact is that it is likely that Saudi Arabia wouldn't engage in this conflict or bombing campaign at all if it weren't for U.S. support.

I think it is time for this body to do some oversight on a conflict that has been raging for over a year with billions of U.S. dollars at stake, the consequence being the dramatic increase of the power of terrorist organizations that have plots against the United States. Remember, AQAP is the most lethal and most dangerous element of Al Qaeda when it comes to potential threats directly to the U.S. homeland. It is AQAP that sits at the pinnacle of Al Qaeda's potential ability to strike the United States. Yet this Congress has remained almost completely silent as a bombing campaign funded and orchestrated in part by the United States has allowed AQAP to get stronger.

God forbid that AQAP is successful in attacking the United States and that they do it from a base in Yemen that was made possible by U.S. paid for and directed bombs dropped on that country.

I think the White House has recently recognized the danger of continuing along this same path. There are reports that the White House recently placed a hold on a pending arms transfer of U.S.-origin cluster munitions to Saudi Arabia over concerns about their use in Yemen in areas inhabited by civilians. But we have to do our due diligence and our oversight as well. If we are really serious about upholding our article I responsibilities to oversee the foreign policy of this Nation, then we have to add some conditions as well.

The amendment that I have helped offer to the NDAA would place two pretty simple conditions on our support for the coalition. Importantly, my amendment doesn't prohibit the United States from continuing to fund this effort. If I had my druthers, I certainly would argue that we at least take a pause, but I understand that the consensus may not be here in this body to temporarily or permanently halt our support for this campaign.

All I am suggesting is that we place effectively two conditions on our financial support and logistical support for this campaign. First, I believe the president should make a commitment to us, the Congress, that the United States is fighting the Houthis. The United States isn't at war with the Houthis. The United States hasn't declared war on the Houthis. We haven't declared war on Al Qaeda, and Al Qaeda is growing in its lethality, influence, and territorial control inside Yemen.

Another condition, as contemplated by our amendment, is to simply have the President certify as a condition of continued support for the bombing campaign that the coalition is fighting terrorist groups alongside the Houthis. I think if I had 100 different conversations with Members of the Senate, I can't imagine there would be a lot of objection because of course we want to fight terrorism. Of course that is our priority, not the Houthis. And of course we want to do everything possible to reduce civilian casualties.

I am grateful to Senator McCain, Senator Reed, and also Senator Cardin and Senator Corker, who have some jurisdiction here, too, that they are really serious about stepping up at this amendment. I am not offering it today because we are contemplating ways to structure the language to make it acceptable to the chair and to the ranking member.

I will end this with a plea for the Senate to get back in the game when it comes to the oversight of this administration's foreign policy, in particular in places like Yemen. We have been out to lunch when it comes to authorizations of military force for a long time. There is no authorization right now to fight ISIS, but we are doing it. There is a decade-old authorization to fight Al Qaeda that we should renew. If we are going to be involved in spending all of this money and all of this time putting our soldiers and airmen at risk in the Yemen campaign, then we should authorize that, too, and if we don't authorize it, then the administration shouldn't do it.

I am not on an authorization I am proposing; it is simply a couple of commonsense conditions. I hope we can find a pathway to get a vote on this amendment, and I hope this body has the courage in the future to step up and call a spade a spade and do our constitutional duty, perform our constitutional responsibility to provide oversight of the foreign policy by this administration.

Thank you very much, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. Baldwin. Mr. President, it is no secret we are living in a dangerous time. We face a variety of threats to our security at home and abroad. We all agree we need to make investments.
in a strong military to protect and defend our national security. We have also come together in agreement on the need to take on our national security challenges and our challenges here at home in a balanced way.

The bipartisan budget agreement that we passed into law last year was far from perfect, but it provided much needed certainty for our economy by preventing the ongoing threats of a government default or a government shutdown. It restored investment in both our economy and our security, ensuring that every dollar of investment in defense was matched by a dollar of investment in a stronger economy and a stronger middle class.

A balanced approach has served us well. It was a necessary compromise grounded in fairness that should guide our bipartisan work going forward. I understand that the chairman would like to give the Defense Department $18 billion more than they currently have for our military. But I also know the American people need stronger investments in the challenges they face each and every day just trying to get ahead.

If we are going to spend more on our military, then it is only fair that we also invest more in education, in job training, and workforce readiness to raise incomes and create a stronger economy for all. If we are going to spend more on the Pentagon, then it is only fair that we invest more in putting people to work and rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure and transportation and water infrastructure.

I also know we have unfinished business in the Congress to bolster our vulnerable cyber security and to boost TSA security and to better support our law enforcement needs. We also have a responsibility to act on the public health crisis posed by Zika. We simply must do more and approve the necessary funding to prevent, protect, and respond to this serious and dangerous threat.

We need to provide relief to the people in Flint, MI, who are still suffering from the impacts of lead contamination.

I understand the military has asked for more helicopters and more fighter jets, but I also know that the American people need Washington to be stronger partners in the fights we are confronting in communities across our country today. That is why I am pleased to support Senator REED’s amendment to invest $18 billion to help our middle class, to keep our country safe, and to respond to the Zika virus, lead contamination, heroin, opioids, and the crisis that we are facing with drug abuse throughout our Nation.

As I have traveled in Wisconsin, it is clear that we face a heroin and opioid epidemic. I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate face that same crisis in their home States.

In Wisconsin, it is a big problem, and it demands a bold response from Washington. We are in the midst of a crisis that is touching far too many across our State. I have heard stories from family members who have tragically lost loved ones to addiction, and I have heard from people who are on the path of recovery.

At one of my community meetings in Pewaukee, a father came up to me to courageously share a story of tragically losing his youngest son to addiction right after Christmas a couple of years ago.

Recently, I heard from Leonard, from Colfax, WI, whose grandson Nathan was killed in a car accident when he was just 16 years old. The driver of the other car was under the influence of heroin at the time.

I have also heard from a mother from South Milwaukee whose son suffered from addiction for 20 years. While he is now in recovery, at one point she found him on their bathroom floor, unconscious from a heroin overdose.

Another mother from Mukwonago wrote to tell me that her own son’s life was saved by paramedics who administered the drug naloxone during his overdose, allowing him to survive.

The message is clear. Families simply cannot afford to wait any longer for help from Washington. It should not be easier for Wisconsinites to get their hands on opioids or heroin than it is for them to get treatment for their addiction.

Today, as we consider increasing our spending for our military, let’s not forget American law enforcement, first responders, health care providers, and citizens fighting on the frontlines to combat our opioid and heroin crisis. Let’s not forget those struggling to get sober and to stay healthy.

As communities continue to confront this epidemic on a daily basis, Washington needs to step up and needs to be a strong partner with State, local, and nonprofit efforts.

The first place we can start is by making emergency investments for prevention, intervention, treatment, and recovery efforts. I was proud to support bipartisan legislation that provides this funding because these resources are vital as we continue to respond to this national emergency. Unfortunately, this funding was blocked by congressional Republicans. This epidemic knows no political party, and it should be an issue that unites us all.

We must do more because fighting this nationwide epidemic is a shared responsibility. The role to play in addressing this crisis, and Congress should be no exception. The communities we represent need the resources necessary to win this fight.

From talking to the people I work for in Wisconsin, the opioid and heroin epidemic is a problem that neither law enforcement nor the health care system can tackle alone. The Federal Government cannot solve this problem by itself, just as we cannot expect State and local communities to address it by themselves.

Together we must continue our fight and rise to this challenge. Let’s work together to help our communities recover from this epidemic and stay healthy.

The Senate will soon vote on the Reed amendment. This amendment would provide $1.1 billion to respond to the opioid and heroin crisis. The amendment would invest a total of $18 billion, equal to the amount of funding that my Republican colleague, Chairman MCCAIN, is proposing to spend on the Department of Defense.

The vote is about fairness and priorities. I believe that, if we are going to provide more funding to the Pentagon, we should also invest in our middle class, ensure our security here at home, and step up to the plate and provide the resources Americans need to respond to the serious emergencies they face here at home.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on Monday I came to the floor to speak about the important provisions of the NDAA, sweeping reforms to the organization of the Department of Defense, to the Defense Acquisition System, and to the Military Health System. But I noted there was one challenge the Committee on Armed Services could not address in the NDAA: the dangerous mismatch between growing worldwide threats and arbitrary limits on defense spending in current law. This mismatch has very real consequences for the thousands of Americans who are serving in uniform and sacrificing on our behalf all around the world and their families.

From Afghanistan to Iraq and Syria, from the heart of Europe to the seas of Asia, our troops are doing everything we ask of them, but for too long we in Congress have failed to do everything we can for them.

Shamefully, our military is being forced to confront growing threats with shrinking resources. This year’s defense budget is more than $150 billion less than the fiscal year 2011, before the Budget Control Act imposed arbitrary caps on defense spending. Over the last 5 years as our military has struggled under the threat of sequestration, the world has only grown more complex and dangerous.

In 2011, we have seen Russian forces invade Ukraine, the emergence of the so-called Islamic State and its global campaign of terrorism, increased attempts by Iran to destabilize U.S. allies and partners in the Middle East, increased assertive behavior by China and the militarization of the South China Sea, numerous cyber attacks on U.S. industry and government
agencies, and further testing by North Korea of nuclear technology and other advanced military capabilities. Indeed, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified to the Armed Services Committee in February that over the course of his distinguished five-decade career, he could not recall “a more diverse array of challenges and crises” than our Nation confronts today.

The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015—or BBA—provided our military service members with much needed relief from the arbitrary caps on defense spending in the Budget Control Act. The BBA was a credit to the congressional leadership, and many of us supported it as a necessary compromise that provided our military with vital resources for fiscal year 2016 but was more constrained in the resources it could provide for fiscal year 2017. The fact remains that despite periodic relief from the budget caps that have imposed those cuts, including the BBA, each of our military services remains underfunded, undersized, and unready to meet current and future threats.

By the end of this fiscal year, the Marine Corps will be reduced to 182,000 marines, even though the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Neller, testified last year that the optimal size for the force is 186,800. Facing a shortage of eight amphibious ships, the Marine Corps has been forced to examine options for deploying forces aboard foreign vessels, and a recent news report revealed the crisis in Marine Corps aviation. Years of budget cuts have left us with a Marine Corps that is too small and has too few aircraft. The aircraft it does have are too old and can barely fly—and only by cannibalizing parts from other aircraft. Pilots cannot train and receive fewer flight hours a month than their Chinese and Russian counterparts. Young marines are working around the clock to keep planes in the air with shrinking resources, knowing that if they fail, their comrades flying and riding in those aircraft could pay a fatal price.

Another news report showed what it means to have the oldest, smallest, and least ready Air Force in history, as our Nation now does. The service is short 700 pilots and 4,000 maintainers for its fleet, which is smaller than its mission requirement and lacks the spare parts it needs to keep flying. It is so short on airpower that Air Force officials are stealing parts from retired aircraft in “the boneyard” in my home State of Arizona and even museum pieces just to get their planes back into combat. Our aircraft are aging, but even worse, our airmen are left “burnt out” and exhausted. This is the predictable consequence of years of relentless operational tempo combined with misguided reductions in defense spending. Today, less than 50 percent of the Air Force’s combat squadrons are ready to operate. Indeed, the Air Force does not anticipate a return to full-spectrum readiness for another decade, and this will only grow worse as budget cuts force the Air Force to retire more aircraft than it procures.

The story is similar in the Army. The Army has been reduced by 100,000 soldiers since 2012, bringing the Army to a size that Army Chief of Staff Mark Milley testified that the Army “has a high ‘high risk.” As the size of the Army has shrunk, readiness has suffered. Just one-third of Army brigade combat teams are ready to deploy and—just two—of the Army’s 60 brigade combat teams are at the highest level of combat readiness. To buy readiness today, the Army is being forced to mortgage its future readiness and capability by reducing and deferring and laying vital modernization programs, and the result of budget cuts, force reductions, and declining readiness is clear. In an unforeseen contingency, General Milley testified in March that the Army is no longer able to provide the forces available to provide flexible options to our national leadership... and most importantly, [risks] incurring significantly increased U.S. casualties. I repeat, significantly increased U.S. casualties are the men and women who are serving.

By any measure, the fleet of 272 ships in the Navy today is too small to address critical security challenges. Even with recent shipbuilding increases, the Navy will not achieve its current requirement of 308 ships until 2021, and there is no plan to meet the bipartisan National Defense Panel’s unanimous recommendation of between 323 and 346 ships. A shrinking fleet operating at a higher tempo has forced difficult tradeoffs. Extended deployments have taken a heavy toll on our sailors, ships, and aircraft, and the Navy is no longer able to provide a constant carrier presence in the Middle East or the Western Pacific.

In short, as threats grow, and the operational demands on our military increase, defense spending in constant dollars decreased in the President’s defense budget is $17 billion less than what the Department of Defense planned for last year. In order to make up for that shortfall, the military was forced to cut things it needs right now: Army fighting vehicles, Air Force fighters, Navy ships, Marine Corps helicopters, and critical training and maintenance across the services. As a result, the military services’ unfunded requirements total nearly $23 billion for the coming fiscal year alone. Then there is a massive and growing defense bill that we keep pretending does not exist. Over the next 5 years, the Department of Defense says it needs an additional $30 billion above the budget Control Act caps on defense spending, add to that nearly $30 billion in base budget requirements that are currently hiding in the emergency account for contingency operations—or OCO. That is another $150 billion over 5 years.

Put simply, according to our own Department of Defense and our own military leaders, our Nation needs an additional quarter of a trillion dollars over the current Budget Control Act caps over the next 5 years just to execute the current defense strategy—a strategy that I think many of us would agree is not doing enough to address the many global threats. My colleagues, we are fooling ourselves and we are misleading the American people about the true cost of defending our Nation. This makes no sense, and it is time to put a stop to this madness. That is what my amendment would begin to do.

This amendment would increase defense spending by $18 billion. These additional resources would be used to restore military capabilities that were cut from the President’s defense budget request; address unfunded requirements identified by military commanders, especially those aimed at restoring readiness in the military services; and support national security priorities consistently identified by military leaders and defense experts in testimony and briefings before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

This amendment would increase the pay raise for our troops to 2.1 percent. The President’s budget request sets pay raises at 1.6 percent, which would make this the fourth year in a row that pay raises for our troops were below inflation. Our troops deserve better, and if this amendment passes, a 2.1-percent pay raise would match the employment cost index and keep pace with private sector wage growth.

This amendment prioritizes restoring military readiness. Over the past 5 years, the combination of expanding threats, high operational tempo, budget cuts, shrinking forces, and aging equipment have created a growing readiness crisis in our military. Indeed, $23 billion of the requirements identified by the military services, almost $7 billion were directly related to readiness. The NDAA took a first step in addressing these requirements by redirecting about $2 billion in targeted savings toward improving readiness. My amendment would add an additional $2.2 billion to help alleviate the readiness crisis and mitigate the growing risk posed to the lives of our servicemembers.

This amendment would stop misguided cuts to the size of our military that are based on outdated assumptions about the world. For example, cuts to the size of the Army were set in motion before the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the rise of ISIL. There is simply no strategic logic for continuing these cuts now and placing a dangerous burden on the backs of our soldiers. That is why my amendment cancels the planned reduction of 15,000 Active Army soldiers. It also restores end strength in the Navy. Marine Corps, and Air Force National Guard and Reserve. The amendment also prevents cutting a 10th carrier air wing.
Our military confronts an ongoing strike fighter shortfall, which is especially severe in the Navy, and a readiness crisis across aviation in the services. This amendment would begin reversing this dangerous trend by increasing aircraft procurement, including 14 F/A-18 Super Hornets and 11 F-35 Joint Strike Fighters.

The amendment also accelerates Navy shipbuilding to mitigate a looming funding crunch in the next decade. My amendment provides the balance of funding to fully fund our additional Arleigh Burke-class destroyers. It also replaces funds for a third Littoral combat ship in the next fiscal year.

This amendment supports the recommendations of the National Commission on the Future of the Army. In order to support combat aviation across the total Army, including the Guard and Reserve, the amendment includes funding for 36 additional UH-60 Black Hawks and 17 LHH-72 Lakotas, 5 CH-47 Chinooks, and 5 AH-64 Apache helicopters. The amendment also includes advanced procurement funding for 10 more Apaches.

Despite the fact that our troops are still facing a war in Afghanistan, where the Taliban is making steady gains and ISIL is still in harm’s way, the President’s budget requests less than two-thirds of the current level of U.S. forces in Afghanistan. Both Republicans and Democrats on the Armed Services Committee have recognized that U.S. troop levels in Afghanistan should be based on conditions on the ground. That is why this amendment provides full funding for the current level of 9,800 troops in Afghanistan to help our Afghan partners preserve the gains of the last 15 years and take the fight to terrorists who seek to destabilize the region and attack American interests.

This amendment supports the European Reassurance Initiative by modernizing 14 M1 Abrams tanks and 14 M2 Bradley fighting vehicles for deployment to Eastern Europe to deter Russian aggression.

The amendment also provides vital support for our allies and partners. My amendment provides $150 million in security assistance for the Ukrainian people to defend themselves against Vladimir Putin’s aggression. It also provides an additional $320 million for missiles, defense programs, including cooperative programs with U.S. industry in order to protect one of our closest allies from a growing missile threat.

In short, my amendment gives our troops the resources, training, and equipment they need and deserve to rise to the challenge of a more dangerous world.

I would also add one important fact about this amendment. Whatever some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may say, this amendment is completely compliant with last year’s budget agreement, the Bipartisan Budget Act. That legislation set binding spending caps on defense and nondefense discretionary spending, but the BBA set what the Congressional Research Service called nonbinding target levels of funding for overseas contingency operations, or OCO. In other words, it preserved the flexibility to increase OCO spending to meet current and future threats if it saw fit. There is no doubt that this additional spending is needed, and this amendment provides it in full compliance with last year’s budget agreement.

That said, I understand that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe we also need increases in nondefense spending. That is why the Senator from Rhode Island has offered a second-degree amendment that would add $18 billion in nondefense spending. This amendment has some laudable programs.

I have long said that national security is not just the Department of Defense. I agree that we should provide additional funding for the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and the Coast Guard. I would have added the CIA and some of our other intelligence work. But I do not believe there is any national security justification for adding billions in taxpayer dollars to a defense bill to pay for infrastructure, national parks, affordable housing programs, or agricultural research.

While the Senate may not reach full agreement on the amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island, what I believe his amendment does show is that we all agree our military needs the additional resources my amendment provides.

I do not know whether the amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island will succeed or fail, but if it does fail, my Democratic colleagues will be left to answer a simple question: Will you vote to give our military servicemembers the resources, training, and equipment they need and deserve? This vote will be simple. Let’s be clear what voting no would mean.

Voting no would be a vote in favor of another year where the pay for our troops does not keep pace with inflation or private sector averages.

Voting no would be a vote in favor of cutting more soldiers and marines at a time when our national requirements for our Nation’s land forces—from the Middle East and Africa to Europe and Asia—are growing.

Voting no would be a vote in favor of shrinking the number of aircraft that are available to the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps at a time when they are already too small to perform their current missions and are being forced to cannibalize their own fleets to keep our Nation’s pilots flying at far higher risk.

Let’s be clear what voting no would mean.

Voting no would be a vote in favor of continuing to shrink the number of aircraft that are available to the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps at a time when they are already too small to perform their current missions and are being forced to cannibalize their own fleets to keep our Nation’s pilots flying at far higher risk.

Voting no would be a vote in favor of letting arbitrary budget caps set the timelines for our mission in Afghanistan instead of giving our troops and our Afghan partners a fighting chance at victory.

In short, voting no is a vote in favor of continuing to ask our men and women in uniform to perform more and more tasks with inadequate readiness, inadequate equipment, an inadequate number of people, and unacceptable levels of risk to their missions and themselves. This is unfair, and it is wrong. It is wrong.

For the sake of the men and women in our military who, as we speak, are putting their lives on the line to defend this Nation, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will make the right choice.

For 5 years we have let politics, not strategy, determine what resources we give our military servicemembers. If we keep doing this, our military commanders have warned us that we risk sending young Americans into a conflict for which they are not prepared. I know the vast majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle recognize that the mistakes of the past 5 years have created this danger. Yet this is the reality our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are facing. It is our urgent and solemn task to confront it.

I say to my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, it doesn’t have to be this way. We don’t have to tolerate this anymore. Let’s stop allowing politics to divide us when we should be united in support of our military servicemembers. Let’s begin charting a better course today, one that is worthy of our service and sacrifice of those who volunteer to put themselves in harm’s way on our behalf. Let’s adopt this amendment to give our service members the support they need and deserve, and in so doing, let’s do our duty.

Mr. President, I know there are speakers on this amendment. I hope they will come to the floor to discuss these amendments so that we can set a time—hopefully this afternoon, if not today—on this amendment and the second-degree amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott). The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 459

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Reed-Mikulski amendment to respond to threats to our Nation by raising the caps for both defense and nondefense discretionary spending.

All agree that we must defend the security of the United States. So many argue that we need more money for DOD, even though DOD already consumes 50 percent of all discretionary spending.

Here is a quick tutorial on the Federal budget. Discretionary spending is $1 trillion. The other two big expenditures are interest on the debt and trust funds, particularly for earned benefits like Social Security and Medicare. But on discretionary spending—what we can decide to spend of that $1 trillion—about $500 billion goes to defense.
We all know we are under some pretty big threats. We have fought a 15-year war. Our men and women deserve the best training, the best technology, and support for themselves and their families. I don’t argue that, but I want people who like to say I am a numbers guy—let them know what the numbers are.

I take the position that we need to make sure our national security is what it should be, but I argue that not all of national security is in the Department of Defense. There are clear and present dangers to the people of the United States that are met by other agencies.

When we passed the Bipartisan Budget Act last October, we agreed on parity. What we said was that there would be parity between defense and non-defense. What does that mean? That means defense gets about $500 billion and nondefense, which is all of the other programs for the United States of America, gets the other roughly $500 billion. That means everything from the Department of Health to Homeland Security, the FBI—I could go on and on.

We are running significant deficits in research infrastructure and human infrastructure. I am going to elaborate on that in a minute. Why do we need the Reed-Mikulski amendment? Current spending caps are $20 billion below the fiscal 2010 level. Let’s make no mistake—we appropriators aren’t exactly these wild big spenders. Neither is the Budget Act. The Budget Act authorizes funding to meet real problems.

Other Members will come to discuss that, but I want to make clear that if you want to keep our troops safe, the best way is to give peace a chance. It is not a song from another era. If we want to try to prevent war, to contain war, or to end war, we need diplomacy. That is what the State Department does around the world—quelling conflict, stopping genocide, supporting treasured allies.

We need to protect our people who work abroad, both our military and those who work at our Embassies. We need Embassy security. We need for foreign aid to respond to real human needs while avoiding creating new enemies or new problems abroad. We need the State Department, but we also need Homeland Security. We need to protect our borders. We need the U.S. Coast Guard out there protecting us against drug dealers, terrorists, and helping to provide port security. We need Customs and Border Protection to secure borders. There are those who want to build a wall. I want to make sure we have the men, women, and technology to secure the borders.

We need law enforcement to fight terrorism abroad and also to fight the drug dealers, human traffickers, cartel people, and organized crime. That is why we need the FBI’s help and help from the Drug Enforcement Agency and the U.S. Marshals Service.

This would authorize $1.4 billion for the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to make sure we have enough people and the right technology to protect us, in addition to the spartan situation we find in the Appropriations Committee. We need to be able to do that. When we look at cyber security, this is all hands on deck. We do need DOD to help with threats to our military.

We are increasingly relying on digital technology. I am so proud of what we do at the National Security Agency, our counterespionage, our other hands on deck on protecting the Nation. I am proud of the cyber command, but I am also proud of what we do through our cyber security in terms of what we do with the Department of Homeland Security, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and others, coming up with new information for security technology. There are a lot of numbers and data, but I will skip over that.

Then there is the legacy of war. The legacy of war is why we have so many veterans. We just celebrated Memorial Day, honoring those who made the ultimate sacrifice, but we also extended our support for veterans everywhere.

We all remember Walter Reed and how the years of neglected maintenance led to horrible conditions for our injured veterans and their families. They deserve better. They deserve facilities that are as fit for them as they are for our people who work abroad and our military.

Then there is this other issue that I am very concerned about, which is in the area of research and development. Some of my colleagues might say: What the heck does that have to do with being in the military? We need research and development to be able to come up with the new ideas and new technologies to protect our Nation. Look at what the Department of Energy did. They are helping to develop better tritium that sip gas like a Honda Civic. What does that mean? It not only means our military can be more efficient, but we can also be more energy independent.

The National Science Foundation has done so much in the way of basic research that it has helped us to come up with whole new fields like nanotechnology or microfabrication that enables our people not only to have the smart weapons of war but the smart weapons against disease. My gosh, look at what was done developing just in terms of new technology.

I don’t know if the Presiding Officer is aware, but a lot of the work that was
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done at NASA, particularly in the area of space telescopes and rockets, helped us come up with the new digital mcomo-ography. Can you believe that? Because we studied space out there, we learned to protect our people right here, and it also helps others.

I also want to talk about the fact that we do help some domestic programs here in the area of children and human infrastructure. People say: What does that have to do with defense? Well, tell you what General Dempsey told me. General Dempsey told me this, and he told others. So it wasn’t like a little thing with General Dempsey. GEN Martin Dempsey, former head of the Joint Chiefs and decorated war hero said: Senator Mikulski, did you know that for every four people who want to enlist in our military, only one is found fit to serve? Either people are physically unfit, can’t read, or have had a problem with mental health or addiction.

We need to invest in our children. If for nothing else, we need to make sure all Americans are fit for duty, and that is why we need to do this.

We need to speak more frequently as to why we need more money for Zika, the need to fight the addiction some have with opioid drugs, and the situation in Flint.

Mr. President, as I said, I rise in support of the Reed-Mikulski amendment to respond to threats to our Nation by raising the caps for both defense and nondefense spending. All agree that we must defend the security of the United States. Let me tell you we need more money for the Department of Defense, DOD, even though DOD consumes 50 percent of discretionary spending. But I argue not all of national security is in Department of Defense. There are other Federal agencies, such as the Departments of Homeland Security, DHS, State, and Veterans Affairs, VA.

The Bipartisan Budget Act, which passed with 64 votes in the Senate last October, was argued we need more money for the Department of Defense, DOD, even though DOD consumes 50 percent of discretionary spending. But I argue not all of national security is in Department of Defense. There are clear and present dangers to Americans met by other agencies, such as the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, State, and Veterans Affairs, VA.

The Bipartisan Budget Act, which passed with 64 votes in the Senate last October, was argued we need more money for the Department of Defense, DOD, even though DOD consumes 50 percent of discretionary spending. But I argue not all of national security is in Department of Defense. There are clear and present dangers to Americans met by other agencies, such as the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, State, and Veterans Affairs, VA.

The Reed-Mikulski amendment does two things. It amends 2015 Bipartisan Budget Act to allow both: $18 billion of relief from sequestration for defense spending, in addition to DOD, for DHS to defend our coasts and borders, Department of Justice to track down drug cartels and terrorists and State Department diplomacy, foreign aid, and embassy security; 2, funding to address urgent threats to America, including: 1, all human infrastructure as exposed in Flint, the Zika virus, and cyber security; 3, physical infrastructure, including funding for roads, bridges, transit, and VA hospitals; 4, research infrastructure investments, through new products and cures; and 5, human infrastructure, providing more resources to underfunded, but overwhelmingly passed, authorizations for education and college affordability, workforce training, and food safety. This amendment meets threats to America with new funding not available in our appropriations bills due to austerity imposed by budget caps.

Current spending caps are $30 billion below the fiscal year 2010 level, 7 years ago. These cuts have consequences. This amendment authorizes funding to meet real problems. Other members of the Appropriations Committee will come to the floor to discuss needs in their states. But I want to talk about some of the dangers we are addressing with this amendment.

The best way to keep our troops safe is peace. But we live in turbulent times, which means we need diplomacy. The Department of State works around the world to quell conflict and help displaced and threatened refugees, stop weapons proliferation, and support treated allies, especially those absorbing refugees from Syria.

We need embassy security so we can bring our diplomats home safely. We need foreign aid to respond to real human needs while avoiding creating new enemies abroad. We need the State Department to help keep America safe.

What is in the amendment includes $1.9 billion to continue the key security mission of the State Department.

Communities in the U.S. face lone-wolf terrorists, drug traffickers, and smugglers. The Department of Defense doesn’t fight domestic crime and terrorism. We need the Department of Homeland Security’s Coast Guard protecting our coasts; Transportation Security Administration, TSA, keeping our transportation to safe; Customs and Border Protection, CBP, securing the border. We also need the Department of Justice’s Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, and U.S. Marshals.

This amendment authorizes $1.4 billion for DHS and the Department of Justice, so they can improve outrageous wait times at airports, meeting growing passenger volume, which is up 7.4 percent from 2015, without compromising safety; hire 2,000 officers on the homeland; hire FBI local agents; and other Federal law enforcement to capture and prosecute criminals here in America—violent crime rose nearly 2 percent last year after falling in 2 prior years. The Department of Defense can’t do those things.

I now want to turn to a threat that requires all hands on deck: cyber security. We need DOD to help threats to our military, which is increasingly reliant on digital technology, and threats from nation states. I am so proud of Cyber Command, Fort Meade, and the National Security Agency, NSA, the mothership of talent, focused on protecting the Nation.

We need to be done enough to protect ourselves at home. More than 22 million Americans are at risk of identity theft because our own Office of Personnel Management couldn’t keep their records safe. We need the FBI finding the criminals behind the keyboards, DHS advising Federal agencies, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology setting standards. And every agency needs to secure itself.

Last year, Federal agencies reported 77,000 cyber incidents—up 10 percent from fiscal year 2014. The Food and Drug Administration and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office need to protect trade secrets, and the Social Security Administration needs to protect our personal information. That is why our amendment includes $2 billion for cyber security, so our nondefense agencies can join DOD in the fight.

The Reed-Mikulski amendment helps America be more secure, but also safer. Americans are threatened daily with our roads and bridges falling, our waterways and ports need modernization, and our transit systems clogged and crumbling.

Demand for flexible transportation investments is overwhelming. Since 2010, the Federal Aviation Administration’s backlog has grown by $1 billion to a total of $5 billion, risking breakdowns in air traffic control. Amtrak carries 30 million passengers each year, but can’t stop deadly derailments. Here in the National Capital Region, while “safe track” repairs clog highways and side streets, the Department of Transportation tells us there is an $86 billion maintenance backlog for bus and rail systems nationwide.

It is not just our transportation infrastructure that fails us; 60 percent of Veterans Health Administration facilities are over 50 years old and facilities are beginning to show their age. VA has catalogued almost $10 billion worth of maintenance deficiencies and code violations at existing hospitals and clinics. VA even classifies these deficiencies as Ds and Fs, from leaking roofs to air handling systems in need of replacement.

These deficiencies can cause serious problems. For example, old air handling units risk microbial contamination. If uncorrected, it could directly impact patient care because old ventilation systems would pump contaminated air into inpatient and outpatient areas. We all remember Walter Reed, where years of neglected maintenance


led to horrible conditions for injured veterans and their families. Our veterans deserve better. That is why the Reed-Mikulski amendment includes $3.2 billion to meet the physical infrastructure needs of the U.S.

It is not just our physical infrastructure, our research infrastructure has failed to keep pace with inflation. The National Institutes of Health, NIH, has lost more than 20 percent of its purchasing power since 2003. The history of economic growth shows we need civil unrest to create new ideas and new jobs.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration built a methane detector for its Mars rover that is helping find dangerous gas leaks on Earth. The NIH researchers are on the cusp of finding cures for Alzheimer’s, diabetes, and cancer. That is why the Reed-Mikulski amendment includes $3.5 billion for research and development to create jobs and find cures.

We can’t cure cancer without investing in NIH. Now, we are looking at a new health crisis and a new threat to America: Zika. Americans—particularly women and children—are in danger. The President has said $1.9 billion is needed to fight Zika and stop it from doing any more harm. That funding is included in our amendment.

As of June 6, there were more than 1,732 confirmed Zika cases, including 341 pregnant women, in the U.S. and its territories. The mosquitoes that carry Zika are already in at least three of our States, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that soon they will be in 30 States.

There is still a lot we don’t know, but we do know for sure that Zika has terrible consequences for women and babies. Scientists have confirmed the link between the Zika infection in pregnancy and serious birth defects in babies. The details about what Zika does to the brains of unborn children are truly horrific. Zika is a threat we can stop if we have the will and the funding to do so.

Another emergency we can stop is the heroin epidemic. Every Senator and every person heard about the resurgence of heroin, which knows no boundaries—geographic or socioeconomic. Since 1999, the rate of heroin and opioid deaths quadrupled to an average of 78 deaths each day.

The Senate passed the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, CARA, on March 10 with a vote of 94-1. Authorization is nice, but we need the money to fund law enforcement, treatment and recovery and better pain management so people don’t get hooked on the opioid in the first place. That is why the Reed-Mikulski amendment includes $1.1 billion for heroin response and treatment.

Every community is dealing with addiction, but every State also worries about its water. The amendment also includes $1.9 billion to upgrade water systems throughout the U.S. Today, nearly 100,000 residents of Flint don’t have clean and safe drinking water. Up to 70 people are hospitalized or have died from poisoning; some are already exhibiting signs in school. Flint’s water is still contaminated because its pipes are permanently damaged.

This is a national crisis. Flint is ground zero. Contaminated drinking water is happening in cities and rural communities across America. This is about the infrastructure and our failure to replace it. But it is about more than just replacing pipes. It is about the human infrastructure. This is about the lives of our children. What happened in Flint, MI is a failure of a State’s government to protect its own people. The threat from our aging water systems is real, and it can’t be solved by penny pinching.

From our water infrastructure to our human infrastructure which includes the very troops who make up the DOD, we must do more to ensure readiness. Shockingly, General Dempsey tells us our supply chain only funds 80 percent of required goods for duty. One can’t read, one can’t meet physical requirements, and one is disqualified due to legal or mental problems. They wanted to serve, but did we serve them?

We must unequivocally pass authorizations to help. The Every Student Succeeds Act, which passed the Senate 85-12, aims to give kids a better K-12 education so they are ready for college, careers, or military service. But implementation is underfunded in the fiscal year 2017 Labor-HHS-Education bill by more than $1 billion. We can’t say we want to solve problems with great policies, but then fail to fund the solutions. That’s why the Reed-Mikulski amendment includes $900 million for underfunded authorizations of education and college affordability, job training, and food safety policy.

I talked at the beginning about how the State Department makes America safe with diplomacy and foreign aid. But I want to end with how foreign aid can help make us safer by helping the 20 million of those people, half of which are children. This is not an isolated problem. Millions of refugees are in Sudan, Burundi, and other conflict zones. What do they have in common? They are forced from their homes due to conflict and persecution. Refugees account for 20 million of those people, half of which are children. This is not an isolated problem. Millions of refugees are in Syria and Iraq, Yemen, South Sudan, Burundi, and other conflict zones. What do they have in common? They are desperately in need of livelihood, food, water, medical care, and shelter. Many will never be able to return home for years—if ever.

These refugees cannot survive indefinitely on relief aid. The children need to attend school. The adults need jobs. These refugees are scared and ready to face the unknown, rather than endure the brutality at home. They are only asking for one thing: help. All of us remember a time when, as a child, we needed help or our parents needed help. We don’t help, what are we creating? A generation of people who hate and distrust us because of our refusal when they were in need. We need the Reed-Mikulski amendment so our frugality doesn’t create a generation that hates America.

We all want to protect America. I support the troops. I support the Department of Defense. I support the men and women at Maryland’s nine military bases. The Chairman of the Armed Services says they need $18 billion more to meet the threats around the world. I support that effort, but only if there is parity. That is why we are proposing $18 billion to meet threats to America not funded by the Department of Defense. I urge my colleagues to support the Reed-Mikulski amendment to raise the caps for both defense and non-defense items that defend America.

I note that the distinguished majority leader is on the floor right now. If we are going to spend more money on defense, even though we already spend roughly $500 billion—about 50 percent of all discretionary spending—let’s also spend money on other agencies that enable us to have a strong national security. Let’s also put money into the other threats to the United States. Right now there is a public health crisis with Zika. There is a public health crisis with opioid and heroin addiction. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that 10,000 people may have lead poisoning in Flint, MI. Others are facing environmental problems. Let’s make these other investments to make sure we keep America strong.

I yield the floor by saying: Let’s please vote for the Reed-Mikulski second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, our government has work to do, but when it comes to making sure that our courts have the judges they need, when it comes to making sure that the Federal agencies have the leaders they need, and when it comes to filling a vacant seat on the highest Court in this Nation, the Senate Republicans refuse to do their job.

Senate Republicans have a long history of obstructing President Obama’s nominees. Earlier this week, I released a report documenting that long history. Senate Republicans have slowed down the confirmation of judicial nominees to a crawl—the people needed to resolve important legal disputes.
They have stalled confirmations of key agency heads. These are the people needed to protect consumers, to protect our environment, and to defend our country.

They are blocking Merrick Garland, a judge whom our colleague from Utah, Senator ORRIN HATCH, called a “fine man” whom the President could “easily name” to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court.

Instead of working to make government work more efficiently, Senate Republicans have made it their priority to keep key positions empty for as long as possible—to hamstring efforts to protect consumers and workers, to delay efforts to hold large corporations accountable, and to slow down work to promote equality.

The view of Senate Republicans seems to be pretty simple. If government isn’t working for them, their rich friends, or their rightwing allies, then Senate Republicans aren’t going to let it work. But it is not too late. They still have time to put aside their extremism and start doing what they were sent here to do.

Start with district court judges, the men and women who resolve disputes over who gets to go to the next school, and whether the Constitution or Federal laws are being respected. They do an enormous amount of work. Their work is not political. Democratic and Republican Senators have worked with the President to select these nominees.

As of today the Senate Judiciary Committee has cleared 15 people who were nominated for seats on the Federal district courts. These nominees have the support of Democrats and Republicans. They are ready to serve their country. One of them is from Massachusetts. We need our judge. This Nation needs its judges. So let’s vote.

Mr. President, I rise today to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following 15 nominations: Calendar Nos. 357, 358, 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, 508, 569, 570, 571, 572, and 573; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; 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 related statements 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. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we continue to process judicial nominations, and we assume even when a majority of the Republican conference did not support the nominee, as was the case with the district court nominee from Maryland, whom we con-
years to today—apples and apples—President Obama has had 327 judges confirmed, and President Bush had 304. President Obama has not been treated unfairly, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, right this minute, right here on the floor of the Senate, we face one of those "issues of great national significance" that the majority leader wrote about in the Wall Street Journal. It is an exploding number of judicial vacancies.

The Washington Post recently reported:

Of 673 U.S. district court judgeships, 67—or 10 percent—are vacant under President Obama, nearly twice as many as at this point of Republican George W. Bush’s presidency and 50 percent higher than at this time under Bill Clinton or George H.W. Bush.

The number of federally designated district court "judicial emergencies"—where seats carry particularly heavy caseloads or have not been filled for extended periods—is also roughly double what it was in May 2008 and May 2000.

Addressing those emergencies is good for the country. Keeping our courts functioning is good for the country. Confirming nominees who have the support of Republicans and Democrats is good for the country.

But just a minute ago, the majority leader blocked confirmation of all 15 noncontroversial judges who are waiting for action. That is not putting the country first; that is putting politics first. It is forcing the will of a small number of extremist Republicans on the entire country, and the integrity of our judicial branch is suffering for it.

So let me try this again. Surely we can agree to confirm the four oldest nominations on this list—two Democratic recommendations and two Republican recommendations. They all had hearings in September, 9 months ago. What are we waiting for? Give them their votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 357; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table without intervention of action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements 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. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I reserve the right to tell certainly look at this and see what can be done, but at this present time, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Brian Martinotti deserves better than this. All these nominees deserve better than this. Merrick Garland deserves better than this, and the American people deserve better than this. We will keep fighting to try to get the Senate Republicans to do their job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have only been here 40 years, and this happens every time at the end. They have not been mistreated. The fact is that they have had more judges confirmed in 7 years than President Bush had in a full 8 years, and they are going to have more judges. But it is the majority leader’s determination when those judges will come up and when they will be confirmed, and I think he has been doing it on a regular basis.

I have to go back in time, but I could go back in time and show how the delays on the Republican judges with the Republican Presidents were just unbelievable. All I can say is that it is nice to raise these fusses around here—and I don’t blame the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts because she is doing her job—but let’s allow the majority leader to do his job as well.

OBAMACARE AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. President, I rise once again to discuss the state of our health care system and what we can likely expect in 2017 under ObamaCare. This is a good subject following on to the judge discussion because the Democrats are acting so offended and so mistrusted.

Well, President won re-election, but Senate Republicans have still stalled, delayed, and blocked his nominees. Since they took charge of the Senate last year, these Republicans are on pace for the lowest number of judicial confirmations in more than 60 years.

So can we at least confirm one noncontroversial district judge?

The nominee on the list who has been waiting the longest is Brian Martinotti. New Jersey needs this judge. He was nominated a year ago. He has been twisting in the wind for 9 months since his confirmation hearing. Give him a vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 357; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; 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 to the nomination; that any related statements 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. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I reserve the right to tell certainly look at this and see what can be done, but at this present time, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, right here on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise once again to discuss the state of our Nation’s healthcare system.
up almost exponentially—and exponentially in some areas. Health care premiums for families with employer-based coverage—one of a handful of benchmarks for measuring the costs of health care in the United States—have gone up by an average of 5 percent a year, or 20 percent in a two-year period. According to both the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, is expected to continue over the next decade, with premiums in the individual health insurance market going up at an even faster rate.

Meanwhile, the Federal Reserve projects that growth in our economy will range between 1.8 percent and 2.3 percent, well below historic averages and far below the growth rate for average health insurance premiums.

Do you think we are going to do any better with a new Democrat President? I don’t think so. She has already admitted she is going to follow the principles of this President and the pro-grams he implemented while he was in office. And from what we have seen thus far, those things are only going to get worse. According to one analyst, the average of health care law requests for year 4 of ObamaCare, an average of nearly 14 percent in the States of New York, and New carrier in New Hampshire just requested an increase of more than 45 percent for 2017. Another insurer has submitted a request to raise premiums by more than 30 percent in Tennessee. People in other States, such as Virginia, Florida, Maine, Oregon, and Iowa, are all facing potential double-digit increases in premiums, with some in the 30-percent to 40-percent range.

Keep in mind these are just the States we know about thus far. More numbers and almost certainly more requested premium hikes will be made public very shortly. We are still waiting to see specifically what will happen for the people of the home State of Utah. Still, from what we know of many Utahns facing difficulties, I hear from my constituents all the time on these issues.

For example, a citizen from Roosevelt, UT, recently wrote to me to say this about her experience with ObamaCare:

"I can’t afford the monthly premiums, and as long as I have to pay extraordinary deductibles, I continue paying for the visits as I go and not have to worry about the extra money I would have to spend in premiums, which are outrageous. If I realize I will have to pay a penalty when I do my taxes, but it will be way less than the premiums I would have had to pay had I signed up for this health care debacle."

Another constituent named Richelle from Santa Clara, UT, said this in a recent letter:

"As I am looking into purchasing the health care coverage we need: I’m finding that it is totally ridiculous. The catastrophic health care law we put in place years ago no longer exists because of the health care laws. In order to get LEGAL health care for me, my spouse, and my 3 eligible children, I’m being required to pay close to $1300 per month! These policies still require huge deductibles and will quickly eat up the money we’ve put away for such things."

Unfortunately, these stories are not isolated incidents throughout the country are growing more and more concerned about the cost of health care under the President’s health care law. Even without the skyrocketing cost of health care, millions of American families would still be struggling to make it under the Obama economy. Yet for these people, all of whom have had to suffer through a period of stagnant economic growth and declining incomes, these rising health care costs are, at best, a slap in the face and, at worst, a nail in the financial coffin.

"I have spent a lot of time on the Senate floor over the last 6 years describing what has gone wrong with the Affordable Care Act. I will not detail the substantive and structural problems with the law here today. Instead, I will just repeat what should be clear to everyone here. This law is not working. This law has imposed even greater burdens on the middle class and the lower income families throughout the country. We can and we must do better, but in order to do so, we will have to turn our attention to the biggest problems that patients face as they navigate our health care system, and that is cost. We must bring down costs. Any future attempts at health care reform that are not cost-focused are, in my view—and I suspect the view of most Americans—a waste of time and effort."

As for me, my position is pretty clear. I support the repeal of ObamaCare, and I support a replacement that makes sense. I have worked with my colleagues to come up with a replacement proposal designed specifically to contain costs for patients and consumers. A number of health care experts have concluded that our proposal, which we have called the Patient Care Act, would do just that.

"Of course, there are other proposals out there. For example, I know the House majority is working on a proposal, and I am anxious to see what they come up with. As chairman of the Committee, of course, I have the authority over many major aspects of our health care system, I have begun reaching out to stakeholders to discuss in more detail the current premium prices and what needs to be done to address it."

But let’s be clear. To bring down these rising health care costs, we will need significant buy-in from my friends on the other side of the aisle. Quite frankly, I don’t know how any of us can read the recent news reports about premium hikes and hear the stories from their constituents about skyrockets in health care costs and think ObamaCare is working just the way it was supposed to.

As I have said before, my hope is that at some point my colleagues on the Democratic side will begin to acknowledge the failures of ObamaCare. At the very least, they should acknowledge it has failed to bring down costs for patients and consumers and is, in fact, driving up costs.

Until that acknowledgment comes, I plan to do all I can to make the case to the American people about the need for change and to work with anyone who is willing to put in the effort to address these monumental problems. I look forward to speaking more about these issues in the coming weeks and months.

With all the economic struggles the American people—particularly those in lower middle class and lower income families—in the United States..."
need is the continuation of the skyrocketing health premiums we have seen as a result of ObamaCare. I plan to do all I can to reverse this trend.

I know there are some on the Democratic side who knew from the beginning it wasn’t going to work. They would be able to throw their hands in the air and say: It is not working. We need to go to socialized medicine or one-size-fits-all Federal Government control of health care in this country. Anybody who thinks that is going to be a good system, boy, have I got a bridge to sell you.

The fact is, as bad as our system was before, it was better than what this is. We can make it better; but it is going to take Democrats and Republicans coming together in the best interests—and get rid of the stupid politics involved—to come up with a program that will work for the American people.

I can tell you this, the American people cannot live on the slow growth that is currently going on. We cannot compete with the rest of the world on the slow growth that is currently going on, and it has been a slow growth for all of President Obama’s time in the Presidency.

It wasn’t all his fault, but—by gosh—there could have been programs that would have made it better had they just relied a little bit more on the free market system that has made this country the greatest country in the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Toomey). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to talk against an amendment that would undermine the spirit of bipartisanship we have cultivated with the last several budget deals without fully addressing our national security and domestic needs and to speak in support of an alternative. Our amendment, the Democratic alternative, would restore the defense and nondefense equitably and build on our bipartisan deal in a truly fair and responsible way.

As I will go into a bit more, for an amendment to a bill focused on ensuring our Nation is prepared to meet future challenges here at home and throughout the world, the Republican amendment ignores too many priorities that we also know improve national security, and build on our bipartisan budget deal in a truly fair and responsible way.

The other day, I happened to be speaking to a young woman who said: Prime Minister Modi of India and to the floor to talk about the visit of Prime Minister Modi of India and to speak about an amendment I have, but listening to the Senator from Washington, I have to express my sense of wonder and amazement at our Democratic colleagues for whom no amount of money, no growth in the size of government is too much.

While I am certainly sympathetic to the amendment by the Senator from Arizona which would increase defense spending at a time when there is a greater array and a greater diversity of threats to our country than Director of National Intelligence James Clapper has said he has seen in his 50-year career, the idea that we want to sink the rest of the Navy and the Federal Government, which is national security and self-defense, we have to somehow use that to leverage more spending in other areas that are non-defense-related is simply unacceptable, particularly at a time when our national debt is $19 trillion.

The other day, I happened to be speaking to a young woman who said: Well, what would you tell me to tell my peers? She must have been—who knows how old she was—in her early twenties.

She said: What would you tell me to tell my peers about politics and why
they should care and why they should be involved?
I told her: Well, if I were you, I would be angry. I would be mad. Your generation should be angry with my generation because what we have done is spent a bunch of money we didn’t have, and we have simply passed the debt and the bill off to your generation.

It is not just the $19 trillion in debt. It is the pathway to Social Security and Medicare, the promises we made to our seniors for a secure late-in-life lifestyle that simply can’t be kept unless we support and reform Social Security and make it sustainable for future generations.

So this is not the main reason I came to the floor to speak today, but I just have to express my own sense of wonder and amazement at our Democratic colleagues who want to continue to spend money we don’t have because they know that if you end up spending this money they are asking for, it is just going to be added to the bill that is going to be paid for by the next generation. These young folks down here who are pages. That is, frankly, immoral, and it is not acceptable.

VISIT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Mr. President, the main reason I came here to speak today was really a historic day in Washington, DC, and in the relationship between the Government of the Republic of India and the United States of America. Like many of my colleagues, I had a chance to listen to Prime Minister Modi speak to a joint meeting of Congress this morning over in the House of Representatives. I was reminded of how far our two countries have come in such a relatively short period of time.

My first visit to India was about 10 years ago. I had been engaged to go because some of my constituents back in Dallas, TX, who started the Dallas Indo-American Chamber of Commerce, actually founded the Indian-American community in the Dallas-Ft. Worth area and also in Houston. Around the State of Texas, we probably have some 250,000 to 300,000 Indian-Americans—part of the diaspora Prime Minister Modi talked about before and of which he said he was particularly proud and which binds our two countries together.

When I came back from my trip to India, at the same request of the same constituents, we encouraged us to create a U.S. Senate India caucus, knowing that our two countries had a lot more work to do together. I am happy to say that 10 years ago, when Secretary Clinton was Senator Clinton, she and I cosponsored the U.S.-India Caucus. Later on, Chris Dodd—after Senator Clinton became Secretary Clinton—and then after Senator Chris Dodd left, Senator MARK WARNER is my current cochair, and we have about 30-some odd members of the U.S.-India Caucus, which demonstrates again the acknowledgment of how important this relationship has become.

I am grateful for the concrete manifestation—the evidence of that relationship, things like the fact that, as Prime Minister Modi said, India joins the United States in more joint military exercises than any other country. We also have a robust civil nuclear agreement which now, apparently, is coming to fruition. I noticed that President Obama and Prime Minister Modi announced the construction plans for a number of nuclear powerplants in India. India is a vast country— I think he mentioned 1 1/4 billion people. Many of them simply don’t have electricity and live very impoverished lives. So it is an acknowledgment of our close-knit relationship but also of the need that India has, in order to advance and lift its own people to better living conditions, to have access to the electricity that is going to become available once these nuclear powerplants are operational.

Of course, our economies continue to rely upon each other increasingly for trade and investment. As more and more American-made goods or American agricultural products are sold to India—with the rising middle class, there are going to be more and more people purchasing those goods and services. Of course, that is going to help improve jobs here in the United States, as well as the quality of life there.

Perhaps most importantly, we share growing cultural ties. Fast-forward to today. When Prime Minister Modi spoke today, he talked about his vision for his country’s future, including deepening and broadening the relationship with the United States. That is a very welcome statement by the Prime Minister.

Unfortunately, over the last few years—or 8 years of the Obama administration, many of our friends and allies around the world have questioned our commitment to those friendships and these alliances, and, conversely, many of our adversaries have become emboldened when they see America retreating from its engagement with the rest of the world. We do not need American boots on the ground around the globe, but we do need American leadership around the world. It is time to work with our friends and allies around the world, and we have had an opportunity to work with our friends from India in order to guarantee that goal.

So I was glad to hear Prime Minister Modi talking about the importance of it. I hope we all respond appropriately. Of course, it is true, but we know India is a target for international terrorist attacks. Indeed, the Prime Minister mentioned the terrible attacks that occurred in Mumbai not that many years ago, when terrorists came in and killed a bunch of tourists there in Mumbai or Bombay.

I am proud to cosponsor an amendment to the Defense authorization bill filed by the junior Senator from Alaska. This amendment would encourage greater military cooperation with India. Even though it is at an all-time high, it could certainly be improved through more joint military operations and officer exchanges. This is really an incredible source of American diplomatic power and strength, particularly in our military-to-military relationship.

I can’t tell you how many times I have been to countries around the world, the way I was, for example, in Cairo, Egypt, sitting there talking to the President of Egypt, Sisi, who was talking about his military training here in the United States, in San Antonio, TX, my hometown. Of course I had to ask him how he likes the Tex-Mex, Mexican food. He said it wasn’t too spicy for him.

The point is that these military-to-military exchanges with countries like India and Egypt and others are a great opportunity for us to establish friendships and connections, and people who invariably say to me that somehow nobody dreamed that then-Military Officer Sisi would become the President of Egypt, but he rose in that leadership position and now is the leader of that large

There are a couple of pieces of legislation I have cosponsored with Senator WARNER, my cochair of the U.S.-India caucus, that will bolster our ties with India.

The first would help bring India into the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, or APEC. It would direct the Department of State to develop a strategy to facilitate India’s membership status in this organization, and it would urge APEC nations to support India’s membership. As the world continues to become more interconnected through trade, we need to make sure like-minded countries with economic might, such as India, have a seat at the table. Of course, it is a truism that countries that do business together and trade together are much less likely to engage in some conflict against each other. So trade is good for national security and internal security as well, not just for the economy.

The second bill I introduced would help cement India’s status as a major partner of the United States. It would strengthen our defense and technology ties and also make sure that India is equipped to handle the myriad threats coming its way. The world is at risk for many of the same sort of threats that the United States is. This morning, Prime Minister Modi mentioned the cyber threat. Certainly that is true, but we know India is a target for international terror threats. Indeed, the Prime Minister mentioned the terrible attacks that occurred in Mumbai not that many years ago, when terrorists came in and killed a bunch of tourists there in Mumbai or Bombay.

I am proud to cosponsor an amendment to the Defense authorization bill filed by the junior Senator from Alaska. This amendment would encourage greater military cooperation with India. Even though it is at an all-time high, it could certainly be improved through more joint military operations and officer exchanges. This is really an incredible source of American diplomatic power and strength, particularly in our military-to-military relationship.

I can’t tell you how many times I have been to countries around the world, the way I was, for example, in Cairo, Egypt, sitting there talking to the President of Egypt, Sisi, who was talking about his military training here in the United States, in San Antonio, TX, my hometown. Of course I had to ask him how he likes the Tex-Mex, Mexican food. He said it wasn’t too spicy for him.

The point is that these military-to-military exchanges with countries like India and Egypt and others are a great opportunity for us to establish friendships and connections, and people who invariably say to me that somehow nobody dreamed that then-Military Officer Sisi would become the President of Egypt, but he rose in that leadership position and now is the leader of that large
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country of some 92 million people. So those military-to-military relationships, those joint military exercises with countries like India are very important.

Let me close on the Prime Minister’s commendable statement by thanking him publicly. It speaks volumes to his commitment to further the U.S.-India relationship. I look forward to continuing to play a small part in that effort through the work of the Senate India Caucus.

As Prime Minister Modi’s visit illustrates, the United States cannot afford to ignore our friends and those who share common values, as Prime Minister Modi spoke. The world is simply too unstable and too dangerous. Plus, it is just plain stupid not to maintain a good relationship with your friends and allies and people who share similar values. But we also have to look at the other side of the coin, and that is to push back on our adversaries. And as I said, over his 8 years in the White House, the President has seemed somewhat detached from both of those—either encouraging stronger relationships with our friends and allies by demonstrating that we have their backs, or we can be used or by pushing back on our adversaries when they take aggressive action. As I mentioned earlier this week, his first Secretary of State, Secretary Clinton, regularly lacked the ability to call a spade a spade, particularly with regard to challenges like the enemy in North Korea.

Not long ago—I guess it was in August of last year—I had a chance to visit with Admiral Harris, the four-star head of Pacific Command. When we asked him to list the danger spots in the world that keep him awake at night, he mentioned North Korea as the No. 1 threat. Of course, some of that may be the proximity of his command there in Hawaii. But the fact is, North Korea is ruled by a dangerous dictator who has nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles, which is a dangerous mix.

Of course, unfortunately, under Secretary Clinton’s watch and President Obama’s watch, this has gotten nothing but worse. As we continue to consider the National Defense Authorization Act, we do have a chance to take up some of the slack, though. We are not without tools here in the Congress to fill in some of the gaps and to correct some of the misguided foreign policy prescriptions of the White House.

One way we can do that is by supporting an amendment I have filed that will help us hold Iran accountable for its recent hostile actions against U.S. sailors. We all remember that last January, two Navy riverine boats with 10 American sailors on board made headlines around the world when they strayed into Iranian waters. They were taken captive by members of Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps after being forced at gunpoint to surrender. The sailors were blindfolded. They were hauled back to Iranian soil. They were interrogated and detained. The IRGC interrogators documented the event at almost every step along the way, quickly broadcasting those videos and photos of the captured sailors among state-run media outlets.

This is not in line with international norms. This is not the way we would treat a foreign country’s navy if the same thing happened, and the Geneva Convention makes clear that when our country detains military forces of another those prisoners are to be protected from public displays of humiliation, not to be used for propaganda purposes, which is what the American sailors were used for. Something called the doctrine of innocent passage—a concept of what is known as customary international law—provides that all vessels have the right of travel through another country’s territorial or Iran’s hostile actions from point A to point B swiftly.

It is pretty apparent that Iran violated our sailors’ right to innocent passage, but we haven’t heard a peep out of the White House. Instead, the administration has positioned itself on the back and claimed their bad Iran deal somehow brought those sailors home safely. They claim that somehow the enhanced credibility they had from the misguided Iran nuclear deal somehow gave them a seat at the table and an ability to negotiate the release of our own sailors from Iran. This is absolutely ridiculous, and it ignores the crux of the problem. These sailors shouldn’t have been taken captive in the first place.

While the President may leave this kind of aggression unanswered, we don’t have to. My amendment would require the President to answer two simple questions: Did Iran violate international law? And were any Federal funds paid to the Iranian regime to effect the release of our sailors? In other words, did the Obama administration pay ransom to the tyrant who has nuclear weapons to negotiate the release of our sailors? I think the answer is yes, and that is absolutely ridiculous, and it ignores the crux of the problem. These sailors shouldn’t have been taken captive in the first place.

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

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.
within the Federal Government, or, most importantly, hopefully sent back to the taxpayer or reduced from the taxes that we take from the taxpayer.

'Gracious, Mr. President, having said that, I want to add, as we do each week, $3.7 billion for failed efforts to develop the new presidential helicopter for the President, which brings our total taxpayer price tag to nearly $176 billion—not small change. Think what we could do with that if it was spent wisely or, more importantly, if we didn't have it—take it from the taxpayer in the first place.

Mr. President, having said that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to discuss the Presidential Tax Transparency Act—legislation that I have authored with Senators WARREN, BENNET, KAIEN, BALDWIN, and Boxer. The proposed legislation is that ever since Watergate, it has been routine for Democratic and Republican Presidential nominees to release their tax returns. In fact, this has been the norm; this has been the standard operating procedure for almost four decades. That is because the American people expect transparency when it comes to a Presidential candidate’s actions and values.

They are running for the highest office in our land. They are running to be Commander in Chief for the most powerful Nation in the history of the world. When transparency is the overwhelming expectation of the American
people regarding the Presidency, my view is it ought to be the law.

We are in the midst of a Presidential election. The nominating conventions are weeks away. One of the candidates who has become party’s presumptive nominee has so far refused to release his tax returns. In my view, this is a clean break from decades of traditions in our elections. It is a rebuke of the overwhelming majority of Americans, including a majority of Republicans, who are demanding openness and transparency from their Presidential candidates of both political parties on this issue.

The reason is that tax returns give the American people a lot of straightforward, honest answers. It is not just about what rate you pay; it is about whether you even pay taxes. Do you give to charity? Are you avoiding loopholes at the expense of hard-working middle-class families? Do you keep your money offshore? When a tax return shines a light on your financial integrity, it will show if a person is trying to game the system, for example, by having their company pay for personal vacations on a private jet. Certainly, that is something that would be removed from the reach of most hard-working families.

My view has been that running for President is pretty much like a job interview. Every candidate has to stand up before the public and show that they have the temperament, the background, and the character to lead our wonderful country and be Commander in Chief. I believe that after decades of tradition, releasing tax returns is a big part of the process.

When it comes to a candidate’s financial background in taxes, I don’t think the public should have to take somebody’s word for it or just accept the kind of boasting you see on some of these shows that get wide viewership. The public has a right to know the truth, and the public has a right to know the facts, and the public has a right to know the truth.

The proposal that my colleagues and I have proposed is pretty simple. It says that within 15 days of becoming the nominee at the party conventions, the candidates would be required to release at least 3 years of tax returns. If a nominee stonewalls the law and refuses, then the Treasury Secretary would share the returns with the Federal Election Commission, and that Commission would make them public online. There would be an opportunity as well for redactions, which, in effect, are changes when appropriate.

When Presidents nominate individuals for Cabinet seats and executive branch jobs within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee—the Treasury Secretary, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Social Security—those nominees all submit 3 years of tax returns before the committee reviews. When there is a need and where it is appropriate, information from those returns is made public. Remember, that is the standard for people who would serve under the President of the United States. In my view, the Commander in Chief ought to be required to do better. The fact is, nominees have traditionally released a lot more than 3 years. So probably it is a bit modest, and a number of people who have looked into this have said that what our colleagues and I are doing, like the transparency, like the disclosure. A number of them have said: You really ought to think about going further.

I think colleagues know that I probably have spent much time here in the Senate as any colleague trying to promote ideas and policies and get beyond some of the partisanship that dominates these debates, I am talking about candidates on both sides being required to meet this new bar. The same rules would apply to all nominees from both parties.

A word about this notion of requiring a Presidential nominee to do this: I certainly wish that it weren’t necessary, but that is why we are proposing this. That would be my first choice. The fact is, it shouldn’t take a law because this has been the norm; this has been the expectation.

This is how I came to believe that a law was necessary. You volunteer to run for President of our wonderful country. You are not required to do it; you volunteer to do it. In my view, when you volunteer, there has been this norm, and there has been this expectation. For the past almost 40 years, there has been this expectation that you would make public your tax return. The failure to do so deviates from the norm, deviates away from transparency and in favor of secrecy. So my view is, when a candidate for President of the United States is not willing to disclose their taxes voluntarily and deviates from the norm, deviates from the understandable expectation the American people have, then I think you need a law, and that is why I have proposed it.

For these four decades, the American people have been pretty clear: If you are a major party’s nominee to be the leader of the free world, you do not get to hide your tax returns. This is the first time I have discussed our proposal here on the floor. I hope our colleagues will support the Presidential Tax Transparency Act, and I hope our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree that the American people deserve this guarantee of tax transparency that I have described this afternoon.

RECOGNIZING HERMISTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. President, I am going to speak briefly on one other matter that was particularly striking last week when I was home. I am going to talk for a few minutes about the wonderful work talking place at Hermiston High School in Eastern Oregon.

Last week I had the honor of visiting the terrific Career and Technical Education Program—the CTE Program—in Hermiston, and I had a chance to watch some very impressive students in action. One of the programs I visited was the Columbia Basin Student Home-builders Program that got off the ground with a small amount of State financial assistance. The reason I wanted to discuss it this afternoon is, I think this program can be a model for all students in the United States. Students enrolled in the homebuilders program work with local construction professionals to actually build houses for their community. Under the supervision of a teacher, students learn all the skills involved in a construction and tourism project that involves starting a hospitality business. She is working to expand her line of cupcakes to meet customer demands.

I note that the President Office has a great interest, as we do, in promoting recreation. That is why I have introduced the RNR bill, the Recreation Not Red-Tape Act.

I was struck by Hannah’s expertise.

I note that the President Office program saw this last Sunday. The Denver Post had an extraordinary article describing recreation as the economic engine of the future. I am not saying that just because they were kind to the RNR bill, but they talked about the promise of recreation and tourism, particularly for our part of the world.

I was so impressed with Hannah. I said: I am going to send you the RNR bill, and I would appreciate it if you and your colleagues would look for additional ways to cut the red-tape and promote recreation and tourism in Oregon, and throughout the West, and support our existing and future businesses.

The fact is that too many of our students are not graduating high school on time and far too many are unprepared for the workforce. Research has shown that students enrolled in career and technical education courses graduate from high school at a higher rate. In fact, the students at Hermiston High School told me their homebuilders program made them want to show up for school.
I am committed to increasing graduation rates in Oregon and across the country, and I think one of the best ways to do it is to support programs like the one I saw at Hermiston, because I think it is tailor-made to achieve this goal.

Funding for Perkins Career and Technical Education Act courses is a way to make sure that programs like the one I just saw at Hermiston can be started around the country, but funding for these programs has been decreasing since 1998. At the same time, there is bipartisan consensus that career and technical education programs are important, not just for kids who want to be homebuilders but for all students. It seems to me that in overhauling the failed policies of No Child Left Behind, the Senate made a choice to move away from the era of overtested “bubble kids” and towards an era of well-rounded, multi-skilled high school graduates. I am glad to see that the Senate committee is working hard on a proposal to reauthorize this career and technical education program, known as the Perkins Act. The last time it was reauthorized was in 1998. So I am going to work closely with both sides of the aisle to keep pushing for a new bill.

The fact is that the educators I saw last week are ambitious by any measure. They saw that their students were not graduating with the skills necessary to be successful in their future school and work lives. So the local educators started partnerships with local architects, engineers, and other professionals. They created a unique program that blends innovative classroom instruction with real-world application. We have businesses directly engaging with young people. Not only do they show what kinds of jobs are available in the community, but they also prove that school is an important stepping-stone in preparing students for the real world.

I have been in public service for a while. It is such a tremendous honor to represent Oregon in the Senate. But I will tell you, watching the way a small community in eastern Oregon, Hermiston, has come together and made a commitment to their young people is special. It is truly what we call the Oregon way.

I will close by way of saying that I am grateful this school, Hermiston High School, for allowing me to visit. I will do everything I can to take the student homebuilder program that I saw last week and spread the word about what the potential is here. They already sold one house for a very healthy price, and I think we would be wise—again here in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans—to come together and support career technical education programs like the ones I saw in Hermiston and urge all of us here in the bipartisan group to support Federal and State assistance for these kinds of programs, career and technical education programs, for even more students from one end of our country to the other.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG CHEMICAL SAFETY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, for some time, including times on this floor, I have said that the choice between a clean environment and a strong economy is a false one. Some people say you can’t have a clean environment and a strong economy at the same time. I just don’t think that is correct. TSCA is an acronym for Toxic Substances Control Act.

The TSCA reform legislation that we approved in this body last night is proof of the fact that we can have a cleaner, safer, and healthier environment and also have a strong economy. They go together. When I finish my remarks, folks will understand why that might be true.

Every day in this country manufacturers use a variety of chemicals. I am told there are tens of thousands of chemicals. It is in the air, in the ground, in the water, and in our bodies. Manufacturers use these chemicals to make everything from carpets—for the carpet we are standing on—to cosmetics, water bottles, and dishwashing soap.

Former President Gerald Ford signed the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 and said it was landmark legislation. He said that this huge legislation in terms of protecting the environment and public health. He said it was intended to give the authority to monitor, test, and regulate the chemicals that pose a risk to human health or the environment. That was the deal. Over the past four decades, since Gerald Ford signed that legislation into law, the Toxic Substances Control Act has never worked as intended, leaving the public at risk for toxic exposures and the private sector with a broken regulatory process that has undermined innovation. Frankly, it led to a lot of uncertainty and lack of predictability.

As a recovering Governor, I know that among the things we need in order to have a better and more nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation is to make certain that businesses, whether large or small, have predictability and certainty. When the Toxic Substances Control Act passed 40 years ago, it did not provide that predictability and certainty.

In fact, for the last 40 years, I think the EPA has gotten it wrong for toxic substances. Imagine that—six in 40 years. In the last 20 to 25 years, there were none. In the meantime, States have stood up and said: If the Federal Government is not going to do it, we will do it. Now we have a patchwork quilt of State requirements. We have businesses—not just chemical businesses but a wide variety of businesses—in the same industry that are trying to comply with laws in dozens of States, and the Federal standard that we set 40 years ago just does not work.

For a while, the Toxic Substances Control Act has been broken. That is a polite way of saying it. Over the past 39 years, we have learned a lot more about toxic chemicals, but we are still concerned about how they can cause harm to our environment. They can cause harm to public health, and we also learned how best to identify and protect against these risks.

More than 3 years ago, two of my colleagues—one a Democrat, Tom Udall of New Mexico, and the other a Republican, Dave Vitter of Louisiana—wrote something called the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act. That is a mouthful, isn’t it?

Frank R. Lautenberg was a Senator from New Jersey for many years, whose birthday I remember to this day. He is now deceased, but his birthday is January 23, and the reason why I know that is because that is when my birthday is. This is an issue we actually shared a strong interest in doing something about.

My recollection—it is hard to remember when people move around from desk to desk—is that his seat was back here behind where I am standing today.

My colleagues Tom Udall and David Vitter wrote a bill and named it after Frank R. Lautenberg because this is an issue that he cared a lot about. He tried several times to write legislation that could be enacted to take the 40-year-old Toxic Substances Control Act from 1976 and bring it into the 21st century and help it become effective and make sense for digital businesses.

The bill written by Senators Udall and Vitter reforms the old Toxic Substances Control Act, and it does it in ways to better protect the public—to protect us, our families, our businesses, and so forth. It is also designed to create a more manageable regulatory framework for a member of the Congress and innovators so they have some predictability and certainty with what they are dealing with. Whether they happen to be doing business in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Wyoming, Idaho, or California, they would have some certainty as to what the rules of the road were going to be for toxic substances or the chemicals they might be using in their processes.

After the bill was introduced by Senators Vitter and Udall, I worked closely with both of them for more than a year as a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. We led a number of meetings, had many discussions, and we were always
focused on securing enhanced protections for public health and the environment while providing certainty and predictability for American businesses.

I focused especially on language to secure provisions that would protect children, the working-age population, and green jobs and workers from toxic risk. The provisions I especially focused on included ensuring that the EPA had access to information in order for them to assess safety risks.

A third area that I looked at was to enact something to allow States to enforce Federal toxic safety law. If the EPA wasn’t doing its job, could there be a State backstop in a way that made sense? I thought that was not an unreasonable thing to ask. We did that in Dodd-Frank with respect to nationally chartered banks. If the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency in nationally chartered banks is not making sure consumers are being looked after, then we allow State attorneys general—at least with respect to those banks’ own law but to enforce Federal standards and laws. I wanted to make sure that in the event that someday we had an EPA that frankly wouldn’t enforce a new version of the substance control act, then States could enforce it for them.

Chemical manufacturers and consumers alike deserve legal clarity, a timely review process, and the ability to trust that products people use every day are safe. I added to that when Senator UDALL and Senator VITTER started to introduce this legislation and started to gather cosponsors—I don’t mean to be presumptuous, but my guess is the Presiding Officer probably ended up as a cosponsor. At the end of the day, we had 30 Democrats and 30 Republicans. The idea was to add a Democrat, add a Republican, add a Democrat, add a Republican—a little bit of a look at how a bill is made or should be made. It is almost a textbook example of how legislation could be formed or should be formed, even on a difficult and contentious issue like the one I am talking about today.

I was involved at the very beginning in the initial efforts to rewrite the Toxic Substance Control Act. I was involved with DAVID VITTER and Tom UDALL and also the chairman of the committee, JIM INHOFE. But I got to a point where I said to the coauthors of the legislation—they were looking for cosponsors, and I said: I will be willing to cosponsor your version of the rewriting of the Toxic Substance Control Act, but there are 10 changes that I would like to consider making. They said: What are they? I said: Three things, here they are:

And I gave them some idea of what they were. They asked me to put them in writing, so I put them in writing in a letter to Senators VITTER and UDALL and said: These are the changes I would like to see made in the bill you have introduced. If you will make these changes or agree to these changes, I will cosponsor your bill, and not only will I cosponsor your bill, but so will 10 or 11 other Democrats. We all signed the letter. This was probably about a year and a half ago.

The letter was more to Senator VITTER than Senator UDALL: I think it publicizes both. But I think Senator VITTER and his staff went through it piece by piece, proposal by proposal—all 10 of them. At the end of the day, they agreed essentially with all of them, and they said that they would incorporate all 10 of the proposals in the bill. They said: Now will you co-sponsor the bill?

And I said: Yes, I will. And so did the rest of us who signed the letter—all 10 of us.

When I said that I would cosponsor the bill, I also said there were three areas that still needed some work. My passion for pushing for this legislation will be tempered somewhat by your willingness to also act on subsequent changes in the bill in these three areas. I will not go into those three areas, but I will say that later on, some of my colleagues—Senators CORY BOOKER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator JEFF MERKLEY, and Senator ED MARKEY—sort of stepped up and said: We are interested in those areas and we want to see further changes made in the bill.

With those changes, we added even more cosponsors, and finally we ended up with 60. We said: Let’s take that bill and the proposals of the Appropriations committee and eventually worked through the Senate. It was not easy, but we finally got it done. We went to conference with the House, and, lo and behold, we passed a conference report unanimously last night by unanimous consent, and nobody objected. Considering how controversial this bill has been for years, that is amazing.

At a press conference we held today with the principal Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate, one of the House Members came over. Senator TOM UDALL talked about how he felt elated to be able to unanimously pass a contentious bill after all these years. He likened it to standing on a mountaintop. He is a mountain climber. In New Mexico they have some tall mountains, and he said it was like standing on a mountain top. He said: I feel elation when I climb to the top of a tall mountain and stand atop the mountain. And he said this morning at the press conference that he felt elation as well.

Then, when I spoke after Senator UDALL, I said that in Delaware we don’t have tall mountains. Delaware is the lowest lying State in America. We really worry about climate change and sea levels rising. Besides that being some theory, it is something that we worry about. So the highest part of land in Delaware is a bridge. Every now and again, if I want to go up high and climb something, I can climb the bridge, but it is not really that high.

The thing that gave me elation in Delaware was when I was Governor—and before that the State treasurer and all—was when we all worked together. Delaware has a tradition; we call it the Delaware way. It is where Democrats and Republicans work together, set aside partisan differences, and just ask: What is the right thing to do?

That is especially true in the Senate. In order to get anything of any consequence done you are at about 55 Republicans, and roughly there are about 45 Democrats with maybe an Independent in there somewhere. So we have to figure out how to travel together.

We have been traveling a long way over the last 4 years or so, and we finally got to our destination, and I think we finally came to a good outcome in terms of the policy we have adopted. For the first time, the legislation has been adopted. We went to conference with the House, and, lo and behold, we passed a conference report unanimously last night by unanimous consent, and nobody objected. Considering how controversial this bill has been for years, that is amazing.
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I said: Really?
He said: Yes.

After about a week or two, we went to his hideaway, and we had lunch together. His hideaway was an amazing place. It was almost like a museum in terms of all the things about the Kennedy family and his brothers and his own life.

Among the things we talked about that day was his ability to find compromise and consensus with one of our current, non-partisan, civil servants—Mike Enzi. Mr. Enzi who the Presiding Officer knows is one of two Senators from Wyoming, a former mayor of Gillette, an accountant—I think maybe a CPA. When I was presiding over the Senate years ago, I remember Mike Enzi coming to the floor of the Senate and speaking about the 80–20 rule and how the 80–20 rule allowed the folks in a committee he served on as the senior Republican called the HELP Committee, or the Health, Education, Labor, and Pension Committee. How do you do that?

He said: That is the 80–20 rule. I said: What’s that?

He said: Ted Kennedy and I agree on about 80 percent of this stuff, and we disagree on the other 20 percent. What we do is we focus on the 80 percent where we agree, and we set aside the other 20 percent to another day and we will figure that out some other time.

When I talked to Ted Kennedy about the same thing, he said: I am always willing to compromise on policy, process, and I don’t want to compromise on my principles. He and Mike Enzi managed to have an incredibly productive partnership on that committee and here in the Senate.

Senator Kennedy had a similar relationship with Orrin Hatch, who now chairs the Finance Committee, as we know.

But we are where we are today because both Democrats and Republicans have worked together to compromise on the pain of not having to compromise our principles. The final product is a testament to a robust and a transparent committee process. I think it is a textbook example of how we ought to legislate around here. If we can get something that difficult, that complex, and that controversial behind us in an appropriate way and get support from environmental groups, business groups, Democrats and Republicans, maybe there are some other things we can get done, and God knows we need to do that.

I am proud of the work we have done together to reach this historic agreement. In addition to thanking Senator Udall, Senator Vitter, and the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator Inhofe, I also want to say a special thank-you to the members of our staff. I think those of us who serve or are privileged to work here as Senators work hard, but based on this issue some of us worked hard on this issue, but the folks who really worked hard on this issue are the members of our staff. I will not go through the names of all the folks who worked with this Senator and that Senator, but I just want to say to those of you who know who you are, thank you. You have done great work, and you have enabled us to do the people’s work.

I would say to a fellow who was a member of my staff for the last maybe 3 years and who worked day and night on this legislation—a fellow named Colin Peppard who now works for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority out on the west coast—a special shout out to him and a special thank-you to him for all his efforts.

Mr. President, I think that is pretty much it for me today. It looks as though the Senator from Minnesota is not going to be here. It is very cold outside. He hungers to share something with all of us.

With that having been said, I will yield the floor to Senator Franken of Minnesota.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. I thank my good friend from Delaware.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

Mr. President, I rise today to address the nomination of Chief Judge Merrick Garland to the U.S. Supreme Court. Today marks 84 days since President Obama nominated Judge Garland to fill the vacant seat on the Supreme Court bench. In that time the consequences of prolonging that vacancy to persist have become clear. The eight-member Court has now deadlocked four times, and in two cases where the Court found itself evenly divided and unable to reach consensus it punted, sending cases back to the lower courts.

There is no denying that the Senate’s refusal to do its job, to take up the business of filling that vacancy, means that in some cases the Court is not able to fulfill its core function, meaning in some cases the Court does not resolve circuit splits and cannot serve as the final arbiter of the law. That is not just my view, that is an opinion shared by one of the Court’s current members, Associate Justice Anthony Kennedy. Testifying before the House Appropriations Committee back in 2013, Justice Kennedy described what happens when the Court is short-staffed. Although he is discussing the effect of recusals on the ability of the Court to do its job, his comments are equally true for the case of vacancies. This is what Justice Kennedy said: “On our Court, if we recuse without absolutely finding it necessary to do so, then you might have a 4-4 Court, and everybody’s time is wasted.”

Let me say that again. “Everybody’s time is wasted.” Well, my Republican colleagues don’t seem to be bothered by wasting everybody's time.

Mr. President, less than an hour after the news of Justice Scalia’s death, the majority leader proclaimed that the Senate would not consider a replacement until after the Presidential election and said that “the American people should have a voice in the selection of their next Supreme Court Justice.”

In the 116 days since the majority leader made that bold announcement, Republican Senator after Republican Senator has taken to the Senate floor to deliver variations on that theme. My good friend Senator CORNYN helpfully explained that Senate Republicans had made a decision to “give the voters a voice on who makes the next lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court.” He said, “clear that the American people do deserve a voice here and we will make sure that they are heard.”

We have been through this before. We agree. The American people should have a voice in this process. President Ronald Reagan made this point quite eloquently when he presided over the swearing in of not just William Rehnquist as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court but also one Antonin Scalia as Associate Justice. He said, “I hold my office under the Constitution. The Founding Fathers recognized that the Constitution is the supreme and ultimate expression of the will of the American people.” Of course, President Reagan was right. The Founding Fathers recognized that the very purpose of the Constitution was to embody the spirit and the voice of the American people.

I find it preposterous when my Republican colleagues, who purport to revere the Constitution and the Framers’ original intent, insist that the only way to guarantee that the people’s voice is heard is to delay filling the vacancy, because, after all, the Founding Fathers did not just contemplate such a situation, they actually experienced it.

When President John Adams—himself a Founding Father and a drafter of the Declaration of Independence—was presented with the opportunity to appoint a Supreme Court Justice, he himself was a lame duck President. The Chief Justice at the time, Oliver Ellsworth, resigned after the 1800 Presidential election—an election that
President Adams lost. Nevertheless, Adams set about the work of selecting a replacement. When he eventually nominated John Marshall in January of 1801, more than 2 months after losing the election to a President of a different party—and the country still did not know who that would be—Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr had tied, but they were not his political party. Despite an unresolved election and in the face of great uncertainty, Adams nominated Justice Marshall, and the Senate took up John Marshall’s nomination and confirmed him to the post of Chief Justice on January 27, 1801, by voice vote.

John Adams was by every definition of the term a lambéed President. The Senate could have refused to fill the vacancy. They could have left the Supreme Court short-staffed. Senators could have insisted that the seat not be filled until it was clear just exactly whom the American people had selected as President. But the Senate recognized that it had a constitutional obligation to confirm a replacement. That should come as no surprise because of the 32 Senators serving in the Sixth Congress, 5 of them had been delegates to the Constitutional Convention: Abraham Baldwin of Georgia; Jonathan Dayton of New Jersey; John Langdon of New Hampshire; Gouverneur Morris of New York, whose first name was Gouverneur; but he wasn’t a Governor: his maiden name was Gouverneur; and Charles Pinckney of South Carolina. All of them are real Founding Fathers. If anyone should have known what the Constitution required in this situation, it was they.

Now, picture them milling about the floor of the Old Senate Chamber on January 27, 1801, talking amongst themselves and their colleagues and whipping votes. At the time, the Senate’s practice was to consider nominations in executive session with the doors closed. Only Senators and certain staff were allowed in the Chamber and the proceedings were intended to be secret, so the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains no debate on John Marshall’s nomination. We can only imagine what Senators said, but I suspect it went something like this:

Well, John, Abraham, Gouverneur, I suppose we should vote now on the President’s nomination to the Supreme Court.

Why, yes, Jonathan, of course. I remember when we wrote into the Constitution that when a vacancies occurs, the President shall appoint a nominee to fill the vacancy and we Senators shall provide our advice and consent. Yes, John, I recall the day we wrote that. You were in a particularly good mood because your wife Betsy had arrived by carriage the night before from New Hampshire.

Yes, and I recalled that well. After all, it was only 13 years ago, and the next day we wrote the provisions about the Supreme Court. I remember very well how specific we were. The President appoints a nominee in the event of a vacancy and we in the Senate do our job by providing advice and consent. So by all means, let’s vote.

These men, these Founding Fathers set aside whatever they may have had about the unique circumstances surrounding John Marshall’s nomination and a lambéed President of a different party than the party that won the Presidential election. They allowed the Senate to hold a proper vote on a nominee who wrote the Constitution. As a consequence, John Marshall went on to serve as our Nation’s fourth Chief Justice, authoring opinions that make up the foundation of constitutional law. It was obvious to those Founding Fathers in the Senate, as it should be to all of us serving here today, that the Supreme Court is too important, too central to our democracy to ignore.

I urge my colleagues—particularly those motivated by a fidelity to the Framers’ original intent—to end their obstruction and grant the President’s nominee full and fair consideration.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise to speak on amendment No. 4251. I have filed the amendment; I have not yet requested it to be made pending. I would like to see this amendment move through. It seems to remove the President’s authority to deny troops their mandated pay raise.

The issue of paying our troops should not be a partisan issue any longer. We have fought this battle for too many years on the Senate floor. This year I put forth a bipartisan solution with my colleagues from Montana, Jon Tester, with Senators Rubio, Portman, and Boozman. It is a long-term solution.

Since 2004, the President has been required by law to give troops a pay raise matching the Employment Cost Index, also called the ECI, but when we mandated the President raise troop pay with the ECI, we gave the ability for an exemption: that is, when the country is facing serious economic conditions or for matters of national security.

Now, citing economic conditions, the President has used this exemption the past 3 years and he used it again this year—all while citing a growing economy. What happens is our troops are not getting the pay raise that Congress says they should, matching the ECI. When we are facing economic uncertainty, that is when our troops need it the most.

The amendment is very clear cut. It removes the President’s authority and future Presidents’ authority to cite economic concerns when sending over a presidential budget requesting without the mandated pay raise. It is clear that this exemption is being abused. For example, in 2016, in his State of the Union Address, President Obama said that “anyone claiming that America’s economy is in decline is peddling fiction.” But just 1 month later, in his fiscal year 2017 budget request he sent to Congress, President Obama cited “economic concerns affecting the general welfare” and only asked for a 1.5-percent increase for our troops, despite the ECI being 2.1 percent.

As we continue to debate this bill and call up amendments, I urge my colleagues to support amendment 4251. Again, we have good bipartisan support for this amendment. This is a long-term solution. This is not just about the current President, this is about future Presidents as well and the problems we continue to face; that is, our troops have not seen a pay raise over 2 percent in the past 6 years. As our Nation continues to find itself threatened abroad, we rely on our troops now more than ever. They deserve better. It is time to act.

I thank Senator Tester, Senator Rubio, Senator Portman, and Senator Boozman for their support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of an amendment offered by Senator from Alaska, Ms. Murkowski, to strike the changes to the basic allowance for housing, or BAH, that are proposed in section 604 of the Defense authorization bill. This amendment is very similar to one I sponsored last year.

Currently, each servicemember receives a housing stipend based on his or her rank, geographic location, and dependency status. Under section 604, however, this part of the military compensation package would no longer be considered a cash allowance. Instead, servicemembers would be compensated on an actual cost basis similar to the system that was in place in the 1990s, which resulted in a flawed and inefficient administrative approval process.

Notably, the 2015 Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission established by the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act examined the issue of allowances as it assessed the military’s compensation and retirement system. The Commission found that the current allowance system strikes an appropriate balance in providing for military members and assistance for their living expenses. The Commission deliberately chose not to recommend any changes to the allowance system, and this view is shared by the Department of Defense. In fact, the Secretary of the Navy called me today to express his concerns about this provision.

In its Statement of Administration Policy, the administration notes that it strongly objects to section 604, which, in its words, would inappropriately penalize some servicemembers over others by linking their BAH payments to their status as members of dual-military couples—"in other
words, members of our military who are married to other servicemembers. Under section 604, both members of a dual military couple would be provided a lesser compensation package than other members of equal grade, sending a message that their service is not as highly valued.

The Statement Of Administration Policy went on to note that “Section 604 would disproportionately affect female servicemembers and those military families in which both military members have chosen to serve their country.” Twenty percent of service-women are married to other service-members. By comparison, only 3.8 percent—in other words, less than 4 percent of Active Duty men—are married to other servicemembers. Thus, women are five times more likely to be affected by this reduction in housing allowances than their male counterparts—five times more likely for the women members to be affected because they are more likely to be married to servicemembers.

This proposed change would similarly penalize our junior servicemembers who are more likely to live with another servicemember as a roommate to help defray the cost-of-living expenses. As such, this provision could have a profound implication for both recruitment and retention of our all-volunteer force and discourage our best and our brightest from staying in the service.

I do recognize that the Department’s personnel costs are a budget concern, but finding savings that unfairly single out some military members is not the way to do it. Particularly when one considers the growing role women servicemembers are playing and which I strongly support and admire.

Last year I spearheaded a successful movement to remove a similar provision from the fiscal year 2016 NDAA. I am disappointed to see that this provision has resurfaced again this year. I do recognize that the Department’s personnel costs are a budget concern, but finding savings that unfairly single out some military members is not the way to do it. Particularly when one considers the growing role women servicemembers are playing and which I strongly support and admire.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in my previous capacity.

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

TRIBUTE TO BILLY LAWLESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we all know the Senate is composed of two Senators from each State. Today I have news. My home State of Illinois just picked up a third senator.

Last month, the Irish Prime Minister—Taioseach—Enda Kenny, announced eight appointees to the Irish Senate. One of the appointees is my dear friend in Chicago, Billy Lawless. Billy is the first Irish citizen living in the United States to be appointed to the Irish Senate. This is truly historic. Today Billy takes a seat in the Irish Senate. Ireland will get a senator who will fight for the disenfranchised, the dispossessed, and those yearning to work hard for a better life. No one understands better the Irish diaspora and immigration reform than Billy Lawless of Chicago, IL. Prime Minister Kenny couldn’t have made a better choice.

For generations, sons and daughters of the Emerald Isle have landed on our shores in search of the American dream. Billy Lawless is no different. As a young boy, he grew up on a dairy farm in Galway, a city in western Ireland, delivering unpasteurized milk to local residents. He moved his family to America. After 48 years in Galway, he wanted to see if he could succeed in the United States and he personally could live the American dream.

He first went to Boston and Philadelphia, but on December 31, 1997, New Year’s Eve, a historic day, Billy Lawless arrived in Chicago and knew he had found a home. From Galway, that most Irish of Irish cities, to Chicago, the most Irish of American cities, it was a perfect transition.

Within 6 months, Billy opened an establishment known as Oak, just a couple blocks south of Wrigley Field. Today he owns four restaurants and a fifth one is about to open. All the Lawless restaurants are known for three things—great food, great fun, and great people.

Simply put, the Lawless family is restaurant royalty in Chicago. The family business started with 10 employees. Now they have 300. Since arriving in Chicago nearly 20 years ago, Billy has brought new energy to the city. As Irish energy and work, “an absolute drive to succeed. With the great help of his great wife Anne and his four children—Billy, Jr., Amy, John Paul, and Clandagh—Billy achieved the American dream.

Billy could have said: I have achieved my American dream. Good luck with yours.

That is not who he is. After all, Billy is Irish. He looks out for his friends and neighbors. The first bar Billy opened, the Irish Oak, became a favorite for Irish construction workers. Many of them were undocumented and asked for Billy’s help in getting their papers in order. Billy never hesitated. He became their champion and a strong defender of Irish immigrants everywhere. When asked why he took such an interest in the issue, he said: “That’s what we Irish do for each other.” But he didn’t stop there. Most of the problems that were shared by others, Billy became an eloquent and forceful advocate for all immigrants.

Billy Lawless gets it. He understands that protecting immigrants’ rights is part of the strength of our immigrant Nation. I know he will continue to be an energetic and compassionate guardian of the Irish diaspora and all immigrants’ rights from his seat in the Irish Senate.

The United States and Ireland have long and proud histories, forged in the fires of a proud and rebellious spirit and united in friendship. Having Billy Lawless’s unique and authentic voice in the Irish Senate will only strengthen Irish countries here abroad. He represents the very best of both the Irish and American spirit.

It was only 2 years ago that I came to the Senate floor to congratulate Billy and his wife Anne on becoming citizens of the United States. They had waited a long time, and they had worked hard for it. I was proud to call them not just my friends but my fellow Americans. Today I am proud to call Billy Lawless my fellow Senator.

Congratulations on a well-deserved honor.

INDEPENDENCE OF OUR FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. President, I rise to address an issue of serious constitutional gravity. I rise to address the latest in a long line of appalling and insulting remarks made by the Republican Party’s presumptive Presidential nominee.

Last week Donald Trump attacked the ethnicity of U.S. district court judge Gonzalo Curiel, who is presiding over a civil fraud lawsuit against Trump’s so-called university.

Mr. Trump referred to Judge Curiel’s heritage in a lengthy tirade about the judge’s ruling in the case. He also called Judge Curiel a “hater” and “a total disgrace,” suggesting that the judge should recuse himself due to his “negative” rulings.

When pressed on the issue, Mr. Trump doubled down. In an interview with the Wall Street Journal published last Thursday, Mr. Trump stated that Judge Curiel had “an absolute conflict” in presiding over the lawsuit because the judge is of “Mexican heritage.”

Mr. Trump went on to explain that the judge’s ethnicity presents an “inherent conflict of interest” because of Mr. Trump’s campaign pledge to build a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico. Let me be clear. Mr. Trump’s attacks on Judge Curiel have been characterized—even by Republican Senators and Congressmen— as inappropriate, and completely unfounded.

Judge Curiel is an American. He was born in East Chicago, IN, just steps away from Judge Curiel’s home. Mr. Trump’s so-called university.

The first bar Billy opened, the Irish Oak, was a perfect transition. Within 6 months, Billy opened an establishment known as Oak, just a couple blocks south of Wrigley Field. Today he owns four restaurants and a fifth one is about to open. All the Lawless restaurants are known for three things—great food, great fun, and great people.

Simply put, the Lawless family is restaurant royalty in Chicago. The family business started with 10 employees. Now they have 300. Since arriving in Chicago nearly 20 years ago, Billy has brought new energy to the city. As Irish energy and work, “an absolute drive to succeed. With the great help of his great wife Anne and his four children—Billy, Jr., Amy, John Paul, and Clandagh—Billy achieved the American dream.

Billy could have said: I have achieved my American dream. Good luck with yours.

That is not who he is. After all, Billy is Irish. He looks out for his friends and neighbors. The first bar Billy opened, the Irish Oak, became a favorite for Irish construction workers. Many of them were undocumented and asked for Billy’s help in getting their papers in order. Billy never hesitated. He became their champion and a strong defender of Irish immigrants everywhere. When asked why he took such an interest in the issue, he said: “That’s what we Irish do for each other.” But he didn’t stop there. Most of the problems that were shared by others, Billy became an eloquent and forceful advocate for all immigrants.

Billy Lawless gets it. He understands that protecting immigrants’ rights is part of the strength of our immigrant Nation. I know he will continue to be an energetic and compassionate guardian of the Irish diaspora and all immigrants’ rights from his seat in the Irish Senate.

The United States and Ireland have long and proud histories, forged in the fires of a proud and rebellious spirit and united in friendship. Having Billy Lawless’s unique and authentic voice in the Irish Senate will only strengthen Irish countries here abroad. He represents the very best of both the Irish and American spirit.

It was only 2 years ago that I came to the Senate floor to congratulate Billy and his wife Anne on becoming citizens of the United States. They had waited a long time, and they had worked hard for it. I was proud to call them not just my friends but my fellow Americans. Today I am proud to call Billy Lawless my fellow Senator.

Congratulations on a well-deserved honor.

INDEPENDENCE OF OUR FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. President, I rise to address an issue of serious constitutional gravity. I rise to address the latest in a long line of appalling and insulting remarks made by the Republican Party’s presumptive Presidential nominee.

Last week Donald Trump attacked the ethnicity of U.S. district court judge Gonzalo Curiel, who is presiding over a civil fraud lawsuit against Trump’s so-called university.

Mr. Trump referred to Judge Curiel’s heritage in a lengthy tirade about the judge’s ruling in the case. He also called Judge Curiel a “hater” and “a total disgrace,” suggesting that the judge should recuse himself due to his “negative” rulings.

When pressed on the issue, Mr. Trump doubled down. In an interview with the Wall Street Journal published last Thursday, Mr. Trump stated that Judge Curiel had “an absolute conflict” in presiding over the lawsuit because the judge is of “Mexican heritage.”

Mr. Trump went on to explain that the judge’s ethnicity presents an “inherent conflict of interest” because of Mr. Trump’s campaign pledge to build a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico. Let me be clear. Mr. Trump’s attacks on Judge Curiel have been characterized—even by Republican Senators and Congressmen— as inappropriate, and completely unfounded.

Judge Curiel is an American. He was born in East Chicago, IN, just steps away from Judge Curiel’s home. Mr. Trump’s so-called university.
away from the border with my State. His parents had emigrated from Mexico to the United States.

He has a distinguished record. After attending law school at Indiana University, Judge Curiel practiced law in Indiana and California. In 1989, he joined a California law firm and served as a United States Commissioner in the Southern District of California.

As a Federal prosecutor, Judge Curiel served in the Narcotics Enforcement Division and worked to bring down drug cartels. After prosecuting a major cartel, he received a death threat and was forced to live under guard for months.

In 2007, he was appointed by a Republican Governor in California to serve as a State judge. President Obama later nominated Judge Curiel to the Federal bench. The Senate confirmed his nomination by a unanimous vote on September 22, 2012.

Judge Curiel is well respected in the legal community. A former colleague recently said: "His integrity is beyond reproach." And a California attorney who led the screening committee that reviewed Judge Curiel in 2011 said:

He was very highly recommended. No one could say a bad thing about him.

Despite these accomplishments, Donald Trump views Judge Curiel as in-capable of serving as an impartial jurist in this case involving Trump University due to the judge's ethnicity. Mr. Trump believes the lawsuit that Judge Curiel is presiding over should have been dismissed long ago. Maybe Mr. Trump should take a closer look at reality.

Multiple lawsuits have been filed against Mr. Trump's so-called university, and in one of the two lawsuits that Judge Curiel is presiding over, former students allege that Mr. Trump and Trump University defrauded them by making representations about the education they would receive.

The plaintiffs provided evidence to support their claims and, as a result, Judge Curiel denied a motion from Mr. Trump to grant summary judgment in his favor, which would have avoided a trial. Nothing in this ruling suggests a lack of impartiality. Instead, Judge Curiel's rulings indicate that a factual dispute exists in the case and the plaintiffs deserve their day in court.

Unfortunately, reality and the facts don't seem to matter to Mr. Trump. Instead of acknowledging the inappropriateness of his attacks on Judge Curiel's character and heritage, he has doubled down on them. Mr. Trump apparently believes that after he bullies and de-means a group of people, he should never have to face a member of that community in a courtroom.

One of Mr. Trump's most reprehensible statements—and there are many—calls for a total and complete ban on Muslim immigrants coming to the United States of America. In an interview that aired on "Face the Nation" on Sunday, Mr. Trump was asked:

If it were a Muslim judge, would you also feel like they wouldn't be able to treat you fairly because of that policy of yours?

He responded:

It's possible, yes. Yeah. That would be possible, absolutely.

Where does Mr. Trump's twisted logic end? Does his crude attack on a disabled reporter present a conflict of interest for a judge with a disability who presides over a case against him? Do his disparaging remarks about women disqualify female judges from ruling on lawsuits against his failed business ventures?

Mr. Trump's assertions are not only bigoted, they also endanger the independence of the Federal judiciary as he aspires to the highest office in the land. Despite those concerns, Senate Republicans are keeping 89 Federal judicial seats vacant, including an empty seat on the U.S. Supreme Court, in the hopes that Donald Trump will be able to fill those vacancies.

After Mr. Trump's racist diatribes, I would like to ask my colleagues how they can possibly trust Mr. Trump to appoint judges to the Federal bench. Are they comfortable with a potential President who apparently believes that only qualified candidates for Federal judgeships are those who possess racial, religious, or other characteristics that he has not yet disparaged?

"Trusting Donald Trump to fill judgeships in our Nation's Federal court system is a constitutionally dangerous bet. Placing that trust in Trump would threaten grave harm to our system of justice and to our rule of law."

I thought—oh had hoped—that we had moved past the dark time in our Nation's history when defendants believed it was appropriate to try to remove judges from a lawsuit on the basis of race. It was just over 40 years ago that an African-American Federal judge named A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr. presided over a class action lawsuit involving civil rights claims.

The defendants in the lawsuit filed motions to disqualify Judge Higginbotham from the case based on his race. In his opinion denying their motions, Judge Higginbotham wrote the following:

"It would be a tragic day for the nation and the judiciary if a myopic vision of the judge's role should prevail, a vision that re- quires the exclusion of judges from their cases based on their race. It would be a tragic day for the nation if a myopic vision for the Federal judiciary prevails, it will indeed be a tragic day for the Nation."

Mr. ISAKSON addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia would yield for me to make a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ISAKSON. I yield.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized following the remarks of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, last week, the Attorney General of the United States sent a letter to KEVIN McCARTHY, the majority leader of the House, to inform Mr. McCARTHY and all others that she would defend the administration on the constitutional challenge to the firing of Sharon Helman, the director of the Arizona hospital of the Veterans' Administration.

The firing took place because Ms. Helman had manipulated the books and overseen the manipulation of appointments to the point where as many as 40 veterans waiting in line to get their first appointment died before they were ever seen by the VA. She was convicted by a court of law for taking illegal gratuities in her position as director of the hospital.

Ms. Helman filed a constitutional challenge as to whether we had the ability in the administration to fire her constitutively. Loretta Lynch has said she is not going to defend the United States or the law we passed, called the Veterans Accountability and Choice Act, which calls for the firing of employees by the Secretary of the Veterans' Administration for cause.

Today, in Phoenix, AZ, it was announced that the Veterans' Administration is firing three more employees of the Veterans' Administration hospital. Yet, in the shadow of that, Loretta Lynch is telling America she will not defend the country on the carrying out of the laws we pass in this country, in this body, and that the President of the United States has signed.

There is a solution to this problem, Mr. President. It is called the Veterans First Act, which was written originally by 19 members of the Senate—all members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It has been signed and cosponsored by 49 other Members of the Senate. It is designed to get the hide-and-seeucht that takes place at the Veterans' Administration. It takes the Veterans Administration out from
under the Merit Systems Protection Board for all senior executive leadership. In other words, the 434 senior executives in the Veterans Administration now protected by the Merit Systems Protection Board no longer would be protected by that Board but instead would fall under the Second Counsel or the Secretary’s hiring. Any appeal for actions taken on behalf of the Secretary will be to the Secretary, not to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

The American people and the brave veterans who have fought and sacrificed for this country deserve the right to know that if they are injured by the Veterans Administration or if the Veterans Administration is not carrying out what it is supposed to do for them, we will take action, and we will be effective.

I resent the fact that the Attorney General of the United States has chosen not to defend a constitutional challenge to the Veterans Administration. Mr. President, for the first time, and I yield to the distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 459

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Senator MCCAIN, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, believes that $602 billion is not enough for the Department of Defense. Rather than reject unnecessary spending for weapons and other programs the Pentagon says it does not want or need, the Senator from Arizona not only says we should fund the Pentagon’s $602 billion to spend another $18 billion on defense.

I will leave it to others to defend or contest the assumptions on which Senator McCain’s amendment is based. But I do want to speak briefly in support of the second degree amendment offered by the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Senator REED of Rhode Island.

Because if there is one thing we have learned over and over, it is that protection of our military is not only about a strong military that can respond when all other options fail. It is also about homeland security, including border control and maintaining critical infrastructure. It is about law enforcement in the United States. It is about cyber security. It is about educating the next generation of Americans and creating jobs that lead to advancements in science and technology. And it is about strengthening the capabilities of foreign partners and acting as a leader in international diplomatic efforts to prevent and respond to threats to global security.

The fiscal year 2017 budget allocation for the Department of State and foreign operations is $591 million below fiscal year 2016. That, coupled with the fact that the President’s budget underfunds programs for refugees and other victims of disasters by $1 billion, presents us with an untenable budgetary situation. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island would help to alleviate this shortfall.

While there are many foreign crises, Senator REED’s amendment focuses on one area where the situation is particularly dire. It authorizes $1.9 billion to support the Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development to implement their portions of the Integrated Campaign Plan to Counter ISIL. The funds would also support embassy security, as well as additional assistance for Israel, and for Jordan and Lebanon which have been severely impacted by the influx of hundreds of thousands of Syrian refugees.

This is directly related to U.S. security interests in the Middle East at a time when the stability of the entire region is under threat.

In a June 2 piece in Time Magazine, Retired GEN James Conway, former Commandant of the Marine Corps, and Retired ADM James M. Loy, former Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, wrote that:

...the security challenges our nation faces today are not the same as when we began our service during the Cold War... Twenty-first century problems require fine scalps, and the military is a broad sword. We can start by better resourcing and strengthening our own institutions. The State Department, the Peace Corps and USAID are the front lines of keeping our country safe, but they are underfunded and understaffed.

Mr. President, we should also remember that the Balanced Budget Act is based on priority. The spending caps we put in place have consequences for both the defense and nondefense sides of the ledger. But the Senator from Arizona’s one-dimensional approach ignores this bipartisan compromise. His amendment ignores the essential roles that development and diplomacy play in national security. It ignores the many domestic components to a strong defense, like a well-trained workforce and reliable infrastructure, like energy independence, like health systems that have the resources to protect the public from infectious diseases, contaminated drinking water, and unsafe food. It is shortsighted to ask the American people whether these investments are as important as more fighter planes and warships, they would emphatically answer “yes”. And that is why the very name of the Balanced Budget Act is flawed—the word “balanced”.

The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island should be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have printed in the RECORD the June 2 article I referred to by General Conway and Admiral Loy.

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

FORMER MILITARY LEADERS: 3 LESSONS FOR OUR NEXT COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF

(James Conway and James M. Loy, June 2, 2016)

MILITARY ALONE CANNOT KEEP US SAFE

As military Clinton myself to national security speech Thursday and with Trump’s recent major foreign policy speech, it’s important to remember that the military alone keep us safe. Commandants of the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, we believe our next Commander-in-Chief will also need the civilian tools in our arsenal to keep our nation strong and secure. For centuries, the blessing of two large oceans on our flanks acted as geographical barriers. But in the modern era, technology has made the world smaller and increasingly interconnected. The recent attacks in Brussells, Paris and San Bernardino, Calif., remind us that global threats do not respect boundaries and oceans strong enough to preserve our peace and prosperity.

The security challenges our nation faces today are not the same as when we began our service during the Cold War. National security challenges have become more resistant to bullets. Ebola, the Zika virus, the influx of undocumented children from Latin states, even the rise of ISIS cannot be resolved only with the force of arms.

If there was one immutable lesson of the Sept. 11 attacks, it is that instability in remote corners of the world can pose a direct threat to our way of life. The rise of ISIS is only a recent example that underscores that reality.

Military force will continue to be a necessary deterrent for the exercise of American
power, but it cannot be the only option. To preserve our flag and freedom, there are three areas where America must do better.

1. We must strengthen not only our soldiers, sailors, Marines, Coast Guard, and airmen but also our diplomats and development experts who are critical to our national security.

   Fighting terrorism means more than bombing the Middle East from the air. It means supporting weak or fragile states, increasing foreign military training and assistance, and devoting more resources to fight weapons proliferation. These are battles best fought at the local level with knowledge of cultures, economics and history.

2. We have economic opportunities around the world—particularly those where there are security concerns.

   Think of America’s engagement with Germany, Japan and South Korea in the postwar years. They are now our fourth, fifth, and sixth largest trading partners, respectively. Helping promote rule of law and economic development strengthens our economy here at home.

3. We must strengthen the humanitarian values that undergird American global leadership.

   U.S. foreign assistance has helped cut extreme poverty in half since 1990. It has increased security in the developing world by 33%, afforded two billion people access to clean water, and the number of children in primary school has tripled over the last 20 years.

   Pandemics and diseases like Ebola and the Zika virus are more easily defeated in the countries where they originate when those countries have strong health care systems, an educated population and the economic means to combat the virus. We can help build those institutions. To those concerned about the cost of assistance to the developing world, we would submit to you that economic development is cheaper than sending in the military.

   Twenty-first century problems require fine scalpels, and the military is a broad sword. We can start by better resourcing and strengthening our own institutions. The State Department, the Peace Corps and USAID are the front lines of keeping our country safe, but they are underfunded and underformed.

   Facing the largest global displacement of people since World War II, we have much more work to do. If we are not helping to support our allies and friends, then we are reducing our prospects for success and ceding immense benefits for our own national security.

   General James Mattis got it right when he said: ‘If you don’t fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition.’

   Keeping all the tools of American national security strong will help save lives and promote global stability and prosperity. Regardless of who is elected in November, it is the President’s responsibility to be responsible and acts accordingly, will be in America’s best interests.

Mr. LEAHY, Mr. President, I see the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska on the floor, and I yield the floor to:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MS. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an amendment that I have filed to the National Defense Authorization Act, amendment No. 4222, and it addresses an issue of great interest to military families not only in my State, where we are proud to host a strong continuum of military that defend our Nation, but this is an issue that really stretches across the country. What we propose in amendment No. 4222 is to strike section 604 of the NDAA, which represents a paradigm shift in the way the basic allowance for housing (BAH) pay is paid to our Active-Duty members.

The Department of Defense and our military families have long believed that BAH is part of a total compensation package. It is an essential component of their pay. BAH essentially replaces the BAH into a reimbursement program. So instead of having BAH in your bank account to spend on living expenses as you deem fit, Section 604 essentially requires servicemembers to turn a reimbursement office and basically spell your entitlement to that reimbursement for the cost of your housing as well as utilities. I suppose alternatively you could take your entitlement and accept the risk that you are going to verify this process will work.

Believe me, when I had an opportunity to visit with military spouses at Fort Wainwright just last week about this, they asked me: How does this reimbursement work? How do I get these utilities statements in for reimbursement? When you are not on a community tap to fill up your tank, you have to get your water from somewhere. Some military families at Fort Wainwright are paying to have water hauled to their homes either by a truck or they go out to the community tap to fill up their tank, or you have a cost associated with that. These spouses are asking me: How is that going to be accommodated under the new BAH plan? Will this be considered part of these allowable reimbursements?

I find this very troubling to me. It was certainly very troubling to the military families I spent time with. It is not like our military families don’t have enough to worry about.

One military spouse told me of the situation in her family. She is a licensed attorney in another State. She hasn’t been able to get waived in to practice in the State of Alaska. Her husband is an E7 soldier and has been in for 19 years, so effectively two professional people now in the military. They have three small children. She says she spends about $1,500 a month for food, formula, and diapers for the three small children. She pays $38,000 a year for childcare. Childcare in and around the Fort Wainwright area is very expensive, and she is not able to get reimbursement for childcare because she is not working. She is trying to get a job. But recognizing that they have all these other costs on top of it all, this military spouse, two professionals in the household, three children—tells me her family is WIC eligible.

The stories I hear about our military families who are accessing our community food banks—our military families are worried. They are worried about what is happening at home, the financial issues they are faced with.

This was one concern I heard specifically: If this is a reimbursement system, and I have to submit receipts for expenses—expenses that may exceed the cost of housing, exceed the cost of a mortgage, and it takes a long while to get this reimbursement—what happens if I can’t pay my bills on time?
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My job requires a security clearance? And that security clearance requires that your credit record be absolutely impeccable. How is all this going to work?

There is so much stress, so much anxiety for so many of our spouses as we were discussing these issues. When we think about what our military families are worried about, they are focused on the stress that comes with force structure reductions, frequent PCS moves, needing to understand the latest and greatest TRICARE complexity, figuring out whether the old retirement paradigm or the new retirement paradigm is better. And then they have this—yet another layer of complexity with section 604 that just adds to the stress and adds to the anxiety.

We have to be honest with one another. We have to be honest with our military families. The bill before us does not address those who serve a salary increase that is commensurate with the value of their service. Thankfully, we are working on a fix, and I greatly appreciate the leadership of Senator McCain and his willingness to work with so many of us on these issues that are affecting our military families.

When we look at what is going on now with BAH, I think we are messing with a very significant component of total compensation. That is simply not an appropriate way to thank those who serve a salary increase. There are those who have served through multiple deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan, and now they have to contend with a host of uncertainties created by the rise of ISIL, the tensions on the Korean Peninsula, a resurgent Russia, and an ambitious China. This is not right for our military families.

The Pentagon has issued a Statement of Administration Policy. They are quite clear about where they are on this. They believe section 604 is damaging to the force, and that is why they oppose section 604. It is burdensome to move from a compensation approach to a reimbursement approach. It is inefficient. It appears to completely eliminate the BAH increment presently paid to families with children. It penalizes dual military couples. It disproportionately impacts female servicemembers. Think about it. About 20 percent of women on Active Duty are in a dual military marriage, compared to about 3.8 percent of Active-Duty men. So women on Active Duty are effectively taking a harder hit. And if we think this is not going to have an impact on recruitment and retention—I think we are going to be looking at some second-order consequences with respect to that, and also it, as it relates to administration of the GI bill education benefit.

I mentioned the effective penalty on dual military couples. I know a dual-career military couple. I am very pleased to know that their military career has taken them to some pretty good places and the better news is that they have moved together. One spouse has been selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel 2 years below the zone, which is a very big deal. This week, his wife learned that she, too, has been selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel 1 year below the zone. So we can see that both of these individuals are very high performers, and their success comes to a competitive promotion environment. They are doing great, but they are looking at the impact section 604 will have on their specific situation as a dual military couple. They estimate that if they are transferred here in July, if they are below the lower 48, they will lose about $20,000 from their compensation. If we are fortunate that they should both get assigned to Alaska on the next rotation, that hit to them will rise to $29,000—an almost $30,000 reduction in total compensation from what they as a military couple would receive under the current system. That is significant. They are exactly the kinds of people the private sector wants to recruit but our military wants to retain, and I am not the only person who appreciates this fact.

When I was in Fort Wainwright, one dual military spouse said: Who I am married to should not affect my BAH entitlement. That summed it up in a pretty neat and tidy way.

Over this past week since I have been back here, I have heard from senior military leaders and senior enlisted advisors to those leaders, all of one voice. They are saying to me directly that this brings down the morale in the volunteer force. I will relay to my colleagues the comments from one of the commanders in Fort Wainwright when I was there last week. He had been sitting in the back of the room listening to all of the military spouses weigh in and voice their concerns and their anxiety about what was going on. He said to me: This is a clear reminder of how morale affects the overall mission. I have been on assignment. I have been deployed to Afghanistan. I have been on patrol looking for IEDs. I have been on patrol looking for IEDs.

When you are on these missions, your head has to be 100 percent in the game. You can’t be thinking about whether or not there are financial struggles that your spouse is dealing with. You cannot be distracted from where you are in the mission. You cannot be thinking about what is happening at home. You cannot be thinking about whether or not there are financial struggles that your spouse is dealing with. You cannot be distracted from where you are in the here and now. We are not just talking about a quality of life issue. We are talking about a matter of life and death issues.

He said: If my head is not 100 percent in the game, then somebody’s life potentially is on the line.

It was a clear reminder to me of how morale affects the mission and how we need to ensure that our men and women whom we have tasked to take on the most difficult of tasks are able to focus on where they are right then. And making sure all is well at home is a responsibility that the career military couple. There has been a lot of discussion about the BAH over the years. Some of us think that it is in need of reform or that perhaps right-sizing the BAH will mean more money for readiness and modernization. I certainly get that argument. I may not agree with all of that, but I do know there are some very hard choices that have to be made in a difficult budget environment. I respect the work that has been done, along with the ranking member, in trying to deal with all of that. But I do feel very certain about one thing: Those who believe that BAH should be reformed need to make that case openly and directly and transparently to our military families. I think putting a game-changing provision like section 604 in the NDAA without that consultation misses the mark.

The changes we are considering in BAH would not be effective until 2018. We have some time here, and we can get this right. My amendment, which is a bipartisan amendment, simply says: Take a timeout. Let’s take a step back.

To those who think the BAH is in need of reform, make the case to military families if you think they are not right for our military families. I think putting a game-changing provision like section 604 in the NDAA without that consultation misses the mark.

The changes we are considering in BAH would not be effective until 2018. We have some time here, and we can get this right. My amendment, which is a bipartisan amendment, simply says: Take a timeout. Let’s take a step back.

To those who think the BAH is in need of reform, make the case to military families if you think they are not right for our military families. I think putting a game-changing provision like section 604 in the NDAA without that consultation misses the mark.

The changes we are considering in BAH would not be effective until 2018. We have some time here, and we can get this right. My amendment, which is a bipartisan amendment, simply says: Take a timeout. Let’s take a step back.

To those who think the BAH is in need of reform, make the case to military families if you think they are not right for our military families. I think putting a game-changing provision like section 604 in the NDAA without that consultation misses the mark.

The changes we are considering in BAH would not be effective until 2018. We have some time here, and we can get this right. My amendment, which is a bipartisan amendment, simply says: Take a timeout. Let’s take a step back.

To those who think the BAH is in need of reform, make the case to military families if you think they are not right for our military families. I think putting a game-changing provision like section 604 in the NDAA without that consultation misses the mark.
Thank you for your leadership and for your continued support for our men and women in uniform and their families.

Sincerely,

DANA T. ATKINS.

AIR FORCE SERGEANTS ASSOCIATION.

Sault, MI, June 1, 2016.

Hon. Lisa Murkowski
Hart Senate Office Building.

Washington DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: on behalf of the 190,000 members of the Air Force Sergeants Association I want to thank you for introducing amendment #4222 to S. 2943. Re-moving §604 from the Senate’s FY17 NDAA, as articulated in your amendment, is absolutely the right call.

To propose BAH reductions while service members are already completely contributing more to their retirement and potentially to their healthcare clearly sends the wrong message. Keeping in mind that vast numbers of military families funnel their children into similar service, retention of those now serving in uniform as well as recruitment of future talent both stand to suffer.

AFPSA strongly supports amendment #4222 to remove §604 from S.2943 and urges other members of the Senate to also support this amendment.

Respectfully,

ROBERT L. FRANK.
Chief Executive Officer.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield the floor to my colleague from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Alaska. I appreciate that.

I rise today to speak in support of the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act, which we are currently working on. The NDAA is clearly one of the most important pieces of legislation we take up in Congress because it authorizes vital programs designed to keep our Nation secure and our people safe.

We have worked very hard to make sure the bill upholds the nuclear missions at our missile bases, as well as unmanned aerial systems—the UAS missions—that have emerged as a vanguard part of our Nation’s defense.

I commend the chairman and the ranking member for their good work in bringing this bill to the floor. It is a massive undertaking. In particular, I thank them for their support on some important priorities.

This bill fully authorizes programs to sustain forces, including plans to upgrade the Minuteman III ICBM, the venerable B-52 bomber, and our nuclear cruise missiles. The bill also fully authorizes the Global Hawk program, which is proving its worth every day and demonstrates the value of unmanned aircraft in performing intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions.

The Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, approved the National Defense Appropriations Act last month, putting in place the funding to support our armed services. As soon as we pass the authorization bill that is now before the full Senate, I understand we will work to bring its companion bill, the appropriations bill, to the floor for a vote as well. Both are vital for our armed services.

Together, these two bills—the National Defense Authorization Act and the National Defense Appropriations Act—will provide our armed services with both the blueprint and the funding they need to defend our Nation and the American people.

As I have said, I have filed several amendments that I believe will strengthen the bill and our national security, and I wish to take a minute to talk about them now.

First, I have filed a measure that requires the Air Force to procure, in a timely manner, Black Hawk helicopters to replace the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters that currently provide security to our intercontinental ballistic missile fields. These fields are located near Minot Air Force Base in my home State of North Dakota, as well as at F.E. Warren in Wyoming and the State of Montana.

The Air Force uses helicopters to provide security for missiles that are in transit, as well as to move security forces quickly to any missile field site that could come under any kind of threat.

I love the old Huey helicopters. They are great. I have flown in them for many years, on many occasions, and it is certainly an iconic aircraft and one that has served our Nation’s military very well through the Vietnam era and through today. But the reality is that it is no longer able to do the job that we need done.

I spent some time with pilots at Minot Air Force Base earlier this year and heard about the challenges they face. For example, the front panel of the Huey sometimes will not light up. Remember, these are aircraft that were manufactured in 1969. The pilots flying these aircraft are a lot younger than the helicopters they are flying, but they do a remarkable job. The mechanics do an amazing job in keeping them going.

For example, sometimes the front panel of the Huey will not light up. When they are flying at night, they stick a portable LED light on the dash so they can see their gauges. Think about that. We have amazing young men and women in the military flying these helicopters much older than they are—helicopters from 1969. Some of the gauges don’t have lights on them, so they put LED lights on as a makeshift way to see the gauges in the dark when they are flying to the missile fields performing their mission. If they hit some rough weather, guess what happens. The jostling knocks the LED lights off the control panel, and now they are in the dark. They can’t even see their gauges.

Think about being out there flying helicopters on a military mission, and it is dark. You may be in rough weather, and you can’t see your gauges. Obviously, that doesn’t get the job done.

That is not something that is acceptable for our men and women in uniform.

The Air Force acknowledges this, and they are working on getting an upgraded helicopter. To their credit, the Air Force wanted to move this as fast as possible, but under the plan DOD had approved, it would take 5 years before we would get new helicopters.

Think about the situation I just described. Here are these air men and women flying in this make-shift condition. In a situation where the Air Force has acknowledged that this equipment does not meet the mission requirements—does not meet the mission requirements. That is why we have to accelerate this timeline, and that is what this amendment does.

Specifically, my amendment instructs the Air Force to get Black Hawk helicopters on contract by 2018, which accelerates the Air Force’s current procurement plan by approximately 2 years. It would enable them to acquire Black Hawk helicopters under the Army contract. The Army is already buying these helicopters. It has been fully bid. They have been doing it for some period of time. It would allow the Air Force to piggyback on it and buy the Black Hawk helicopters they need. It saves millions of dollars. I think somewhere between $80 and $120 million. This is commonsense stuff. I think it is a win all the way around.

This provision is cosponsored by Senator Jon Tester, Democrat of Montana. Obviously, he is well aware of the problem, too, because they face the same difficulty across our border in Montana. It is cosponsored by the other members of the Senate’s ICBM coalition. It is bipartisan. We have a number of Senators on board supporting it.

Also, it is a companion bill to the amendment that Senator Tester and I included in the fiscal year 2017 Defense appropriations bill. We have already put $75 million in the Defense appropriations bill to start the acquisition. The dollars are there; this is the authorization that goes with the dollars. We worked very hard on this. We set it up the right way, and it is something we need to do.

The second amendment I introduced will help to meet the challenge of training enough pilots to fly RPAs, or remotely piloted aircraft—unmanned aircraft. I don’t know that there is any mission in the Air Force or perhaps the whole DOD that is more in demand right now than RPAs, unmanned aircraft. All over the world, we are using this amazing tool—Global Hawk, Predator—and it is in tremendous demand right now. That also creates a tremendous demand for pilot training.

Chairman McCaIN and Ranking Member REED included language in the base
with a bipartisan bill, but as a body and as a country we haven’t done enough and this is a chance to rectify what I think is an incredibly big problem.

We are at war—at least I think we are. We have been at war for the last 15 years. I cannot tell you how hard it has been on the all-voluntary force. I was in the Air Force for 33 years. I retired last year. I had the pleasure of meeting a lot of men and women in uniform in Iraq and Afghanistan. I think I have been to Iraq and Afghanistan 37 times in the last decade. I have seen incredible sacrifice by those who serve our Nation to defend us against another 9/11 and what their families have gone through.

As a nation and a Congress, what have we done to those who have been fighting this war? We are on track to have the smallest Army since 1940. Sequestration—across-the-board budget cuts that have taken almost $1 trillion out of our military projects—is insanely bad and nobody seems to give a damn about fixing it. None of us have to go and fly in planes that are about to fall out of the sky. None of us are commanders of troops and having to use duct tape to get to the other end of an objective is not only unrealistic but it is about to become a problem.

I worry about going over and over and over to the war zone because the war is getting worse, not better.

It looks like all of us should listen to our commanders who have said with one voice that the readiness of the U.S. military is in an emergency situation. The ability to give the flying hours our pilots need can’t be done because of budget constraints. It looks like we would want to listen to the Chief of Staff of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps who are telling us that sequestration has taken a toll on the ability to defend this Nation.

We have had some patchwork solutions. We put some money back, but we are due to go back into sequestration next year. The amount of money we put back in the Ryan-Murray compromise was much appreciated, and Senator McCaskill is trying to put an $18 billion infusion into the military to meet their unfunded needs that would plus-up the Army by 15,000 and would plus-up the Marine Corps and the National Guard and would give more money for operation and maintenance. The Administration on this side and Congress is that training hours have to give way to operational needs in the other. Let me give one small example. There is a Marine Corps readiness rapid response force in Spain that is stationed in Spain to deal with Bengahazi-type events throughout Africa. They have to fly—in case something went bad—thousands of miles. They have 12 aircraft, B-22s, and 2 teams. The Commandant of the Marine Corps is having to take six of these aircraft away from the United States because we don’t have enough airplanes to train the B-22 pilots. That means there is a hole in our ability to protect our citizens and diplomats in Africa.

I cannot tell you the damage that sequestration has done to our military, and we seem unmoved by all of this. I cannot believe that the body is not responding to the needs of our military, given the threats we are facing. How much more information do we need from our commanders to believe this is an emergency? I say to my Democratic colleagues. I know sequestration is hurting on the nondefense side, but all spending is not equal. I stand ready with you to find a way to buy back sequestration and pay for it by having some revenue come from closing loopholes and deductions like the supercommittee envisioned by using some revenue and some entitlement reform to buy back what is left on sequestration. I am not asking that you just spend money on defense and ignore the rest of the problems associated with sequestration.

I have sat down on two separate occasions with Members on the other side to try to find ways to buy back sequestration so we could actually achieve the savings, and we have been able to do that. My colleagues from Florida and Arizona came up with a fix that provided some relief that expires at the end of the year.

The bottom line is this. The McCain amendment is making the argument that the Ryan-Murray amendment has to be spent based on an emergency.

Here is the question: Is there an emergency when it comes to the operational needs of this country on the defense side? Have we put our troops in a spot where we are risking their lives and their ability to prosecute the war because we have gone too far with defense cuts? I think we have, but if you don’t believe me, you should listen to our commanders and hopefully I can read some of their dispatches.

With this $18 billion infusion, we are able to increase the size of the Army, and if you are in the Army, you could use a little help right about now. You have been busting your ass for the last 15 years, going back and forth, back and forth, and the way we reward your service is to decrease the size of the Army.

I just got back from Asia, and everybody in Asia is wondering: What the heck is America doing in this amendment to have the smallest Navy since 1915. We are going to pivot to Asia with what? Under sequestration our ability to modernize the Navy has been lost. They don’t have the money to build the new ships that we need to fight the wars of the future, and they contain a threatening China because they are in a war now. They are robbing Peter to pay Paul. It looks like we would want to help the Marines. If you are a marine, boy, have you been on the tip of the spear?
more people to help prosecute the war and take a little burden off the Marine Corps, which has been absolutely worn out. Seventy percent of the F-18s in the Marine Corps have problems flying. We are cannibalizing planes to keep other planes flying.

To those who say we need to reform the Pentagon, you are right. Not only do we need to, we have. Fifty percent of the Department of Defense budget is personnel costs. Last year we reformed retirement. At 20 years, you are not going to get half of your basic pay. You will get 40 percent in the future. That will save money. We are going to allow a Thrift Savings Plan for those who want to contribute 5 percent of their pay and we will match 5 percent, but they can’t get the money until they are 59 or 60. That will be money for the servicemembers, but it comes later.

We are going to ask our retirees to pay a little bit more for the military health care system because we haven’t had an appropriation of the Defense Department since 1995. We are going to go to fixed-price contracts to deal with the abuse of cost-plus contracts to save money. We are trying to reduce the number of general officers because they are overstaffed.

We are doing a lot of things to make the Pentagon operate better, but at the end of the day, you need people to defend this country. When sequestration kicks in, we are going to go from 475,000 to 420,000.

What I am asking for is a bipartisan effort to stop the bleeding, to take the request for the military that is un-funded and desperately needed and give them a little bit of hope. We need to let them know Congress is listening to their problem because we are not. We are ignoring the problems of our military because if we were really serious about helping them, we would pass this by a voice vote, but, no, we can’t increase funding by $1 trillion to increase the size of the Army, Marine Corps, and the National Guard, to give more flight time to our pilots, more money to maintain the equipment and increase the size of the National Guard, which has really suffered during the last 15 years, and to buy more airplanes. The bottom line is, we can’t do all of that because we have to increase nondefense spending.

To my Democratic colleagues, if you don’t think there is an emergency in the military, then you haven’t been listening. To those Republicans who believe the appropriations bill has adequately funded the needs of the military, you haven’t been listening. Well, I have been listening. Washington is broken in many ways. I enjoy being a member of the Senate, and I respect my colleagues, even though we disagree, but this one I can’t understand. I can’t understand this. I can understand ideology, I can understand the difference between pro-life and pro-choice, guns, revenue, and taxes. I can understand conservatism, liberalism, libertarianism. I can understand that in a great country we have differences, but this I can’t understand.

I can’t understand why any of us would let this happen to our military. Whether you are a Libertarian, vegetarian, Republican, or Democrat, you need the men and women defending you so you can go about defending yourselves. We can argue until the cows come home about how America should be, and it is a privilege to have this debate. While we are arguing among ourselves about how to make America great again, the enemy is changing, becoming one, stronger together, or whatever damn phrase is out there, the people who are giving us the privilege to argue are being worn out and underfunded.

Let me tell you the consequence of this. At a time the enemy is growing in capability to attack this country, we are gutting our ability to defend this country. A perfect storm is brewing. We have an America in retreat and in decline all over the world. We have a President who is absolutely crazy. The Republican nominee, when he talks about foreign policy, it is complete gibberish.

The Democratic nominee seems to be afraid to articulate how to change things. Where is she going to do differently? Where is she on sequestration?

Secretary Clinton, do you think now is the time to spend more on our military because we are in an emergency situation? Tell me why I am wrong. Tell me why you don’t believe all of the things said by those in leadership. I am dumbfounded that this is hard given the state of readiness of our military. I am dumbfounded that we can’t improve military readiness without increasing spending for food safety modernization. I am sure there is probably something legitimate there, but the Food Safety Modernization Act is not going to stop ISIL from coming here. The Department of Defense, I am sure it is legitimate, but all I can say is that whatever problems we have with water, they pale in comparison to the problems we have with terrorism.

Who are we as a body, who are we as a people if we can’t see this being an emergency? If you are not listening and you have shut your mind and eyes to what is going on, then shame on you.

This is the low point to me; that we cannot as a body agree that our men and women in the military are in a bad spot and they need our help yesterday. So vote the way you are going to vote, but don’t tell me that the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, has fixed the problem because we haven’t. We did appropriate more money, and I appreciate it, but the $18 billion on this list is not addressed by the Appropriations Committee’s effort to do more, and don’t tell me this is not a life-or-death issue. Don’t hold the men and women hostage from getting the money they desperately need to defend us all because you want more money somewhere else.

Whatever differences we have, whatever hopes and dreams we have as individuals or collectively as Americans are at risk because the people we are fighting would kill every one of us if they had the chance. They could care less if you are a Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative. They want to hurt us, and they want to hurt us badly, and the only way to keep them from hurting us is for some of us to go over there in partnership with others over there to keep the fight from coming back over here.

It looks like all of us can agree on giving the people going over there the best chance they can to survive the fight, come back home and protect us all, but apparently we can’t get there. Shame on us. Shame on us all.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 7:30 p.m. this evening, the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying H.R. 2577; that Senator McConnel or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferees, that Senator McConnell or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to go to conference and that once a cloture motion is offered, all time be yielded back and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to go to conference; further, that if the motion to go to conference is agreed to, that Senator Nelson or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferences and Senator Sullivan or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferences and that the Senate vote with no intervening action or debate on the motions to instruct conferences in the order listed and that both motions require 60 affirmative votes for adoption; finally, that there be no further motions to instruct in order and that there be 4 minutes, equally divided, prior to each vote on the motions to instruct.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2577

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 7:30 p.m. this evening, the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying H.R. 2577; that Senator McConnell or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferences; further, that Senator McConnell or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to go to conference and that once a cloture motion is offered, all time be yielded back and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to go to conference; further, that if the motion to go to conference is agreed to, that Senator Nelson or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferences and Senator Sullivan or his designee be recognized to offer a motion to instruct conferences and that the Senate vote with no intervening action or debate on the motions to instruct conferences in the order listed and that both motions require 60 affirmative votes for adoption; finally, that there be no further motions to instruct in order and that there be 4 minutes, equally divided, prior to each vote on the motions to instruct.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am grateful you will not make me repeat that.

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.

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

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

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2577) entitled “An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes,” and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

COMPROMISE MOTION

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendment, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 2577, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MUIR) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays are ordered, the yeas and nays are as follows:

YEA—93

Alexander—Crapo—King
Ayotte—Crus—Kirk
Baldwin—Daines—Klobuchar
Barrasso—Donnelly—Lankford
Benet—Durbin—Leahy
Blumenthal—Ed Markey—Menendez
Booker—Feinstein—Menendez
Boozman—Fischer—McConnell
Brockers—Flake—McConnell
Brown—Franken—Menendez
Burr—Graham—Merck
Cantwell—Gillibrand—Murray
Capito—Graham—Murkowski
Cardin—Graham—Murkowski
Carper—Hatch—Murray
Casey—Henshaw—Nelson
Cassidy—Hirono—Perdue
Cochrane—Hirono—Peters
Collins—Hirono—Portman
Collins—Hirono—Portman
Coons—Ihode—Reed
Corker—Ison—Risch
Corry—Johnson—Roberts
Cotton—Kaine—Round

NAY—2

Lee—Paul—Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 93, the nays are 2.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2577 be instructed to reject proposals that would rescind existing Ebola emergency funds provided by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–255), and designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as such funds support Ebola preparedness and response efforts which are critical to preventing, detecting, and responding to potential future Ebola outbreaks, and to insist that the final conference report include $510,000,000 to reimburse Ebola accounts, as provided for in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–255) and designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, for obligations incurred for Zika virus response, as such emergency Ebola funds support critical initiatives to prevent Ebola outbreaks, support country specific public health infrastructure in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea, public health research on infection control, including detection of person to person transmission of Ebola, and advanced research and development of new Ebola vaccines and therapeutics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 4 minutes of debate, equally divided.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this is a motion to instruct the conferees that whatever is decided in the conference to fund the Zika crisis, the money would not be taken out of the Ebola fund and that the money that has been borrowed from the Ebola fund would be replenished.

Remember that since the Ebola outbreak was contained 1 year ago, there have been seven more confirmed Ebola outbreaks since that time, and the CDC still employs 80 employees working on Ebola. With the last recent Ebola case
in Guinea, the CDC has had to vaccinate 1,700 people and then go out and do the infection control over there in West Africa in 50 health centers and make 20,000 connections to try to ensure that it does not spread, which of course is the reason why Ebola gets to the United States.

So this motion is simply to say: Let’s not take the Zika crisis funds out of Ebola and replenish what has already been taken out.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, we just did the Zika crisis and go to conference. I would like to see the conference be able to deal with this issue.

In the Ebola funds, there is still $1.2 billion left in the Ebola fund. There is still $1.2 billion left in the Ebola fund. This is $510 million that was to be used for things like reimbursing hospitals that would have an influx of Ebola patients in this country, which never happened, and other issues.

The administration has said they do not need this $510 million for Ebola. They clearly would like to use it for other purposes, and in fact have used $500 million for other purposes.

I would urge a ‘nay’ vote.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, do I have any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-nine seconds.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would say to my friend from Missouri simply that the administration does not say that they don’t need this. As a matter of fact, in their $1.9 billion request, they have asked for the replenishment of this, and the statements that I just made were made by Dr. Frieden and Dr. Fauci as early as this morning.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, do I have any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, in the $1.9 billion request, they would not have asked for this money because they were asking for $1.9 billion of new money, some justified and some not.

I believe we worked hard to get a good start here. This can clearly be an open item in the conference, but I don’t think it should be a directed item in the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 49, as follows:

[Table of Senators who voted 'yea' and 'nay'.]

Alexandria Briggman
Alexander
Alexander
Alexander
Alexander
Briggman
Blunt
Blunt
Boozman
Capito
Cassidy
Coats
Coats
Collins
Collins
Colinns
Colinns
Cornyn
Corinns
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Craven
Cruz
Daines
Daines
Ernst
Ernst
Michulski
Mikulski
Reid
Reid
Toomey
Toomey

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this motion, the motion is rejected.

The Senator from Alaska.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2577 be instructed to insist upon the inclusion of the provisions contained in Senate amendment 4065 (relating to the reconstruction of certain bridges).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, this instruction relates to an earlier amendment I had, No. 4065. It is a simple amendment that would allow States and communities throughout our Nation to expedite the permitting process and construction of their bridges that pose safety concerns for their citizens. This would only apply to bridges that are in the same place—they are not expanding bridges—same size, same dimensions, andada location. If that were it, I would oppose this amendment; however, this amendment has a safety value that the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of the bridge must pass muster with the State-level permitting and environmental protection authority.

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

Mr. KING. I understand. I think we should support it. Thank you.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

Mr. KING. Wow. In the beginning, God created. I just want to say to my friend Senator KING, just ask the people of Flint,
MI, how happy they were that the State took over the health and safety rules. Their kids are suffering from lead poisoning. Sometimes you are talking about bridges that are 100 years old. They contain toxic materials. Again, this is not necessary. We haven’t got a problem because we have taken care of expedited procedures. My arm was twisted on it in the FAST Act. So let’s reject this because we want to protect the health and safety of the people we represent. I urge a “no” vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARREN) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MUKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. MIKULSKI), and Mr. LEAHY conferees on S. 2943.

SANDERS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Warner).

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

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 38, as follows:

[Rolling Vote No. 94 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Casidy
Coats
Cooper
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Donnelly
Enzi

NAYS—38

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Boozman
Brown
Cassidy
Cardin
Carper
Cassidy
Coons
Durbin
Feinstein

NOT VOTING—6

Graham
Mikulski

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this motion, the motion is rejected.

The Presiding Officer appointed Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Attorney General Mr. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. LEHAY conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for S. 2943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 469, S. 2943, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.


Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatorily quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion, the majority leader is recognized.

CLOTURE MOTION

For 50 years, the Nevada Justice Association has made tremendous advances in educating Nevadans about their legal rights. Their commitment to ensuring that people have equal and lasting access to the justice system has helped Nevadans enjoy the protections our system of government has to offer. I commend the Nevada Justice Association for their hard work in educating the public on their rights and protecting people’s access to justice.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for June 2016. The report compares current law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2016, the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015. Tables from CBO that I will use for enforcement of budget totals agreed to by the Congress.
Because legislation can still be enacted that would have an effect on fiscal year 2016, CBO provided a report for both fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017. This information is used to enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under section 312 of the CBA. CBO’s estimates show that current law levels of spending for fiscal year 2016 exceed the amounts in last year’s budget resolution by $138.9 billion in budget authority and $103.6 billion in outlays. Revenues are $155.2 billion above the revenue floor for fiscal year 2016 set by the budget resolution. As well, Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed for fiscal year 2016, while Social Security revenues are $23 million below levels in the budget.

For fiscal year 2017, CBO estimates that current law levels are below the fiscal year 2017 enforcement filing’s allowable budget authority and outlay aggregates by $974.3 billion and $392.4 billion, respectively. The allowable spending room will be reduced as appropriations bills for fiscal year 2017 are enacted. Revenues are at the level assumed for fiscal year 2017. Finally, Social Security outlays and revenues are at the levels assumed in the fiscal year 2017 enforcement filing.

CBO’s report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate’s pay-as-you-go rule. As part of the fiscal year 2017 enforcement filing, the Senate’s pay-as-you-go scorecard was reset to zero, which remains its current balance.

New to this report are two additional tables that track the Senate’s budget enforcement activities. The first table, Enforcement Report of Legislation Post-S. Res. 21, fiscal year 2016 Congressional Budget Resolution, shows the 11 levels-based points of order that were raised after passage of the last budget resolution in 2015. The largest budgetary violation during that period was the nonappropriations portion of H.R. 2029, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016. The final table of this filing, Enforcement Report of Legislation Post-Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 Enforcement Filing, shows the three points of order that have been raised since my April 18 enforcement filing.

Two of those three points of order were raised against emergency designations in an appropriations bill. The first was raised against the emergency designation in Senator BLUNT’s amendment No. 3900, that provided $1.1 billion to address the Zika virus. This point of order was waived with 70 votes. The second was raised against the emergency designation in Senator MCCAIN’s amendment No. 4059, that would increase spending by $7.7 billion for the Veterans Choice Program. This point of order was waived with 84 votes.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.
### TABLE 5—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS) (Budget authority, millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget authority, millions of dollars</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>19,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>9,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Water Development</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services and General Government</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies</td>
<td>6,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Branch</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Housing, and Urban Development, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CHIMPS</td>
<td>17,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution</td>
<td>−1,314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND (Budget authority, millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget authority, millions of dollars</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>19,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Water Development</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services and General Government</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Branch</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Housing, and Urban Development, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CHIMPS</td>
<td>17,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution</td>
<td>19,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS) (Budget authority, millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget authority, millions of dollars</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2017</td>
<td>19,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Water Development</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services and General Government</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Branch</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Housing, and Urban Development, and Related Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CHIMPS</td>
<td>17,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution</td>
<td>−19,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

- n.a. = not applicable
- P.L. = Public Law

**Source:** Congressional Budget Office.
The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2017 budget and is current through June 6, 2016. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on April 18, 2016, pursuant to section 102 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–74).

Since our last letter dated May 11, 2016, the Congress has not cleared any legislation for the President’s signature that affects budget authority, outlays, or revenues.
June 8, 2016
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BARBARA BUSH FOUNDATION FOR FAMILY LITERACY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks from earlier today at the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy’s Conversation on the Future of Adult Literacy.

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

BARBARA BUSH FOUNDATION FOR FAMILY LITERACY

Mr. ALEXANDER. I’m glad to be invited to join the conversation on adult literacy and to do as my late friend Alex Haley used to say, “Find the good and praise it,” especially about Barbara Bush. Tomorrow, one of the speakers you’re going to hear, Jon Meacham, just finished his book, a biography of George H. W. Bush, and had the extraordinary opportunity to go through the personal diary of Barbara and President Bush going back to the 1960s. I don’t know any other biographer who’s had that kind of access to that much material. The name of the book is ‘‘The Litmus Test: Power’’. I have a friend in Nashville who says that a better name for the book would be “The Last Gentleman.” I think an even better name for the book would be “The Last Gentleman and His Lady,” and perhaps the best name for the book would be “The Last Gentleman and His Very Independent Lady.”

In 1991, it was a sunny day on the South Lawn of the White House, and President Bush was walking out to announce his program to help give scholarships to low-income children so they could choose schools. It was called the “GI Bill for Kids” and President and Mrs. Bush were walking along toward the event, and I was with them and Barbara looked at the president and said, “You’ve got on the wrong pants.” He had one suit coat on and different pants on. She insisted that he turn around and go back into the White House and change his clothes before making his announcement.

On another occasion, the President and Mrs. Bush invited Honey and me to go with them one evening to Ford’s Theatre. When we arrived there in the presidential limousine, the Secret Service opened the door and the President got out first and Barbara said, “I’ll get the door, George.”

On another occasion, I was sitting with them and I forgot that he had been vice president before then, but he was called on to speak unexpectedly and he leaned over to Barbara and said, “What should I speak about?” and she said, “About five minutes, George.” So she is a very independent lady. Before we go much further in this discussion about adult literacy, let’s recognize that today is our lady’s 91st birthday.

As was mentioned, I was education secretary in 1991 when the National Literacy Act was enacted. Let’s use Barbara Bush’s own words to describe the event—you’ll find in her memoir. She wrote, “I must say, I got more credit than I deserved.” I don’t agree with that, but, she continued, “I heard that George was going to give the pen to me, but before he could, Senator Simon spoke up and said, ‘That pen ought to go to Barbara.’ I donated it to the George Bush Presidential Library Center. In the end, however, it’s not pens and pictures that count. It’s the National Literacy Act that really counts. It was the first piece of legislation—and, to date, the only one—ever enacted specifically for literacy with the goal of ensuring that every American adult acquires the basic literacy skills necessary to achieve the greatest possible satisfaction professionally and personally. But even more than that, the act seeks to strengthen our nation by giving us more productive workers and informed citizens.” That was Barbara Bush’s memoir.

Three years before that, in 1988, the year President George H. W. Bush was elected, the Saturday Evening Post did a cover story on Barbara and her passion for literacy. The writer told a story of JT Pace, the 63-year-old son of a former sharecropper who had just learned to read and was invited to read the Preamble to the Constitution on a televised program celebrating the bicentennial of the Constitution as well as the cause of literacy. When Mr. Pace arrived in St. Louis for the event, they discovered there were a few words in the Preamble that he couldn’t read. Right when he decided he couldn’t participate, he was introduced to Barbara Bush. She put him at ease and asked if they might read the Preamble together. The reporter writes: “That evening, they stood together on the podium and slowly began to read the Preamble. JT mumbled some of the difficult words; gradually Barbara Bush’s voice subsided as JT gained confidence and finished his reading in a strong voice, his eyes glinting with tears.” That was the story from the Saturday Evening Post.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF LEGISLATION POST-BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2015 ENFORCEMENT FILING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Motion to Waive</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>S. AMDT. 3960</td>
<td>(Sen. Durbin, D-IL)</td>
<td>S. AMDT. 4169 to H.R. 2577</td>
<td>Sen. Collins (R-ME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>S. AMDT. 4019</td>
<td>(Sen. McCaskill, D-MO)</td>
<td>S. AMDT. 3969 to H.R. 2577</td>
<td>Sen. McCaskill (R-MO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Enforcement of the Budget Resolution.*

*Unless otherwise noted, the motion to waive was offered pursuant to section 505 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.*

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF LEGISLATION POST-S. CON. RES. 11, FY 2016 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Motion to Waive</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1795, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 (SEN. McCASKILL, D-MO)</td>
<td>Sec 3102 (H.R. 1795)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator McCaskill (R-MO)</td>
<td>71–26, Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>HOUSE AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO S. 1344, THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2015</td>
<td>Sec 3102 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Cornyn (R-TX)</td>
<td>64–35, Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>SENATE AMENDMENT TO S. 2964 TO S. 2974 TO H.R. 1795, THE RESTORING AMERICANS’ HEALTHCARE FREEDOMS RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015</td>
<td>Sec 3102 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Brown (D-MA)</td>
<td>45–55, Not Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>SENATE AMENDMENT TO S. 2983 TO S. 2974 TO H.R. 1795, THE RESTORING AMERICANS’ HEALTHCARE FREEDOMS RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015</td>
<td>Sec 3102 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Casey (D-PA)</td>
<td>46–54, Not Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>SENATE AMENDMENT TO S. 3001 TO S. 2974 TO H.R. 1795, THE RESTORING AMERICANS’ HEALTHCARE FREEDOMS RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015</td>
<td>Sec 3102 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Shaheen (D-NH)</td>
<td>47–52, Not Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>SENATE AMENDMENT TO S. 3031 TO S. 2974 TO H.R. 1795, THE RESTORING AMERICANS’ HEALTHCARE FREEDOMS RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015</td>
<td>Sec 3102 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Bennett (D-CO)</td>
<td>47–52, Not Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>SENATE AMENDMENT TO S. 3031 TO S. 2974 TO H.R. 1795, THE RESTORING AMERICANS’ HEALTHCARE FREEDOMS RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015</td>
<td>Sec 3102 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Baldwin (D-WI)</td>
<td>45–54, Not Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>SENATE AMENDMENT TO S. 3031 TO S. 2974 TO H.R. 1795, THE RESTORING AMERICANS’ HEALTHCARE FREEDOMS RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015</td>
<td>Sec 3102 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Murphy (D-CT)</td>
<td>46–53, Not Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>S. CON. RES. 11, FY 2016 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION</td>
<td>Sec 3101 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Wyden (D-OR)</td>
<td>73–25, Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SENATE AMENDMENT TO S. 3395 TO S. 3379 TO S. 324</td>
<td>Sec 3101 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Wyden (D-OR)</td>
<td>46–50, Not Waived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SENATE AMENDMENT TO S. 3345 TO S. 3379 TO S. 324</td>
<td>Sec 3101 (S. CON. RES. 11)–Increased Spending</td>
<td>Senator Shaheen (D-NH)</td>
<td>48–47, Not Waived</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unless otherwise noted, the motion to waive was offered pursuant to section 505 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.*

*Includes off-budget amounts.*

*Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.*

*P.L. 114–148 will cause a decrease in spending of $7 million in 2018 and an increase in spending of $7 million in 2020 for a net impact of zero over the six-year and eleven-year periods.*
How important it is for the future of our country that adult Americans will be able to read our Constitution and understand that we are united by our principles and what those principles and not our ethnicity. It's an important reminder to think about the fact that if you move to say, Japan, you can't become Japanese, really, but if you move to America and embrace our principles, you are an American.

In 1989, President George H. W. Bush did an extraordinary thing. He convened a meeting of all the governors in Charlottesville. The governors do not get together for a single purpose like that very much in history. They established the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which established national goals. In 1991, by then I had been inducted to be education secretary, the president announced America 2000, to move the nation toward those goals state by state, community by community. America 2000 had six goals, and one of those was to increase adult literacy. We said then that a “Nation at Risk” must become a “Nation of Students.” In 1991, Congress passed the National Literacy Act. That act increased the authorization of literacy programs, established the national state literacy resource centers, created national workforce demonstration projects for incarcerated individuals, and required “Gateway Grants” to public housing authorities. Today, we continue to focus on literacy. The National Literacy Act was recently reauthorized, as we say in Congress, in 2014 as a part of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. Then, in December, as was mentioned, we passed a law to fix No Child Left Behind. That included several references to encourage literacy, by innovative, competitive literacy programs, allowing states to use federal authorized state literacy resource centers, created national workforce demonstration projects for incarcerated individuals, and required “Gateway Grants” to public housing authorities.

We are all very fortunate that Barbara Bush is still as active in her pursuit of literacy for all as she used to be, and we honor her lifetime of work by gathering here for this conversation today. Last year, on her 90th birthday, she announced the $7 million Barbara Bush Adult Literacy XPRIZE. This global challenge receives teams from around the world to develop an app that will help people learn to read by just using their smartphones. And the money is currently offered to 15 countries working on this. Barbara has always been able to see what’s important, what endures—while also looking forward to the future with optimism and wit. It reminds me of the story that Jon Meacham tells in the biography of President H. W. Bush that I had mentioned earlier.

He writes of a “generational controversy” that Barbara Bush endured in May 1990. “Generational controversy” are Meacham’s words; he always comes up with good, big words. During the visit by Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife to the White House to see the President and Mrs. Bush. According to Meacham, “Mrs. Bush was invited by Wellesley College to speak at graduation and receive an honorary degree; the First Lady was being criticized by Wellesley’s young women, as President Bush put into his diary ‘because, as she passes through Wellesley, she’s where she is because she’s her husband’s wife. What’s wrong with the fact that she’s a good mother, a good wife, great volunteer for literacy and other fine causes? Nothing. But to listen to these elitist kids there is.’ ” Mrs. Bush invited [Mrs.] Gorbachev along with her to Wellesley. There, the First Lady confronted the issues of work versus family and the role of women head-on, delivering a well-received commencement address.” This is what Barbara Bush said: “Maybe we should adjust faster, maybe we should adjust slower,” she told the graduates. “But whatever the era, what we will never change: fathers and mothers. If you have children, they must come first. You must read to your children, and you must hug them. You must spend your time with your children. Your success as a family, our success as a society depends not on what happens in the White House, but on what happens inside your house.”

Meacham goes on, “She received her most sustained applause when she remarked that perhaps the most important audience that day who would like her, one day preside over the White House as the president’s spouse. ‘And I wish him well,’ she said, to cheers from the crowd.” So Barbara Bush, we wish you well on your 91st birthday and we’re grateful for your lifetime of commitment to our children, our country, and to literacy.

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL FELDMAN’S WHAD’YA KNOW

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today, I wish to commemorate Michael Feldman’s Whad’Ya Know, the live, 2-hour weekly Wisconsin public radio program as it nears the end of production after a tremendously entertaining 31-year run.

Michael, a Milwaukee native, University of Wisconsin graduate, and self-described “kosher beefcake,” created one of the most successful programs in WPR history. Broadcasting live from WPR’s Studio E at 900 Terrace in my hometown of Madison, WI, Michael and his team have found a home on Saturday morning in the hearts of millions of people. They have brought their listeners a uniquely Wisconsin blend of humor, taking us on a trip into the Whad’Ya Know world of comedy, satire, quizzes and interviews. From covering “all the news that isn’t” to delighting audiences across the country on his road show tours, Michael has established this show as a reason to get out of bed early on Saturday and a good excuse to put off shoveling snow.

I am pleased to honor the work of Michael Feldman and all who have contributed to the success of Whad’Ya Know. They should all be proud of the joy they have brought to so many. When asked about the show, Michael has commented, “It may be called Michael Feldman’s Whad’Ya Know, but it really is theTouches Who Listens And Comes To The Shows’s Whad’Ya Know.” With that being said, after Whad’Ya Know airs its final broadcast on June 25, 2016, Wisconsinites across the State will be missing a longstanding part of our community. We may laugh a little less, but we will never forget all the smiles he put on people’s faces.

It has been my delight to be a featured guest on Michael Feldman’s Whad’Ya Know several times, and I will appear for the last time on June 11, 2016. I wish Michael and the entire Whad’Ya Know staff all the best for their remaining shows and for their future plans.

Additional statements

TRIBUTE TO BOB BURG

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today I want to take a few minutes and recognize an outstanding achievement by one of my constituents, Mr. Bob Burg. His story offers us a good lesson about perseverance and the importance of lifelong learning. His story should inspire others.

After dropping out of school in the 11th grade, Mr. Burg went on to serve in the Air Force for 4 years. Following his service in the Air Force, he worked for 35 years in his family business. Eventually, Mr. Burg retired from that position saying, “I had nothing to do. I have plenty of hobbies, but you can only fill up your life so much with hobbies.” Instead, he felt that retirement left a void in his life, so Mr. Burg decided to fill the void by enrolling at the University of South Carolina in Columbia.

Mr. Burg, then age 74, said he wasn’t the best student in high school many years ago. In fact, he admitted his academic shortcomings in his younger days.

Mr. Burg also shared some humorous observations about what it was like to go back to college and be surrounded by fellow students several decades younger: “I walked into school and one of the young girls said, ‘Mr. Burg, are you over 60?’ I laughed and said ‘honey, you were in diapers when I turned 60.’ ”

Well, I am proud to report that Mr. Burg, now age 78, just graduated from the University of South Carolina with an Associate’s degree in history. His story serves as an example to us all that education, whether in life or the classroom, can be a lifelong endeavor.

In his nearly eighty decades of life he has earned many titles—veteran who served his Nation, valued employee in the family business, retiree, and now his newest title—college graduate.

Job well done, Mr. Burg.

TRIBUTE TO ANNE GRIFFITH AND RECOGNIZING MAINE’s LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMUNITY

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this past May, members of Maine’s law enforcement community gathered with the members of the public at Mount Hope Cemetery in Augusta to honor the more than 80 officers who have given their lives in the line of duty. In Maine, where we have more than 2,000 sworn police officers, this ceremony is both a longstanding and cherished tradition, and this year represented the 25th consecutive time that the Maine Chiefs of Police Association and the Maine Sheriffs Association
have come together in commemoration of their fallen brethren.

But for one person, this year’s ceremony also marked a different anniversary.

Anne Griffith, whom many of us know affectionately as Woolie, was just 3 years old when her father, Maine State trooper James “Drew” Griffith, was killed in a car accident while pursuing a speeding vehicle. I first met Woolie in the days that followed—at her father’s funeral, as she shared an experience that no child should have to and as I, then Governor, attempted to convey the deep gratitude of a State that mourned alongside her.

She was strong then, just as she is still now. Woolie is now 25 years old, and this year marks two decades since her father’s death—and in that time, she has grown into a wonderful young woman—raised by her mother, Maine Warden Chaplain Kate Braestrup.

In a remarkable testament to her fortitude and strength of character, Woolie several years ago made the conscious decision to follow in her father’s footsteps by entering the ranks of the Maine State police. Today, she serves as an investigative analyst for the Maine State Police Computer Crimes Unit, donning the same blue uniform once worn so proudly by her father; surrounded by many of the same dedicated public servants who stood beside him years ago.

Woolie spoke at the Maine Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Service in May. Her words were a powerful tribute to the law enforcement community, not only because they speak so well to the law enforcement community, but also because they so aptly capture the unfailing love and kindness that too often is overlooked today.

I deeply hope that future generations of Americans may look at her father’s life, her grief, and her tribute to him and to the law enforcement community and come to more deeply understand and appreciate the sacrifices of those who protect us every day.

Mr. President, I ask that Anne Griffith’s remarks at the Maine Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Service on May 19, 2016, be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

Good Hope Cemetery—Augusta, Maine

By Anne Griffith

Good morning.

My name is Anne Griffith. I am the youngest of four children of Maine Warden Chaplain Kate Braestrup and fallen Maine State Trooper Drew Griffith.

It is a privilege to stand with you, and honor my father today. On behalf of the families of the fallen, I thank you all for being here.

As the youngest of Drew’s children, I was three years old when my dad died, too young to form clear memories. I did not have much of a chance to experience him as a father, and my memories of him are vague and uncertain.

What I had, growing up, were stories—stories of his intelligence, his kindness, and his humor—to tell to me by those who had known him well: my mother, and my siblings of course, my family—my blond blue-eyed brother, and my blue family, too. Law enforcement officers who worked with Dad supported us, shared our sadness and kept us close over the years, caring for him by watching over us. They, too, gave me my father in stories.

And, so two decades later I am still a part of that blue family.

In 2014 I worked as a Reserve Patrol Officer. During this time, I thought often of my dad. I got a glimpse of him—his sorrows and satisfactions—through performing the tasks that he performed in life, handcuffs on offenders while they fought me.

I performed CPR on two victims and could not save them.

I helped in preventing the suicide of a mentally ill woman.

For the past year, I have worked as an Investigative Analyst for the Computer Crimes Unit. During this time I have assisted in a variety of cases from child pornography possession to child molestation offenses.

Because of the nature of my work for the Unit, I can definitively point to particular cases and know for certain that I made a difference in the outcome of the investigation.

There is a satisfaction in this that my father felt... and I have felt it, too.

I know there is no greater sense of honor and purpose than participating in the protection of innocent human lives. This is what my father did doing.

Besides working with an incredible team, I am fortunate to work closely with those who knew and loved my father—Lt. Glenn Lang who helped to carry his casket, Sgt. Laurie Northrup who once told me her last conversation with my dad was of how much he loved his work, Comp. Analyst Andrea Donovan, who worked as a State Police Dispatcher and heard my Dad sign on 10-6, and sign off 10-7.

I am able to know my father through them, just as they are able to know him through me.

April 15, 2016 marked the 20th Anniversary of my father’s line of duty death.

To mark the day, I went for a run.

A sergeant of the Maine State Police K9 Unit and a reserve member of the Maine State Trooper ran with me, in the area where I grew up and Dad’s patrol area.

We ended up at Marshall Point Lighthouse in Port Clyde, where a bench dedicated in my father’s name is placed. The sky was clear and the air was crisp with salt from the nearby ocean.

Neither the sergeant nor the brand-new trooper had ever shaken my father’s hand, or laughed at his jokes. Still, they are his family, they are his brothers. They ran with him by running with me.

The law enforcement family is large; it crosses state lines and international borders. Though my siblings and I lost our father, we did not lose our connection to his legacy; the family he became a part of when he joined the Maine State Police in 1966. I know who my father was because I know you—his brothers and family and sisters in uniform, intelligent, good-humored and kind—who continue to serve and protect the people of Maine and of the United States. In honoring my father today, I honor you. Thank you.

100th Anniversary of Sinclair Oil

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today, on behalf of myself and Senator Mike Crapo, I wish to recognize and celebrate the 100th anniversary of Sinclair Oil Corporation. A family-owned company, Sinclair Oil is one of the oldest continuously operated brands in the oil business.

On May 1, 1916, Harry F. Sinclair founded the Sinclair Oil and Refining Corporation. Three years later, the company had grown to four times its original size. In the 1920s, Sinclair introduced America to the “first modern service station,” providing people and families with a place to get an oil change, fix minor vehicle repairs, and public restrooms that motorists could use. By creating a modern service station, Sinclair paved the way for the American road trip.

The Great Depression was a time of growth for Sinclair Oil as they bought companies that were going under. If not for Sinclair, these companies would have completely disappeared, taking away countless jobs and revenue for communities that the Dinosaur became the company’s mascot and logo. To this day, Dino remains a visible fixture in Idaho and all across the Rocky Mountain region. During World War II, Sinclair supported the Allies with high-octane fuel, tankers, and more.

After Harry F. Sinclair retired as president in January 1949, the company had several different owners including Atlantic Richfield Company and PASCO, Inc., until 1976, when Robert Earl Holding acquired Sinclair Oil. Known for his steadiness and warmth, Earl Holding made Sinclair feel like a mom-and-pop business. Further testament to Earl Holding and his legacy, Dale Ensign, former executive president of Sinclair, once said “the employees learned over a period of time that he would do what he said he would do.”

Earl Holding was actively involved in the management and leadership of Sinclair Oil until 2009. Currently, the Holding family continues to own and run the business under the leadership of Mr. Ross Matthews, CEO and chairman of the board of Sinclair Oil Corporation.

Today Sinclair Oil Corporation includes more than 1,300 Sinclair-branded stations in 24 States, mostly west of the Mississippi River, and is the largest refinery operation in the Rocky Mountain region. In addition to being a fully integrated oil company, Sinclair also has hospitality and ranching ventures. In 1990, Dino became a visible fixture in Idaho and all across the Rocky Mountain region. During World War II, Sinclair supported the Allies with high-octane fuel, tankers, and more.

Today Sinclair Oil Corporation includes more than 1,300 Sinclair-branded stations in 24 States, mostly west of the Mississippi River, and is the largest refinery operation in the Rocky Mountain region. In addition to being a fully integrated oil company, Sinclair also has hospitality and ranching ventures. In 1990, Dino remained a visible fixture in Idaho and all across the Rocky Mountain region. During World War II, Sinclair supported the Allies with high-octane fuel, tankers, and more.

So today we recognize Sinclair Oil Corporation for achieving this historic 100-year milestone and applaud their entire community for the contributions they have made to Idaho and across our country throughout the years. 
TRIBUTE TO W. EDGAR WELDEN

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Edgar Welden of Birmingham, AL, for being named the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame’s 2016 “Distinguished American Sportsman.” Edgar is a distinguished businessman and friend whose life has been marked by selflessness of his community, State, and Nation. His untiring work to benefit young people through athletics makes him most deserving of this honor.

Edgar has an extraordinary record of accomplishment. A Wetumpka native, he grew up with a great passion for sports, playing football, baseball, and basketball in high school before earning a degree from the University of Alabama. His passion for athletics has only grown since then. In fact, he spent 1997 traveling to seven continents and all 50 states to attend more than 250 sporting events, and he chronicled his journeys in his book “Time Out! A Sports Fan’s Dream Year.”

One of his most valuable contributions to Alabama was his service as director of the important Alabama Development Office and the Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs. In the dual assistant to the Governor for Economic Affairs. He has been widely recognized as one of the key players in Governor Guy Hunt’s successful first term. This work for the State, performed on a volunteer basis, earned him recognition in 1987 by the Alabama Broadcasters Association as Alabama’s Citizen of the Year. In 1988, he was appointed by Governor Hunt as voluntary chairman of the Alabama Reunion, a 2-year statewide celebration and promotion of the State’s heritage and economic development opportunities. As the architect of this nationally recognized program, he was awarded the 1992 National Governor’s Association Award for Distinguished Service to State Government.

Despite his impressive accomplishments in government, business, and politics, it is through athletics that he has had perhaps his greatest influence. Edgar has a special place in his heart for young people, and with his keen insight, he has found ways to utilize athletics to promote character and education and improve the lives of young people across our State.

His accomplishments in this regard are too many to list comprehensively. His work with high school athletics includes the Crippled Children’s Foundation, where he currently serves as chairman, and the Monday Morning Quarterback Club, where he is a board member. In 2002, he founded the nonprofit Birmingham Athletic Partnership to support the city’s middle and high school athletic programs. This program has provided Birmingham city schools with over $3.5 million in financial support. Edgar believes that all young people should have the same chances for athletic success as better funded programs and his goal is to ensure their athletes, bands, and cheerleaders are able to compete on a level playing field. In addition, since 2003, he has served as the chairman and president of the hugely successful Bryant-Jordan Scholarship Program, which has awarded over $9 million college scholarships to more than 2,700 students who excel academically and athletically while overcoming adversity. In 2006, he was appointed by President George W. Bush to serve as a member of the President’s Council on Physical Fitness & Sports.

Edgar also serves as chairman of the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame Museum, a true State treasure which maintains for generations to come the stories of legendary Alabama athletes whose stories never fail to inspire us today. Many say it is the best sports hall of fame in America. And in a great victory for the city of Birmingham, he chaired the committee that landed the 2021 World Games. This was a huge effort for Edgar and he used all his energy and people skills to do so. He was inducted into the Alabama High School Sports Hall of Fame in 2007 and was recently elected to the board of directors of the National Football Foundation. Indeed, while he would never say so himself, perhaps no other sportman in the country has done more for their State than Edgar has for Alabama.

Edgar also serves on the president’s cabinet at the University of Alabama and, in 2010, was honored with the Distinguished Alumnus Award. He has accomplished all of this while building a successful business career in real estate development and property management. An essential part of his success has been the support and partnership of his wonderful wife, Louise. She is a star in her own right and has always enjoyed seeing young people grow and progress. They are a great pair. Edgar and Louise get great pleasure out of kindness. On a plane flight, Edgar met the wife of a soldier that was returning from combat—so typical of his generosity, Edgar arranged for them to have the honey-moon suite in his hotel for free. Edgar and Louise are people of generosity, patriotism, and positive spirit. To know Edgar and Louise is to love them.

For all of his accomplishments, I commend and congratulate my friend today. Being named to receive the Distinguished American Sportsman Award is a fitting honor indeed. It is appropriate that our Nation pauses periodically to recognize, celebrate, and give thanks to citizens like Edgar and Louise whose lives make our country so wonderful.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Nomar Garciaparra, clerk, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 87. An act to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Park-er’s Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 87. An act to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Park-er’s Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated
area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1815. An act to facilitate certain projects in a certain area of the United States, and to modify the boundaries of certain wilderness areas in the State of Nevada, and for the provision for the implementation of a plan for the Viper River, Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2009. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3070. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to permit striped bass fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zone transect zone between Montauk, New York, and Point Judith, Rhode Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4001. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue a directive on the management of software licenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4906. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees for appointment to a time-limited appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5273. An act to amend title XXVI of the Social Security Act to provide for regulatory relief under the Medicare program for certain providers of services and suppliers and increased transparency in hospital coding and enrollment data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5338. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide public notice of new and revised regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of the Congress for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and propriety during their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to continue to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5639. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5640. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “State Health Insurance Assistance Program (SHIP)” (RIN 0986–AA11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5641. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5642. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Form 10-K Summary” (RIN3235–L80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5643. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Definitions in the Export Administration Regulations” (RIN0991–AG32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5644. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 102nd Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for calendar year 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5645. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Nevada: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Program Revisions” (FRL No. 9947–28–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5646. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plan Revisions” (FRL No. 9947–27–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5647. A communication from the Chair, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Reports to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences: Fiscal Year (FY) 2015”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5648. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Energy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revised Benchmark Rebasings Methodology, Facilitating Transition to Performance-Based Risk, and Administrative Finality of Financial Calculations” (RIN0938–AS67) (CMS–1644–F) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5649. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Community Living, Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “State Health Insurance Assistance Program (SHIP)” (RIN0986–AA11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5650. 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 “Food Labeling: Revision of the Nutrition and Supplemental Facts Labels” (RIN0910–AF22) (Docket No. FDA–2012–N–1210) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5651. 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 “Mitigation Strategies to Protect Food Against Intentional Adulteration” (RIN0910–AG63) (Docket No. FDA–2013–N–1425) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

The following communications were received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5652. A communication from the Regulator 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 “Provider Certification Renewal” (RIN0986–AZ72) (Docket No. FDA–2013–N–2568) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5653. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Community Living, Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Administration for Community Living—Regulatory Consolidations” (45 CFR Parts 1212, 1212, 1224, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1237, 1237, 1238, 1386, 1397, and 1398) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5654. A communication from the Chair, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5655. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5656. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through
EC-5685. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program (RIN0651-AC99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5686. 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 “Extension of Interpretation Dates for Two Body System Listings” (RIN0060-A100) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5687. A communication from the Chief of the Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program (RIN0651-AC99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President on May 31, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5688. A communication from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Mailing Address of the Board of Veterans’ Appeals” (RIN2900-AP71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5689. A communication from the Director, Office of Outside Liaison, Department of Interior, National Science Foundation, Office of Inspector General, and Public Information, National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species: Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648-XE579) received during adjournment of the Senate on the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5690. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XE597) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5691. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Outside Liaison, Department of Interior, National Science Foundation, Office of Inspector General, and Public Information, National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XE597) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5692. A communication from the Deputy Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of the Interior’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5693. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5694. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5695. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Firearms License Proceedings—Hearings” (RIN1140-AA38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5696. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program (RIN0651-AC99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5704. A communication from the Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of the Commission’s Rules with Respect to Commercial Operations in the 2550–2650 MHz Band” ((FCC 16-55) (GN Dockets No. 14–189, 15–254)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5705. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XE623) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. 1835. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities to support the energy sector and the development of commercial and industrial sectors of the economy; to provide grants for the development of energy technology; to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish a program to improve the efficiency of energy use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 3030. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count resident time spent in a critical access hospital during times spent in a nonprovider setting for purposes of making Medicare direct and indirect graduate medical education payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 3031. A bill to require certain standards and enforcement provisions to prevent child abusers from obtaining firearms; to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study concerning the potential risks of firearms at public events; to require the Attorney General to report to Congress on the potential risks of firearms at public events; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HELMER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TILLS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BRAMMER, Mr. THUNE, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 3032. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2016, in the rates of compensation for federal non-work-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the

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. THUNE:

S. 3030. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count resident time spent in a critical access hospital during times spent in a nonprovider setting for purposes of making Medicare direct and indirect graduate medical education payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 3031. A bill to require certain standards and enforcement provisions to prevent child abuse and neglect in residential programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HELMER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TILLS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BRAMMER, Mr. THUNE, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 3032. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2016, in the rates of compensation for federal non-work-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the
At the request of Mr. Cardin, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Grassley) 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. 1738
At the request of Mr. Paul, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. Lee) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

S. 1555
At the request of Ms. Hirono, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1636
At the request of Mr. Merkley, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1636, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes.

S. 2590
At the request of Mr. Casey, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCaskill) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2590, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 2599
At the request of Mrs. McCaskill, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Menendez) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of hotel room rates, and for other purposes.

S. 2652
At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Blumenthal) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2652, a bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act.

S. 2707
At the request of Mr. Scott, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Cotton) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2707, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to nullify the proposed rule regarding defining and delimiting the exemptions for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees, to require the Secretary to conduct a full and complete economic analysis with improved economic data on small businesses, nonprofit employers, Medicare or Medicaid dependent health care providers, and small governmental jurisdictions, and all other employers, and minimize the impact on such employers, before promulgating any substantially similar rule, and to provide a rule of construction regarding the salary threshold exemption under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

S. 2773
At the request of Ms. Ayotte, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Kirk) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2773, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 3223
At the request of Mrs. Capito, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Portman) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3223, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the section 45 credit for refined coal from steel industry fuel, and for other purposes.

S. 3291
At the request of Ms. Ayotte, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Merkley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2890, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

S. 3293
At the request of Mr. Johnson, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Vitter) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Toomey) were added as cosponsors of S. 2912, a bill to authorize the use of unapproved medical products by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes.

S. 3297
At the request of Mr. Wyden, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2979, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require candidates of major parties for the office of President to disclose recent tax return information.

S. 3007
At the request of Mr. Cotton, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3007, a bill to prohibit funds from being obligated or expended to aid, support, permit, or facilitate the certification or approval of any new sensor for use by the Russian Federation on observation flights under the Open Skies Treaty unless the President submits a certification related to such sensor to Congress and for other purposes.

S. 3009
At the request of Ms. Ayotte, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3009, a bill to support entrepreneurs serving in the National Guard and Reserve, and for other purposes.

S. 3018
At the request of Mr. King, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Crapo)
was added as a cosponsor of S. 3018, a bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to identify security vulnerabilities of certain entities in the energy sector.

S. CON. RES. 36

At the request of Mr. Nelson, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) and the Senator from New York (Mr. Schumer) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 36, a concurrent resolution expressing support of the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in the remaining years and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to that goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

S. RES. 340

At the request of Mr. Casey, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Scott) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 340, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS or Da’esh) is committing genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes, and calling upon the President to work with foreign governments and the United Nations to provide physical protection for ISIS’ targets, to support the creation of an international criminal tribunal with jurisdiction to punish these crimes, and to use every reasonable means, including sanctions, to destroy ISIS and disrupt its support networks.

S. RES. 479

At the request of Mr. Markley, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. Shaheen) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 479, a resolution urging the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to comply with constitutional limits on presidential terms and fulfill its constitutional mandate for a democratic transition of power in 2016.

S. RES. 482

At the request of Mr. Rubio, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Coats) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and to increase pressure on the organization and its members to the fullest extent possible.

S. RES. 483

At the request of Mr. Alexander, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Corker) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 483, a resolution designating June 20, 2016, as “American Eagle Day” and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 4067

At the request of Mr. Nelson, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Donnelly), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Tillis), the Senator from Maine (Mr. King), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4067 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4092

At the request of Mr. Schatz, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cornyn) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4092 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4118

At the request of Mr. Perdue, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Isakson) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4118 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4120

At the request of Mr. Grassley, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Manchin) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4120 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4123

At the request of Mr. Gardner, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4129 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4136

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Enzi) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4136 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 479

At the request of Mr. Cassidy, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4145 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4158

At the request of Mr. Boozman, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. Capito) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4158 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4215

At the request of Mr. Reid, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Menendez) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4215 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4222

At the request of Ms. Murkowski, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4222 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4243

At the request of Mr. Markey, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4241 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4254

At the request of Ms. Ayotte, her name was added as a cosponsor of
amendment No. 4253 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4277**

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. Ernst) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4277 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4310**

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. Mikulski) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4310 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4325**

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Inhofe) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. Hatch) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4325 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4401**

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. Schumer) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4401 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4433**

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Brown), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCaskill), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. Murray), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Blumenthal) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4433 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.
for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4408**

At the request of Mr. Lee, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WURZBACHER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4408 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4402**

At the request of Mr. Heinrich, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Boozman) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4402 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4411**

At the request of Mr. Merkley, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4411 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4407**

At the request of Mr. Merkley, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Franken) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4407 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4403**

At the request of Mr. Cotton, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4403 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4502**

At the request of Ms. Murkowski, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Reed) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4502 intended to be proposed to S. 2943, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED**

**SA 4554.** Mr. Isakson submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

**SA 4555.** Mr. Lankford submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4556.** Mr. Cochrane submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4557.** Mr. Peters submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4558.** Ms. Hartzler submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4560.** Mr. Coats submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4561.** Mr. Barrasso submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4562.** Mr. Flake submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4563.** Mr. Scott submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4564.** Mr. Perdue submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4565.** Mr. Franken submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

**SA 4566.** Ms. Hirono submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4570. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4571. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4572. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4573. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4574. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4575. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4576. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4577. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4578. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4579. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4580. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4581. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4582. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4583. Mr. REID (for Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4584. Mr. Tester (for himself and Mr. Rounds) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4585. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4586. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4587. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4588. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4589. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4590. Mr. McCaskill (for herself and Mr. Blunt) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4591. Mr. Reed submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4592. Ms. Hirono (for herself and Mr. Rounds) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4593. Mr. Lee (for himself and Ms. Klobuchar) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4594. Mr. Graham (for himself and Mr. McCain) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4595. Mr. McCain submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4229 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4596. Mr. Wyden (for himself and Mr. Sanmar) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4597. Mr. boxer (for herself, Mrs. Shaheen, and Mr. Menendez) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4598. Mr. Schumer submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4599. Mr. Portman (for himself and Mr. Murphy) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4600. Mr. Cornyn submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4601. Mr. Rubio submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4602. Mr. Udall submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4603. Mr. Reid submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4554. Mr. Isakson submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X add the following:

SEC. 1097. ADVANCING RESEARCH FOR NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 399g-5 the following:

"SEC. 399g-5. ADVANCING RESEARCH FOR NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may improve the collection of epidemiological and surveillance data on neurological diseases (including, for purposes of this section, both neurological diseases and neurological conditions), which may include the incorporation of such data into a database, to facilitate research and improve public health, including, as appropriate, by leveraging existing surveillance activities and registries established under this Act.

"(b) CONTENT.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary—

"(1) shall provide for the collection and storage of information to better describe the incidence and prevalence of neurological diseases in the United States identified under paragraph (2);

"(2) shall initially identify and focus on up to five neurological diseases that available data indicate are the most prevalent or present a significant public health burden;

"(3) shall identify, build upon, leverage, and coordinate among existing data and surveillance systems, surveys, registries, and other existing Federal public health and infrastructure wherever possible;

"(4) shall ensure that any neurological disease surveillance activities conducted pursuant to this section, including any such registry, are designed in a manner that facilitates research on neurological diseases;

"(5) shall, to the extent practicable, provide for the collection and storage of information relevant to the identified neurological diseases, such as—

"(A) demographics, such as age, race, ethnic background, geographic location, and family history, and other information, as appropriate;

"(B) risk factors that may be associated with certain neurological diseases; and

"(C) diagnosis and progression markers;

"(6) may provide for the collection and storage of additional information relevant to research on neurological diseases, such as information regarding—

"(A) the natural history of the diseases;"
biomedical research as determined appropriate by the Secretary, to the extent permitted by applicable laws, and in a manner that protects personal privacy.

SEC. 807. ENSURING TRANSPARENCY IN ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement a policy that will ensure that acquisition programs of major systems establish cost, schedule, and performance goals at the onset of the program. The policy shall also ensure that acquisition programs of major systems report on the original cost, schedule, and performance goals throughout the program to ensure transparency.

(b) Major System Defined.—In this section, the term "major system" has the meaning given in section 2302d of title 10, United States Code.

SA 4555. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 407. ENSURING TRANSPARENCY IN ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement a policy that will ensure that acquisition programs of major systems establish cost, schedule, and performance goals at the onset of the program. The policy shall also ensure that acquisition programs of major systems report on the original cost, schedule, and performance goals throughout the program to ensure transparency.

(b) Major System Defined.—In this section, the term "major system" has the meaning given in section 2302d of title 10, United States Code.

SA 4556. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 775, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. 807. ENSURING TRANSPARENCY IN ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement a policy that will ensure that acquisition programs of major systems establish cost, schedule, and performance goals at the onset of the program. The policy shall also ensure that acquisition programs of major systems report on the original cost, schedule, and performance goals throughout the program to ensure transparency.

(b) Major System Defined.—In this section, the term "major system" has the meaning given in section 2302d of title 10, United States Code.

SA 4557. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 407. ENSURING TRANSPARENCY IN ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement a policy that will ensure that acquisition programs of major systems establish cost, schedule, and performance goals at the onset of the program. The policy shall also ensure that acquisition programs of major systems report on the original cost, schedule, and performance goals throughout the program to ensure transparency.

(b) Major System Defined.—In this section, the term "major system" has the meaning given in section 2302d of title 10, United States Code.

SA 4558. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 775, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. 807. ENSURING TRANSPARENCY IN ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement a policy that will ensure that acquisition programs of major systems establish cost, schedule, and performance goals at the onset of the program. The policy shall also ensure that acquisition programs of major systems report on the original cost, schedule, and performance goals throughout the program to ensure transparency.

(b) Major System Defined.—In this section, the term "major system" has the meaning given in section 2302d of title 10, United States Code.

SA 4559. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. NELSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 1097. REVIEW OF ILLNESSES AND CONDITIONS RELATED TO STATIONED AT CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS.

(a) Review and Publication of Illness or Condition.—Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:—

SEC. 3999. REVIEW AND PUBLICATION OF ILLNESSES AND CONDITIONS.

(a) In General.—Consistent with section 104i of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, shall—

(i) review the scientific literature relevant to the relationship between the employment or residence of individuals at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina for not fewer than 30 days during the period beginning on August 1, 1953, and ending on December 21, 1987, and specific illnesses or conditions incurred by those individuals;

(B) determine each illness or condition for which there is evidence that exposure to a toxic substance at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, during the period specified in subparagraph (A) may be a cause of the illness or condition; and

(C) with respect to each illness or condition for which a determination has been
made under subparagraph (B), categorize the evidence of the connection of the illness or condition to exposure described in that subparagraph as—

(i) evidence to conclude with reasonable confidence that the illness or condition is no longer related to exposure described in section 1710(e)(1)(F) of this title; or

(ii) evidence of causation relating to the illness or condition condition to exposure described in section 1710(e)(1)(F) of this title.''.

(2) publish in the Federal Register and on the Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services—

(A) the list of illnesses or condition for which a determination has been made under paragraph (1)(B), including the categorization of the evidence of causal connection relating to the illness or condition condition under paragraph (1)(C); and

(B) the bibliographic citations for all literature reviewed under paragraph (1) for each illness or condition listed under such paragraph; and

(3) update the list under paragraph (2), as applicable, to add an illness or condition for which the evidence of causation has been updated under paragraph (1)(B), including the categorization of the evidence of causal connection relating to the illness or condition condition under paragraph (1)(C), which was last updated consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR HEALTH CARE FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1710(e)(1)(F) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (xv) as subclauses (I) through (XV), respectively;

(B) by striking “(F) Subject to” and inserting “(i) Subject to”;

(C) by striking “any of the following” and inserting “any of the illnesses or conditions for which the evidence of connection of the illness or condition to exposure to a toxic substance at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, during such period is categorized as sufficient or modest in the most recent list published under section 399V-6(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act, which may include any of the following”;

and

(D) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

(ii) modest supporting causation, but not sufficiently to conclude with reasonable confidence that exposure is a cause of the illness or condition; or

(iii) no more than limited supporting causation;

(2) For the purposes of ensuring continuation of care, any veteran who has been furnished hospital care or medical services under this section for an illness or condition shall remain eligible for hospital care or medical services for such illness or condition notwithstanding that the evidence of connection of such illness or condition to exposure to a toxic substance at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, during such period is categorized as sufficient or modest in the most recent list published under section 399V-6(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act.”;

SEC. 1277. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE PALESTINIANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States Government has a longstanding position that a peaceful resolution of the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians can only be achieved through direct negotiations between the two parties.

(2) The Palestinian Authority has been pursuing a strategy to seek recognition of a Palestinian state through the United Nations, the United Nations affiliated organizations, and the United Nations affiliated conventions.

(3) On March 17, 2016, the “State of Palestine” became a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change effective immediately.

(4) Section 414 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246; 22 U.S.C. 287e note) states the following: “No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act shall be available for the United Nations or any affiliated organization which records the Palestine Liberation Organization the same standing as member states.”

(5) Section 410 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997 (Public Law 104-297; 22 U.S.C. 287e note) states the following: “The United States shall not make any voluntary or assessed contributions (1) to any affiliated organization of the United Nations which grants full membership as a state to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood; or (2) to the United Nations, if the United Nations grants full membership as a state in the United Nations to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood, during any period in which such membership is effective.”

(b) TREATIES. The provisions described in paragraphs (4) and (5) may not be waived.

(1) The administration of President Barack Obama has asserted that those provisions do not apply to the UNFCCC because, according to Department of State spokesman John Kirby, “The UNFCCC is an organization which the Palestinians’ purported ascension does not involve their becoming members of any U.N. specialized agencies. Indeed, any international organization...”

(2) Treaties can create international organizations, as demonstrated by the case of the Charter of the United Nations, which is a treaty that created the United Nations organization.

(3) Current United States law often treats entities created by international treaties as international organizations, such as the International Organizations Immunity Act (Public Law 79-281), under which the Executive branch has designated the International Boundary and Water Commission of the United States and Mexico, which was created by United States and Mexico international boundary treaties to assist in their implementation.

(4) The UNFCCC established an international organization based in Bonn, Germany that employs more than 400 people from over 100 countries and has an annual budget in excess of $60,000,000.

(5) The operating entities of the UNFCCC constitute an “affiliated organization of the United Nations” in that the UNFCCC Secretariat is connected and linked to the United Nations in many ways, including the following:

(A) The United Nations Secretary-General appoints the executive secretary of the UNFCCC secretariat.

(B) At the first Conference of the Parties, the UNFCCC decided that its secretariat “shall be institutionally linked to the United Nations”. According to the UNFCCC website, it remains “institutionally linked” today.

(C) The United Nations serves as Depository for the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement.

(D) The proposed budget of the United Nations for the biennium 2016–2017 supports the UNFCCC.

(E) The United Nations Campus in Bonn, Germany houses the UNFCCC secretariat, which the United Nations lists as one of 18 organizations that represent it and that are included in the “United Nations presence” in Bonn.

(F) The UNFCCC secretariat is subject to United Nations rules and regulations regarding membership and procedures.

(G) The UNFCCC secretariat supports what it describes as the “largest annual United Nations climate conference” in Bonn, Germany.
Nations conference,” which is the Conference of Parties.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) reaffirms its longstanding position that the only just path to resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is through direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians;

(2) reiterates its strong opposition to any attempt to establish or seek recognition of a Palestinian state outside of an agreement negotiated between leaders in Israel and the Palestinians;

(3) strongly opposes the unilateral actions of the Palestinians to seek statehood recognition through the United Nations, United Nations affiliated organizations, and United Nations treaties, conventions, and agreements;

(4) calls on the President to hold the Palestinian government to account for their failure to undermine and circumvent the peace process;

(5) strongly supports the prohibition on United States funding going to any United Nations affiliated organization that grants full membership as a state to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood; and

(6) reaffirms that, under United States law, the United States is prohibited from making any further contributions of United States funds to the UNFCCC secretariat, the Green Climate Fund, the Conference of the Parties, and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, after the “State of Palestine” was allowed to become a full member of the UNFCCC.

SA 4562. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection 1 of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. ACTIVE SHOOTER AND MASS CASUALTY INCIDENT RESPONSE ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the Attorney General and other Federal agencies as appropriate, shall develop and make available to State, local, tribal, territorial, private, and non-governmental partners guidance to assist in the development of response plans for active shooter and mass casualty incidents in publicly accessible spaces, including schools, places of worship, places of mass assembly, and public events, that have been identified by the Department of Homeland Security as potentially vulnerable targets.

(b) TYPES OF PLANS.—A response plan developed under subsection (a) with respect to a publicly accessible space may include the following elements:

(1) a strategy for evacuating and providing care to persons outside of the accessible space, with consideration given to the needs of persons with disabilities.

(2) a plan for establishing a unified command, including identification of staging areas for law enforcement, fire response, and medical personnel.

(3) a schedule for regular testing of equipment used to receive communications during an emergency.

(4) an evaluation of how communications placed by persons inside a publicly accessible space will reach rescue and other emergency personnel in an expedient manner.

(5) A practiced method and plan to communicate with occupants of the publicly accessible space.

(6) A practiced method and plan to communicate with the surrounding community regarding the incident and the needs of Federal, State, and local officials.

(7) A plan for coordinating with volunteer organizations to expedite assistance for victims.

(8) To the extent practicable, a projected maximum time frame for law enforcement response to active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target the publicly accessible space.

(9) A schedule for joint exercises and training.

SA 4565. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 528. CERTAIN BENEFITS IN CONNECTION WITH SERVICE IN THE SELECTED RESERVE FOR PREPAREDNESS MISSIONS IN SUPPORT OF COMBATANT COMMANDS.

(a) TRICARE BENEFITS BEFORE DEPLOYMENT.—Section 1074(d)(2)(B) of United States Code, is amended by striking “, or under section 12304 of this title.”, after “section 12731(a)(13)(B) of this title,” and inserting “,” after “section 12731(a)(13)(B) of this title,”.

(b) TRANSITIONAL HEALTH BENEFITS FOLLOWING DEMOBILIZATION.—Section 1143(a)(2) of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(G) A member who is separated from active duty after a period on active duty in excess of 30 days under an order to active duty under section 12304 or 12304b of this title.”;

(c) REDUCED ELIGIBILITY AGE FOR RECEIPT OF NON-REGULAR SERVICE RETIRED PAY.—Section 12731(f)(2)(B) of such title is amended by—

(1) redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively;

(2) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause (iii):

“(iii) Service on active duty described in this subparagraph is service on active duty after the date of the enactment of this clause under an order to active duty under section 12304b of this title.”; and

(3) in clause (iv), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by inserting “or (iii)” after “or in clause (ii)”.

(d) POST-911 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 3301(1)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “12302, or 12304” and inserting “12302, 12304, or 12304b”.

(e) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on December 31, 2011.

SA 4566. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1622. MARITIME INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE CAPABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) the interests of the United States or of any of our regional allies or

(2) to any funding appropriated for a fiscal year other than fiscal year 2017.

SA 4563. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 809. DEFINITION OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITION.—Section 103 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “customarily”; and

(ii) by striking “,” and inserting “,” or “; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “is of a type that” before “has been sold”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), by inserting “,” and the term “broad influence or preponderance of nongovernmental functions or essential physical characteristics” after “requirements.”

(b) RELATIONSHIP TO CERTAIN TITLE 10 PROVISIONS.—This section, and the amendments made by this section, shall not be construed as affecting—

(1) the meaning of the term “commercial item” under subsection (a)(5) of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, or any requirement under subsection (a)(3) or subsection (c) of such section;

(2) the percentage limitation under subsection (a) of section 2468 of title 10, United States Code, or the installation of parts as described under subsection (b)(2) of such section.

SA 4564. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1007. ACTIVE SHOOTER AND MASS CASUALTY INCIDENT RESPONSE ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the Attorney General and other Federal agencies as appropriate, shall develop and make available to State, local, tribal, territorial, private, and non-governmental partners guidance to assist in the development of response plans for active shooter and mass casualty incidents in publicly accessible spaces, including schools, places of worship, places of mass assembly, and public events, that have been identified by the Department of Homeland Security as potentially vulnerable targets.

(b) TYPES OF PLANS.—A response plan developed under subsection (a) with respect to a publicly accessible space may include the following elements:

(1) a strategy for evacuating and providing care to persons outside of the accessible space, with consideration given to the needs of persons with disabilities.

(2) a plan for establishing a unified command, including identification of staging areas for law enforcement, fire response, and medical personnel.

(3) a schedule for regular testing of equipment used to receive communications during an emergency.

(4) an evaluation of how communications placed by persons inside a publicly accessible space will reach rescue and other emergency personnel in an expedient manner.

(5) A practiced method and plan to communicate with occupants of the publicly accessible space.

(6) A practiced method and plan to communicate with the surrounding community regarding the incident and the needs of Federal, State, and local officials.

(7) A plan for coordinating with volunteer organizations to expedite assistance for victims.

(8) To the extent practicable, a projected maximum time frame for law enforcement response to active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target the publicly accessible space.

(9) A schedule for joint exercises and training.
The Navy is on the verge of deploying the Triton unmanned aircraft system (UAS) to the fleet. The Triton system performs maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) missions. The Air Force has already deployed a number of Global Hawk remotely piloted aircraft (RPA), from which the Triton system is derived.

The Navy should acquire maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities in an economical manner. If the Navy determines that the maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities currently planned for the Triton unmanned aircraft system are not sufficient to meet its emerging needs for such capabilities, the Navy should consider using off-the-shelf technologies to fill such needs.

The Navy plans to obtain such capabilities to address that requirement.

Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 757. REIMBURSEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO ENTITIES CARRYING OUT STATE VACCINATION PROGRAMS FOR COSTS OF VACCINES PROVIDED TO COVERED BENEFICIARIES.

(a) Reimbursement.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary of Defense shall reimburse an amount determined under paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 1069a of title 10, United States Code, as amended by the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senate to the bill S. 2943, for the costs of vaccines provided to covered beneficiaries.

(b) Report.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) An assessment of emerging threats for which maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities are a requirement.

(2) A description of the plans of the Navy to obtain such capabilities to address that requirement.

Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 506. MODIFICATION OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 506(b)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "if the Secretary" and all that follows and inserting "—".

(a) the person is an alien who was inspected and admitted at the time of entry into the United States, has been in the lawful immigration status (except temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a)), and

(b) the Secretary determines that such enlistment is vital to the national interest.

Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XXVIII, insert the following:

SEC. 28. ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION, EXPLOSIVES CLEANUP, AND SITE RESTORATION.

(a) In General.—As part of any land conveyance by the Army to a public or private entity, the Secretary of the Army shall carry out under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code, the activities described in subsection (b).

(b) Environmental Remediation, Explosives Cleanup, and Site Restoration Activities.—The activities described in this subsection include—

(1) environmental remediation activities, including—

(A) any corrective action required under a permit issued by the State in which the property is located pursuant to the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) relating to the property;

(B) any activity to be carried out by the entity pursuant to a consent agreement (including any amendments) between the entity and the State in which the property is located regarding Army activities at the property;

(C) the abatement of any potential explosive and ordnance conditions on the property;

(D) the demolition, abatement, removal, and disposal of any structure containing asbestos and lead-based paint, including the foundations, footing, and slabs of the structure, together with backfilling and seeding;

(E) the removal and disposal of any soil that contains a quantity of pesticide in excess of the standard of the State in which the property is located, together with backfilling and seeding;

(F) the design, construction, closure, and post-closure of any solid waste landfill facilities located on the property;

(G) lime sludge removal, disposal, and backfilling relating to any water treatment plant;

(H) the closure of any septic tank on the property;

(i) any financial assurance required in connection with the activities described in this paragraph; and

(2) site restoration activities, including—

(A) the collection and disposal of any solid waste that was present on the property before the date on which the Army conveys the land to the entity;

(B) the removal of any improvement to the property that was present on the property before the date on which the Army conveys the land to the entity, including buildings, roads, and other structures; and

(C) any impediments to redevelopment of the property arising from the use of the property by, or on behalf of, the Army or any contractor of the Army;
(D) any financial assurance required in connection with the activities described in this paragraph; and

(E) payment of the legal, environmental, and enforcement costs incurred by the entity for the analysis of the work necessary to complete the environmental remediation.

SA 4572. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 565. CONSOLIDATION OF FINANCIAL LITERACY PROGRAMS AND TRAINING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan for the consolidation of the financial literacy training programs of the Department of Defense and the military departments for members of the Armed Forces into a program of financial literacy training for members that—

(1) eliminates duplication and costs in the provision of financial literacy training to members; and

(2) ensures that members receive effective training in financial literacy in as few training sessions as is necessary for the receipt of effective training.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall commence implementation of the plan required by subsection (a) 90 days after the date of the submittal of the plan as required by that subsection.

SA 4573. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NEED TO ADDRESS THE NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) FINDING.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review concluded that—

(A) “[t]he impacts of climate change may increase the frequency, scale, and complexity of future missions, including defense support to civil authorities, while at the same time undermining the capacity of our domestic institutions to support training activities”; and

(B) the effects of climate change on severe weather, sea levels, and availability of fresh water represent “threat multipliers that will exacerbate conditions of poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions—conditions that can enable terrorist activity and other forms of violence”; and

(2) in the foreword to the 2014 Department of Defense Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap, former Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel wrote that climate change “has the potential to exacerbate many of the challenges we are dealing with today—from infectious diseases, rising global temperatures, changing precipitation patterns, climbing sea levels, and more extreme weather events to intensifying the challenges of political instability, hunger, poverty, and conflict”; and

(3) the 2014 Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap—

(A) found that the effects of climate change could cause instability around the world “by impairing access to food and water, damaging infrastructure, spreading disease, and increasing large numbers of people, compelling mass migration, interrupting commercial activity, or restricting electricity availability”; and

(B) judges that such developments could undermine already-fragile governments that are unable to respond effectively or challenge currently-stable governments, as well as increasing the threat between countries vying for limited resources; and

(4) the 2015 National Security Strategy states that “[w]e face an urgent and growing threat to our national security, contributing to increased natural disasters, refugee flows, and conflicts over basic resources like food and water”;

(5) the 2015 quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review asserts that “climate change exacerbates our greatest vulnerabilities”; and

(6) the 2013 Department of Homeland Security Climate Action Plan notes that—

(A) some weather effects related to climate change, such as warmer temperatures and increasingly severe storms, “may cause damage or disruptions to telecommunications systems, critical infrastructure systems for telecommunications infrastructure, emergency communications, and cybersecurity”; and

(B) “more extreme weather conditions in particular of the world with limited ability to provide state aid create opportunities for militant groups to become active in their communities”;

and

(C) “[c]limate change acts as a ‘threat multiplier,’ aggravating stressors abroad such as poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions—conditions that could enable terrorist activity and violence”;

(7) in February 2016, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate that—

(A) “[e]xtreme weather, climate change, environmental degradation, related rising demand for food and water, poor policy responses, and inadequate critical infrastructure probably will exacerbate—and potentially trigger—political instability, adverse health conditions, and humanitarian crises in 2016”; and

(B) “[e]ach of those developments, especially those in the Middle East, suggest that environmental degradation might become a more common source for interstate tensions”;

(8) Department of Defense Directive 7155.21 entitled “Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience” and promulgated in January 2016 states that—

(A) as a matter of policy, the Department of Defense “must be able to adapt current and future operations to address the impacts of climate change in order to maintain an effective and efficient U.S. military”; and

(B) all Department of Defense mission planning and execution must—

(i) include “identification and assessment of the effects of climate change on the DoD mission”;

(ii) take “climate effects into consideration when developing plans and implementing procedures”; and

(iii) anticipate and manage “any risks that development as a result of climate change to build resilience”;

(9) in the 2015 report to Congress entitled “National Security Implications of Climate Change and a Changing Climate”, the Secretary of Defense—

(A) acknowledged “the reality of climate change and the significant risk it poses to U.S. interests globally”; and

(B) recognized that—

(i) “[a] changing climate increases the risk of instability and conflict overseas, and has implications for DoD on operations, personnel, installations, and the stability, development, and human security of other nations”; and

(ii) global climate change will have wide-ranging implications for U.S. national security interests over the foreseeable future because it will aggravate existing problems—such as poverty, social tensions, environmental degradation, ineffective leadership, and weak political institutions—that threaten domestic stability in a number of countries;

(10) leading United States national security experts from both major political parties, including 12 former Senators and Representatives, 10 retired Admirals, the Chair and the Vice Chair of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (commonly referred to as the 9/11 Commission), Cabinet and Cabinet-level officials from the Carter, Reagan, George H. W. Bush, Clinton, George
W. Bush, and Obama Administrations, signed an open letter in October 2015, stating that climate change “is critically important to the world’s most experienced security planners. Real, and the costs of inaction are unacceptable. America’s elected leaders and private sector must think past tomorrow to focus on this growing problem, and take action and avoid the worst-case scenarios.”

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national security interests of the United States to assess, plan for, and take the necessary actions to reduce security and strategic implications of climate change.

SA 4575. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 896C. IMPROVED DEFENSE COOPERATION AND ACCESS TO COMMERCIAL TECHNOLOGY.

(a) COMPETITIVE PRICING DISCRETION IN FOREIGN MILITARY SALES CONTRACTS.—Section 22(d)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2762(d)(1)) is amended by striking “shall” and inserting “may, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense.”

(b) COMMERCIAL ITEM ITAR EXEMPTION.—Any commercial item as defined in section 103 of title 41, United States Code, that is incorporated in a defense product shall be regulated under the Export Administration Regulations (part 730 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations) and exempt from regulation under the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (subchapter M of chapter I of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations) unless the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State makes a written determination prior to incorporation of the commercial item in the defense product that the International Traffic in Arms Regulations should not apply.

(c) POST-EXPORT SUPPLY CHAIN TRANSFERS WITHIN NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIAL BASE COUNTRIES.—The government of a country that is part of the national technology industrial base (as that term is defined in section 2500 of title 10, United States Code) may transfer United States-origin material into that government’s supply chain without further United States Government approval or the need to comply with additional export licensing requirements provided that the material remains in the ownership of such government.

(d) INTEGRATION OF SUPPLY CHAIN WITHIN NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIAL BASE.—

(1) the company included on the list under paragraph (2) with facilities in both the United States and in a country that is part of the national technology industrial base (as that term is defined in section 2500 of title 10, United States Code) may transfer controlled material between a United States facility and a facility located in a national technology industrial base country without the need for United States Government approval or the need for an additional export control license. Any such transfer must comply with United States national security classification requirements.

(2) APPROVED COMPANY LIST.—The list referred to in paragraph (1) is a list maintained by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State of companies the Secretaries have determined are qualified for the streamlined transfer authority under such paragraph.

(e) NON-MISSILE TECHNOLOGY EXPORTS.—Export control policies, procedures, and practices specific to implementing the Missile Technology Control Regime shall not apply to the review and approval of exports of non-missile technologies such as unmanned aerial vehicles, non-missile space launchers, and commercial vehicles.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION OF TREATIES ON DEFENSE COOPERATION.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Department of State and the Department of Defense conduct a review of the exempted technologies lists that apply to the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Australia Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation, done at Sydney September 5, 2007, and the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation, done at Washington and London June 21 and 26, 2007, with the aim of reducing the applicable lists to the minimum compatible with international obligations.

(g) ENHANCING PROGRAM LICENSING.—Not later than September 30, 2018, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall establish a structure for implementing a revised program export licensing framework intended to provide comprehensive export licensing authority to support large international cooperative defense programs between multiple nations and determine what, if any, regulatory authorities require modification.

SEC. 897E. IMPROVEMENTS TO THE DEFENSE COOPERATION ACT.

(a) INCREASED FEES.—The fees described in section 22(d)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2762(d)(1)) are increased by $500,000.

(b) IMPROVEDどれの場合에도にリリースされるものでも옻기야요.
him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropria-
tions for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Depar-
tment of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Depar-
tment of Energy, to prescribe mili-
tary personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of subtitle B of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 926. PROHIBITION ON CONSOLIDATION OF UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND WITH ANY OTHER GEO-
GRAPHIC CONBATANT COMMAND.

No amounts authorized or appropriated by this Act, or amounts authorized to be ap-
propriated for the Department of Defense for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2017 that re-
mains available for obligation, may be used as follows:

(1) To consolidate the United States North-
ern Command with any other geographic combatant command.
(2) To subordinate the United States Northern Command to any other geographic combatant command.

SA 4580. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropria-
tions for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of subtitle B of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. PROVISION OF ACCESS BY EMPLOYEES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO CASE-TRACKING INFORMATION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AF-
FAIRS.

(a) In General.—Chapter 59 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 5906. Provision of access by employees of members of Congress to case-tracking information.

"(a) In General.—(1) Beginning not later
than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall provide to accredited, permanent Congressional employees who have successfully completed the certification process described in subsection (b)(1), upon election by the Member of Congress for which the employee works, read-only remote access to the electronic VBA claims records system record of veterans who reside in the area represented by the Member, regardless of whether such employee is acting under a power of attorney executed by such veteran.

(2) The Secretary shall ensure that access provided to an accredited, permanent Congressional employee under paragraph (1) is provided in a manner that does not allow the employee to modify the data contained in the electronic VBA claims records system.

(b) Certification Required.—(1) The cer-
tification process described in this paragraph is the certification process that the Sec-
retary requires an agent or attorney under this chapter to complete before the agent or attorney may access the electronic VBA claims records system.

(2) Each Member of Congress who elects to have an accredited, permanent Congress-
sional employee, as defined in section 217 of title 38, United States Code, pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall bear the cost of the certification process described in para-

graph (1), to be paid from the Member's Rep-
resentational Allowance.

(c) Treatment of Disclosure.—The ac-
cess to information by an accredited, perma-
nent Congressional employee pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall be deemed to be—

(1) a disclosure permitted under section 552(a)(b) of title 5, and
(2) a disclosure permitted under regula-
tions promulgated under section 26(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Account-
ability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191; 42 U.S.C. 15281 et seq.).

(d) Nonrecognition.—Nothing in this section shall prevent the Secretary from 
recognizing an accredited, permanent Con-
gressional employee with access to the electronic VBA claims records system under subsection (a).

SA 4581. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropria-
tions for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: On page 1049, strike lines 14 through 16 and insert the following:

"(c) Certification Required.—(1) The cer-
tification process described in this paragraph is the certification process that the Sec-
retary requires an agent or attorney under this chapter to complete before the agent or attorney may access the electronic VBA claims records system.

(2) Each Member of Congress who elects to have an accredited, permanent Congress-
sional employee, as defined in section 217 of title 38, United States Code, pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall bear the cost of the certification process described in par-

graph (1), to be paid from the Member's Rep-
resentational Allowance.

(c) Treatment of Disclosure.—The ac-
cess to information by an accredited, perma-
nent Congressional employee pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall be deemed to be—

(1) a disclosure permitted under section 552(a)(b) of title 5, and
(2) a disclosure permitted under regula-
tions promulgated under section 26(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Account-
ability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191; 42 U.S.C. 15281 et seq.).

(d) Nonrecognition.—Nothing in this section shall prevent the Secretary from 
recognizing an accredited, permanent Con-
gressional employee with access to the electronic VBA claims records system under subsection (a).

SA 4582. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amend-
ment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropria-
tions for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Depart-
ment of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 590. REVIEW REGARDING AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO CERTAIN ASIAN AMERICAN AND NATIVE AMERICAN PACIFIC ISLANDER WAR VETERANS.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of each service shall review the service records of each Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander war veteran who was awarded the Distinguished-Service Cross, the Navy Cross, or the Air Force Cross during the Korean War or the Vietnam War.

(b) COVERED VETERANS.—The Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander war veteran whose service records are to be reviewed under subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Any Asian American or Native American Pacific Islander war veteran who was awarded the Distinguished-Service Cross, the Navy Cross, or the Air Force Cross during the Korean War or the Vietnam War.

(2) Any other Asian American or Native American Pacific Islander war veteran whose name is submitted to the Secretary concerned for such purpose before the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) CONSULTATIONS.—In carrying out the review under subsection (a), the Secretary of each service shall consult with such veterans service organizations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON REVIEW.—If the review conducted under subsection (a) is completed during the fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, submit to the Congress a report setting forth a plan to ensure appropriate staffing and operation of the Army Child Development Center adjacent to the campus of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency in Springfield, Virginia.

SA 4584. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2443, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle P of title V, add the following:

SEC. 583. REPORT ON PLAN FOR STAFFING AND OPERATION OF THE ARMY CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER, SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a plan to ensure appropriate staffing and operation of the Army Child Development Center adjacent to the campus of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency in Springfield, Virginia.

SA 4585. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2443, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1224. SALE OF MULTIROLE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT TO BAHRAIN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Actions taken by the Administration have unduly delayed the export of multirrole fighter aircraft to Bahrain.

(2) Continued defense security cooperation and assistance with Bahrain are critical to security cooperation between the United States military to address past and current threats from Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, international terrorism, and piracy and smuggling in the Gulf and Arabian Sea.

(3) Bahrain has made several of its military facilities available for use by the United States military to address past and current threats from Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, international terrorism, and piracy and smuggling in the Gulf and Arabian Sea.

(4) Outdated Bahraini F-16 aircraft lack certain capabilities, and this limits their utility in coalition operations.

(5) For several years, Bahrain has expressed interest in upgrading its existing fleet of 20 F-16 Block 40 aircraft with advanced capabilities, including Active Electronically Scanned Array radars.

(6) Bahrain submitted formal Letters of Request for these upgrades, as well as for the sale of a comparable number of new F-16 aircraft in November 2015.

(7) The upgrade and sale of F-16 aircraft to Bahrain will help advance military-to-military cooperation between the United States and Bahrain.

(8) Recent inroads by European and Russian manufacturers of competitor aircraft in
the region have the potential to erode United States military-to-military relations with Bahrain, and these potential erosions deepen regional concerns over United States policy in the Middle East generally and towards Iran specifically.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the current bilateral relationship between the United States and Bahrain is critical to maintaining stability in the Middle East, countering the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and other terrorist threats, and countering Iran and its regional proxies;

(2) Bahrain and the United States share a mutual commitment to regional security, counterterrorism efforts, and related coalition operations; and

(3) the Bahraini air force needs additional advanced multirole fighter aircraft in order to modernize its fleet and participate in regional security initiatives and counter-Islamic State of Iraq and Syria campaigns.

(c) SALE OF MULTROLE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT.—The President shall carry out the sale of all pending foreign military sales of F-16 fighter aircraft and related upgrades of existing aircraft to Bahrain by not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4586. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mrs. FeINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. COMMERCIAL GAMING NOT LOCATED ON INDIAN LAND.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the amendment made by subsection (b) is to ensure that the rights, processes, and provisions of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) are used exclusively to provide for the regulation of noncommercial gaming by Indian tribes on Indian lands (as those terms are defined in section 4 of that Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

(b) COMMERCIAL GAMING.—Section 11(d)(8) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2710(d)(8)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

"(C)(i) Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall approve a compact, or an amendment to a compact, described in subparagraph (B), if the compact or amendment authorizes, approves, or aids, directly or indirectly, in the authorization or approval of a commercial gaming activity—

"(1) that is located on Indian lands; and

"(ii) A compact or an amendment to a compact disapproved under clause (i) shall not take effect."

SA 4587. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. McCaIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1114. PILOT PROGRAM ON APPOINTMENT OF DISQUALIFIED FORMER CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN IN THE EXCEPTED SERVICE.

(a) PILOTS PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—Each Secretary of a military department may carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and appropriateness of appointing to an excepted service former cadets or midshipmen who—

(1) graduated from a military academy service or a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program; and

(2) are medically disqualified for appointment—

(i) as a commissioned officer and fulfilling an active duty service obligation arising from such commission or midshipmen at such academy or through such a program.

(b) EMPLOYMENT.—Under a pilot program, the Secretary of the military department concerned—

(1) may, without regard to any provision of title 5, United States Code, authorize appointment of employees to competitive service positions within the Department of Defense, to a position within the Department in the excepted service an individual who meets the eligibility criteria of subsection (c); and

(2) may, upon satisfactory completion of two years of active duty military service by an incumbent who was appointed to an excepted service position under the authority of paragraph (1), convert the appointment of such individual, without competition, to a career or career conditional appointment.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—Any former cadet or midshipman is eligible for appointment under a pilot program only if—

(1) the former cadet or midshipman was previously under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the military department concerned;

(2) the former cadet or midshipman completed the prescribed course of instruction and graduated from a military service academy or a Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps program;

(3) the former cadet or midshipman is determined to be medically disqualified to complete a period of active duty prescribed in an agreement signed by such cadet or midshipman in accordance with section 4348, 6959, 8394, or 2107 of title 10, United States Code, as applicable; and

(4) the medical disqualification is not the result of the gross negligence or misconduct of the cadet or midshipman.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO REPAYMENT PROVISIONS.—

(1) SATISFACTION OF OBLIGATION.—A former cadet or midshipman shall be treated as relieved of any repayment obligation under section 303(a)(c) or 373 of title 37, United States Code, in connection with the failure of the cadet or midshipman to accept appointment as a commissioned officer and fulfill an active duty service obligation as described in subsection (a)(1) of title V, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 568. REPORT ON EVALUATION AND OVERSIGHT OF THE SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS’ TRAINING CORPS PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, submit to Congress a report on the manner in which the Department of Defense intends—

(1) to improve the oversight and accountability of the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC) programs; and

(2) to ensure that the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces, and Congress have a comprehensive understanding whether particular programs are achieving desired results before decisions to close or terminate such programs are undertaken.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of—

(A) existing Department of Defense processes to evaluate the performance of the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs;

(B) the clarity of goals and objectives for the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs;

(C) the frequency of evaluation of the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs;

(D) the adequacy of the oversight roles and responsibilities outlined in Department of Defense Instruction Number 1215.08, dated June 26, 2006; and

(E) the efforts undertaken by the Armed Forces to effectively communicate evaluations of the performance of the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs to
Congress and other key stakeholders before decisions to close or terminate particular programs are undertaken.

(2) A description of—

(A) the goals and objectives of the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs;

(B) officer output requirements under the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs, set forth by institution of higher education concerned;

(C) attrition rates under the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs, set forth by institution of higher education concerned;

(D) the characteristics of quality officers graduated from Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs; and

(E) the current timeline for any anticipated closure or termination of a Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps program.

(3) A detailed plan for—

(A) improving the oversight and accountability of the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs; and

(B) ensuring the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces, and Congress have a comprehensive understanding whether particular Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps programs are achieving desired results before decisions to close or terminate such programs are undertaken.

SA 4589. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1097. RECONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS FOR DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS WHO WERE THE SUBJECTS OF MUSTARD GAS OR LEWISITE EXPERIMENTS DURING WORLD WAR II.

(a) RECONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS FOR DISABILITY COMPENSATION IN CONNECTION WITH EXPOSURE TO MUSTARD GAS OR LEWISITE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall reconsider all claims for compensation described in paragraph (2) and make a new determination regarding each such claim.

(2) CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION DESCRIBED.—Claims for compensation described in this paragraph are claims for compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determined are in connection with exposure to mustard gas or lewisite during active military, naval, or air service during World War II and that were denied before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) PRESUMPTION OF EXPOSURE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), if the Secretary of Veterans Affairs makes a determination whether a veteran who has filed a claim for compensation described in paragraph (2) has experienced full-body exposure to mustard gas or lewisite, such Secretary—

(A) shall presume that the veteran experienced full-body exposure to mustard gas or lewisite, as the case may be, unless proven otherwise; and

(B) may not use information contained in the DoD and VA Chemical Biological War- fare Database on known testing sites for mustard gas or lewisite maintained by the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Defense as the sole reason for determining that an experiment described in subsection (c)(2)(A) occurred, in connection with exposure to mustard gas or lewisite during active military, naval, or air service during World War II.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report specifying any claims reconsidered under paragraph (1) that were denied during the 90-day period preceding the submittal of the report, including the rationale for each such denial.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly establish a policy for processing future claims for compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines are in connection with exposure to mustard gas or lewisite during active military, naval, or air service during World War II.

(c) INVESTIGATION AND REPORT BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) for each such experiment, investigate and make a determination whether a site should be added to the list of the Department of Defense of sites where mustard gas or lewisite testing occurred, investigate and assess sites where—

(A) the Army Corps of Engineers has uncovered evidence of mustard gas or lewisite testing occurred, or

(B) more than two veterans have submitted claims for compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, in connection with exposure to mustard gas or lewisite at such site and such claims were denied; and

(2) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on experiments conducted by the Department of Defense during World War II to assess the effects of mustard gas and lewisite on people, which shall include—

(A) a list of each location where such an experiment occurred, including locations investigated and assessed under paragraph (1);

(B) the dates of each such experiment; and

(C) the number of members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to mustard gas or lewisite in each such experiment.

(d) INVESTIGATION AND REPORT BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) investigate and assess—

(A) the actions taken by the Secretary to reach out to individuals who had been exposed to mustard gas or lewisite in the experiments described in subsection (c)(2)(A); and

(B) the locations of the claims for disability compensation under laws administered by the Secretary that were filed with the Secretary and the percentage of such claims that were denied by the Secretary; and

(2) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress—

(A) a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the investigations and assessments carried out under paragraph (1); and

(B) a comprehensive list of each location where an experiment described in subsection (c)(2)(A) was conducted.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) The terms “active military, naval, or air service”, “veteran”, and “World War II” have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(3) The term “full-body exposure”, with respect to mustard gas or lewisite, has the meaning given that term by the Secretary of Defense.

SA 4591. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2826. LIMITATION OF CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY AT NAVAL STATION NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act may be obligated or expended to convey the property or other real property at Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island.
disposal of real property by the Department of the Navy at Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island, unless such property is first offered for conveyance to relevant State and local jurisdictions.

SA 4592. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1216. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE ADVICE OF MILITARY COMMANDERS TO ENHANCE SECURITY AND STABILITY IN AFGHANISTAN AFTER 2016 ARE CONDITIONS-BASED.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States vowed to hold those responsible for the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks accountable, and seeks to ensure that terrorists never again use Afghan soil to plot an attack on another country.

(2) Following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States decisively expelled the Taliban from control of Afghanistan and sought to promote a multilateral agenda to stabilize and reconstruct Afghanistan and rebuild its institutions and economy.

(3) The United States and Afghanistan signed a Bilateral Security Agreement (BSA) and Strategic Partnership Agreement, on September 28, 2014, for an enduring commitment between the Government of the United States and the Government of Afghanistan to enhance the ability of the Government of Afghanistan to deter internal and external threats against its sovereignty.

(4) The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) has metastasized beyond the borders of Iraq and Syria, announcing its formation on January 10, 2015, in Afghanistan where it carries out bombings, small arms attacks, and kidnappings against civilians and security forces in a number of provinces.

(5) On September 23, 2015, Taliban fighters took over the city of Kunduz, Afghanistan, after government forces fully retreated, giving the insurgents a military and political victory that had evaded them since 2001.

(6) Since the beginning of 2016, current Commander of Resolute Support and United States Forces-Afghanistan, General John W. Nicholson Jr., former Commander of Resolute Support and United States Forces-Afghanistan, General John F. Campbell, and current Commander of United States Central Command, General Joseph L. Votel—the senior military commanders closest to the fight—have testified that the security situation in Afghanistan is deteriorating and support a withdrawal of United States forces from Afghanistan only when conditions warrant.

(7) On April 19, 2016, the Taliban carried out a suicide bomb and gun assault on a government security building in Kabul, Afghanistan, killing 80 and wounding more than 320, marking the single deadliest attack in the capital of Afghanistan since 2011.

(8) In the first three months of 2016, the United Nations reported that Afghanistan documented 600 civilian deaths and 1,343 wounded, with at least one-third of the casualties being children.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) the future trajectory of security and stability in Afghanistan is contingent upon the proper force levels of the United States and coalition partners, which must be conditions-based;

(2) adjustments to force levels in Afghanistan should be made with all due consideration to the assessment and advice of military commanders on the ground;

(3) decisions on force levels in Afghanistan should take into account the capabilities required to preserve and build upon hard-fought gains achieved over the last 15 years;

(4) United States force levels in Afghanistan should be determined in a timely manner and made known to allies and partners to afford adequate planning and force generation lead times;

(5) the United States must continue its efforts to train and advise the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) in warfighting functions so that they are capable of defending their country and ensuring that Afghanistan never again succumbs to the fate of being a terrorist safe-haven for groups like the Taliban, al Qaeda, and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL);

(6) the United States must continue, in conjunction with the Afghan National Security Forces, to operate a robust counterterrorism force to deal with evolving and immediate threats to the national security interests of the United States;

(7) the decision of the President in October 2015 to maintain the current United States force level of 9,800 members of the Armed Forces in Afghanistan was in the national security interests of the United States; and

(c) PROHIBITION.—The Senate prohibits, if the President decided to maintain the current level of United States forces in Afghanistan and adjust such level based on conditions on the ground.

SA 4595. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCAINE to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, line 5, strike “$7,200,000” and insert “$8,700,000”.

SEC. 1216. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE ADVICE OF MILITARY COMMANDERS TO ENHANCE SECURITY AND STABILITY IN AFGHANISTAN AFTER 2016 ARE CONDITIONS-BASED.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States vowed to hold those responsible for the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks accountable, and seeks to ensure that terrorists never again use Afghan soil to plot an attack on another country.

(2) Following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States decisively expelled the Taliban from control of Afghanistan and sought to promote a multilateral agenda to stabilize and reconstruct Afghanistan and rebuild its institutions and economy.

(3) The United States and Afghanistan signed a Bilateral Security Agreement (BSA) and Strategic Partnership Agreement, on September 28, 2014, for an enduring commitment between the Government of the United States and the Government of Afghanistan to enhance the ability of the Government of Afghanistan to deter internal and external threats against its sovereignty.

(4) The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) has metastasized beyond the borders of Iraq and Syria, announcing its formation on January 10, 2015, in Afghanistan where it carries out bombings, small arms attacks, and kidnappings against civilians and security forces in a number of provinces.

(5) On September 23, 2015, Taliban fighters took over the city of Kunduz, Afghanistan, after government forces fully retreated, giving the insurgents a military and political victory that had evaded them since 2001.

(6) Since the beginning of 2016, current Commander of Resolute Support and United States Forces-Afghanistan, General John W. Nicholson Jr., former Commander of Resolute Support and United States Forces-Afghanistan, General John F. Campbell, and current Commander of United States Central Command, General Joseph L. Votel—the senior military commanders closest to the fight—have testified that the security situation in Afghanistan is deteriorating and support a withdrawal of United States forces from Afghanistan only when conditions warrant.

(7) On April 19, 2016, the Taliban carried out a suicide bomb and gun assault on a government security building in Kabul, Afghanistan, killing 80 and wounding more than 320, marking the single deadliest attack in the capital of Afghanistan since 2011.

(8) In the first three months of 2016, the United Nations reported that Afghanistan documented 600 civilian deaths and 1,343 wounded, with at least one-third of the casualties being children.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) the future trajectory of security and stability in Afghanistan is contingent upon the proper force levels of the United States and coalition partners, which must be conditions-based;

(2) adjustments to force levels in Afghanistan should be made with all due consideration to the assessment and advice of military commanders on the ground;

(3) decisions on force levels in Afghanistan should take into account the capabilities required to preserve and build upon hard-fought gains achieved over the last 15 years;

(4) United States force levels in Afghanistan should be determined in a timely manner and made known to allies and partners to afford adequate planning and force generation lead times;

(5) the United States must continue its efforts to train and advise the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) in warfighting functions so that they are capable of defending their country and ensuring that Afghanistan never again succumbs to the fate of being a terrorist safe-haven for groups like the Taliban, al Qaeda, and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL);

(6) the United States must continue, in conjunction with the Afghan National Security Forces, to operate a robust counterterrorism force to deal with evolving and immediate threats to the national security interests of the United States;

(7) the decision of the President in October 2015 to maintain the current United States force level of 9,800 members of the Armed Forces in Afghanistan was in the national security interests of the United States; and

(c) PROHIBITION.—The Senate prohibits, if the President decided to maintain the current level of United States forces in Afghanistan and adjust such level based on conditions on the ground.

SA 4596. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCAINE to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, line 5, strike “$7,200,000” and insert “$8,700,000”.

SA 4594. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 341. FULL FAITH AND CREDIT GRANTED TO OCCUPATIONAL LICENSES AND CERTIFICATIONS ISSUED BY STATES FOR PURPOSES OF ACTIVITIES ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Government shall provide full faith and credit to an occupational license or certification granted by a State for the purpose of establishing an individual’s authorization to engage in the occupation on a military installation located on land owned or controlled by the Federal Government, provided that the license or certification is not expired, revoked, or suspended by the issuing State, and provided that there are no outstanding enforcement actions against the individual brought by the licensing board or certifying authority for that occupation in the issuing State.

(b) SCOPE OF PRACTICE.—An individual relying on subsection (a) for authorization to engage in an occupation is authorized to sell those goods and services covered by the occupation’s certification.

(c) STATUTE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “State” includes the District of Columbia.

SEC. 1004. ENCOURAGEMENT OF IMPROVEMENT OF ABILITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO MAINTAIN CLEAN AUDIT OPINIONS.

(a) FINANCIAL AUDIT INCENTIVE FUND.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a fund to be known as the “Financial Audit Incentive Fund” (in this section referred to as the “Fund”) for the purpose of encouraging the organizations, components, and elements of the military departments to maintain unmodified audit opinions.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available to the military departments to address readiness funding shortfalls for operational training exercises, including hazardous area training, advanced level or equivalent training, or joint exercises directed by combatant commanders.
(2) TRANSFERS FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund may be transferred to any other account of a military department in order to fund training described in paragraph (1). Any amounts transferred from the Fund to an account shall be merged with amounts in the account to which transferred and shall be available subject to the same terms and conditions applicable to such amounts. The authority to transfer amounts under this paragraph is in addition to the authority of the Secretary to transfer amounts by law.

(3) LIMITATION.—Amounts in the Fund may be transferred to an organization only to organizations components, and elements of the military departments that have a current unmodified opinion of its statement of budgetary resource expenditures in the audit opinions available until expended. The authority to transfer amounts under this paragraph is in addition to the authority of the Secretary to transfer amounts by law.

(c) TRANSFERS TO FUND IN CONNECTION WITH ORGANIZATIONS NOT HAVING ACHIEVED QUALIFIED AUDIT OPINIONS.—

(1) REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AVAILABLE.—Subject to paragraph (2), if during any fiscal year after fiscal year 2012 the Secretary determines that an organization, component, or element of the Department of the Army has not achieved a qualified opinion of its statement of budgetary resource expenditures, the authority to transfer amounts in the Fund to such organization, component, or element for the fiscal year, and for purposes specified in paragraph (1), shall be equal to

(i) the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such organization, component, or element for the fiscal year; or

(ii) the lesser of—

(I) an amount equal to 0.5 percent of the amount described in clause (i); or

(II) $100,000,000; and

(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO AMOUNTS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL.—Any reduction applicable to an organization, component, or element of the Department under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall not apply to amounts, if any, available to such organization, component, or element for the fiscal year for military personnel.

SA 4597. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 127. OFFICE OF GLOBAL WOMEN’S ISSUES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State shall establish the Office of the Secretary of State an Office of Global Women’s Issues in the Under Secretary for Political Affairs. The Office shall be headed by an Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women’s Issues, who shall be appointed by the President. The Office shall be subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. The Ambassador-at-Large shall report directly to the Secretary and shall have the rank and status of Ambassador-at-Large.

(b) PURPOSE.—In addition to the duties described in subsection (c) and those duties determined by the Secretary of State, the Ambassador-at-Large shall coordinate efforts of the United States Government, as directed by the Secretary, in coordination with the Governments of women and girls in United States foreign policy.

(c) DUTIES.—The Ambassador-at-Large—

(1) shall serve as the principal advisor to the Secretary for the promotion of gender equality, women’s empowerment, and violence against women and girls as a foreign policy matter;

(2) shall be responsible for representing the United States in diplomatic and multilateral fora on matters relevant to the status of women and girls;

(3) shall advise and provide input to the Secretary on all activities, programs, policies, and funding relating to gender equality and the advancement of women and girls internationally for all bureaus and offices of the Department of State and in the international programs of all other Federal agencies;

(4) shall work to ensure that efforts to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment are fully integrated into the programs, structures, processes, and capacities of all areas of operation of the Department of State and in the international programs of other Federal agencies;

(5) shall direct, as appropriate, United States Government agencies to respond to the United States Government’s needs for gender integration and empowerment of women in United States Government foreign policies and international programs;

(6) may design, develop, and implement activities regarding empowerment of women internationally; and

(7) shall conduct regular consultation with civil society organizations working to advance gender equality and empower women and girls internationally.

SA 4598. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle I—Countering Foreign Propaganda and Disinformation Act

SEC. 128. TESTING AND INTEGRATION OF MINEHUNTING SONARS FOR LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP MINE HUNTING CAPABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of the Navy has determined that the Remote Minehunting System (RMS) has not performed satisfactorily.

(2) On February 26, 2016, Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus stated that new testing must be done to find a reliable solution to the mine countermeasures mission package and that the Navy wants to “get it out there as quickly as you can and test it in a more realistic environment”.

(3) There are several mature unmanned surface vehicle-towed and unmanned under-water vehicle-based synthetic aperture sonar (SAS) sensors in use by the Department of Defense and navies of allied nations.

(4) SAS sensors could provide a technology that would reinforce the littoral Combat Ship (LCS) minehunting area clearance rate sustained requirement.

(b) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Navy shall authorize at-sea testing of a range of sonar technologies to determine which systems can meet the requirements of the Navy LCS mine countermeasure mission package (MCM MP).

SA 4599. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 129. CENTER FOR INFORMATION ANALYSIS AND RESPONSE

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall establish a Center for Information Analysis and Response in the Department of Defense (the “Center”). The purposes of the Center are—

(1) to coordinate the sharing among government agencies of information on foreign government information warfare efforts, including information provided by recipients of information access fund grants awarded under this Act, and appropriate classification guidelines; and

(2) to establish a process for integrating foreign information operations into international strategy;

(3) to develop, plan, and synchronize international military activities to expose and counter foreign information operations directed against United States national security interests and advance narratives that support United States national security interests;

(4) to provide for the sharing among government agencies of information on foreign information operations directed against United States national security interests and advance narratives that support United States national security interests; and

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Center shall carry out the following functions:

(1) to conduct an assessment of the capabilities of current United States Navy minehunting sonars and in-production SAS sensors available for integration in the LCS MCM MP; and

(2) to conduct an assessment of the capabilities of current United States Navy minehunting sonars and in-production SAS sensors available for integration in the LCS MCM MP; and

(3) to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the capabilities of current United States Navy minehunting sonars and in-production SAS sensors available for integration in the LCS MCM MP; and

(4) to develop, plan, and synchronize international military activities to expose and counter foreign information operations directed against United States national security interests and advance narratives that support United States national security interests.
(C) PARTICIPATION AND INDEPENDENCE.—The Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall not compromise the journalistic freedom or integrity of relevant media organizations. Journalists may be invited to participate in the Steering Committee at the discretion of the Chairman of the Steering Committee and with the consent of the Government of the United States.

(3) SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY.—

(A) LIMITATION ON SCOPE.—The delegated responsibility provided pursuant to paragraph (1) may not extend beyond the requirements for successful implementation of the mission and strategy described in that paragraph if such determination is that there is a compelling case that executing such activities would do undue harm to other missions of national importance to the United States.

(B) APPEAL OF EXECUTION OF ACTIVITIES.—

The head of any department, agency, or other element of the United States Government may appeal to the President a determination of the official designated pursuant to paragraph (1) for activities otherwise in support of the mission and strategy described in that paragraph.

(4) TARGETED FOREIGN AUDIENCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The activities under this subsection of the Center described in paragraph (1) shall be directed at influence foreign audiences. No funds for the activities of the team under this section may be used with the intent to influence public opinion in the United States.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit the secret service or any other department or agency of the United States Government, a State or political subdivision of a State, the President, a political party, or any forum under the laws of the United States to engage in activities intended to influence public opinion in the United States.

(5) FACILITATING THE USE OF A WIDE RANGE OF TECHNOLOGIES AND PLATFORMS.—The activities of the Center under this subsection may be construed to prohibit the use of any technology or platform, including social media, support for third-party outlets such as think tanks, political parties, and private nongovernmental organizations, in order to coordinate and shape the development of narratives and techniques, and procedures to promote fact-based narratives and policies to audiences outside the United States.

(6) Facilitate the use of a wide range of information-related technologies and techniques to counter foreign disinformation campaigns by sharing expertise among agencies, seeking expertise from external sources, and implementing best practices.

(7) Identifying the countries and populations most susceptible to foreign government propaganda and disinformation.

(8) Administering and expending funds made available pursuant to subsection (e).

(9) Coordinating with allied and partner nations, particularly those frequently targeted for foreign disinformation campaigns, and international organizations and entities such as the NATO Center of Excellence on Strategic Communications, the European Endowment for Democracy, the European External Action Service Task Force on Strategic Communications, in order to amplify the Center's efforts and avoid duplication.

(c) INTERAGENCY MANAGER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to designate an official of the United States Government to lead an interagency team and to manage the Center. The President shall delegate to the manager of the Center the authority to direct and coordinate the activities and operations of all departments, agencies, and elements of the United States Government in their support, and delegate the authority to ensure the successful implementation of a strategy approved by the President for accomplishing the mission. The official so designated shall be serving in a position in the executive branch by appointment, and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) INTERAGENCY STEERING COMMITTEE.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Interagency Manager shall establish a Steering Committee composed of senior representatives of agencies relevant to the Center's mission to provide advice to the Manager on the operations and strategic orientation of the Center and to ensure adequate support for the Center. The Steering Committee shall include one senior representative designated by each of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the National Security Agency for International Development, and the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

(B) DURATION.—The Interagency Steering Committee shall meet not less than every 3 months.
and activities or existing regulations governing the sharing of classified information and programs.

SA 4600. Mr. CORKYOUTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1277. REPORT ON POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS BY I.R.O. OF THE RIGHT UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW TO CONDUCT INNOCENT PASSAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes a determination with respect to whether, during or after the incident that began on January 12, 2016, in which forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran attacked two United States Navy riverine combat vessels and detained at gunpoint the crews of those vessels, any of the actions of the forces of Iran constituted a violation of the right under international law to conduct innocent passage.

(b) ACTIONS TO BE ASSessed.—In assessing actions of the forces of Iran under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, the following actions:

(1) The stopping, boarding, search, and seizure of the two United States Navy riverine combat vessels in the incident described in subsection (a).
(2) The removal from their vessels and detention of members of the United States Armed Forces in that incident.
(3) The theft or confiscation of electronic navigational equipment or any other equipment from the vessels.
(4) The forcing of one or more members of the United States Armed Forces to apologize for their actions.
(5) The display, videotaping, or photographing of members of the United States Armed Forces and the subsequent broadcasting or other use of those photographs or videos.
(6) The forcing of female members of the United States Armed Forces to wear head coverings.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS.—In the case of each action that the Secretary determines under subsection (a) is a violation of the right under international law to conduct innocent passage, the Secretary shall include in the report required by that subsection a description of the action and an explanation of how the action violated that right.

(d) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘‘appropriate congressional committees’’ means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) FORCES OF I.R.O.—The term ‘‘forces of Iran’’ means the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, members of other military or paramilitary units of the Government of Iran, and other agents of that Government.

(3) INNOCENT PASSAGE.—The term ‘‘innocent passage’’ means the principle under customary international law that all vessels have the right to conduct innocent passage through another country’s territorial waters for the purpose of continuous and expeditious traversing.

SA 4601. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 341. MITIGATION OF RISKS POSED BY ZIKA VIRUS.

(a) INSECT REPELLENT AND OTHER MEASURES TO PROTECT SERVICE MEMBERS FROM THE ZIKA VIRUS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the action and an explanation of how the action violated that right.
(2) The actions of the forces of Iran constituted a violation of the right under international law to conduct innocent passage.

(b) REPORT ON EFFORTS TO MITIGATE RISK TO SERVICE MEMBERS POSED BY THE ZIKA VIRUS.—The Department of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on efforts to mitigate risk to service members posed by the Zika virus.

(c) USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES.—The Department of Defense is authorized to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 1097. INTERNATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the risk of infrastructure disruption in the United States or elsewhere as a result of the Zika virus.

(b) INNOCENT PASSAGE.—The term ‘‘innocent passage’’ means the right under international law to conduct innocent passage.

(c) USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES.—The Department of Defense shall utilize existing Department of Defense or Department of Energy facilities.

(d) CAPABILITIES.—The Department of Defense shall include the following capabilities:

(1) Process-based systems dynamic models.
(2) Mathematical network optimization models.
(3) Physics-based models of existing infrastructure.
(4) High fidelity, agent-based simulations of systems.
(5) Other systems capabilities as deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense to fulfill the mission needs of the Department of Defense.

SA 4603. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall be in effect 1 day after enactment.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ‘‘Implementation of the Fast Act.’’

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to
meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH POLICY

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "U.S. Sanctions Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 8, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–220 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The H–2B Temporary Foreign Worker Program: Examining the Effects of America’s Job Opportunities and Wages."

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that Laura Malenas and Kevin Craw, who are both fellows in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Senate’s consideration of the NDAA.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns from my office be granted the privilege of the floor for the month of June: Coreanne Bean, Emily Harland, Clara Baldwin, Kea Bekkendahl, Desiree Cleary, Xochitl Martinez, Teressa Wrobel, Karl Lundgren, Robin O’Donoghue, Bernie Franulovich, Andrea Witte, and Noam Levenson; and I also ask unanimous consent that Tyler Schroeder be granted the privilege of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Giselle Naranjo-Cruz be granted privileges of the floor today.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2016

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, June 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2943; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions with respect to Reed amendment No. 4549 and McCain amendment No. 4229 ripen at 11:15 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned, following the remarks of Senator McCain.

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

The Senator from Arizona.
IN RECOGNITION OF HEARTLINE PRESS
HON. PATRICK MEEHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Heartline Press on winning SCORE’s 2016 Small Business Achievement Award.

SCORE is a national nonprofit that provides free business mentoring and educational workshops to entrepreneurs and small business owners across the country. I am grateful for the services local SCORE chapters provide for our region’s innovative entrepreneurs. And I commend the Chester County Chapter on being named “2015 Chapter of the Year,” edging out over 300 other chapters around the country.

Ryan Hartley, founder of Heartline Press, developed his passion for the offset lithography printing process while attending Springfield High School. Bob Preston, who operated the school’s print shop, became a lifelong mentor and encouraged Hartley to start his own printing company in 2005.

Hartley was working long hours and the business was barely profitable. So in 2012 he reached out to SCORE and was introduced to SCORE counselors who helped him reorganize his business to operate it more efficiently and effectively. Hartley also enhanced his web design services and developed a strong social media marketing campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Hartley on his success through the SCORE mentorship program.

HONORING JACOB BRUNS
HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob Bruns. Jake is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1099, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jake has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jake has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jake has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob Bruns for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CHARLES ELACHI
HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my dear friend Dr. Charles Elachi, as he concludes 46 years of service to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s (NASA) Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL). As Director of JPL for the last 15 years, Dr. Elachi has been an exceptional leader and invaluable contributor to space exploration.

Born and raised in Lebanon, Dr. Elachi left home to pursue a Bachelor of Science degree in physics from the University of Grenoble, France. From there he received his Diplome Ingenieur engineering from the Polytechnic Institute, Grenoble. He continued his education at the California Institute of Technology where he received his Master of Science and Doctoral degrees in electrical sciences. After joining JPL in 1970, Dr. Elachi continued his education at the University of Southern California where he received his Master of Business Administration, and the University of California, Los Angeles where he received his Master of Science in Geology.

Dr. Elachi began his 46 year career at JPL as a research and science investigator. Quickly rising to leadership, he served as Principal Investigator on numerous NASA projects, most notably the Shuttle Imaging Radar series, the Magellan Imaging Radar, and the Cassini Titan Radar. From 1982 to 2000, Dr. Elachi served as Director for Space and Earth Science Programs at JPL and was responsible for the overall development of instruments for Earth observation, planetary exploration, and astrophysics and the missions utilizing those instruments.

In May of 2001, Dr. Elachi was appointed Director of JPL and through the years has steadfastly stewarded JPL to unparalleled success. JPL’s highly successful Mars missions—Phoenix and the rovers Spirit, Opportunity and Curiosity—have pushed the boundaries of robotic exploration and have inspired a new generation of scientists. Earth missions such as GRACE, Jason 1, 2, and 3, Aquarius, and Cloudsat to name a few, have furthered our understanding of Earth’s climate and given us critical data on the planet we call home. Far beyond our planet, Juno, Kepler, Dawn, and many other missions are studying various parts of our solar system and beyond. Under Dr. Elachi’s tenure, these successful missions and JPL’s consistent ability to deliver on target have created innumerable job opportunities locally and nationally, and have continued JPL’s distinction and prominence in space exploration.

Throughout his impressive career, Dr. Elachi has authored over 230 publications and lectured in more than 20 countries about space, planetary exploration, and Earth observation. He holds numerous patents in the fields of active microwave remote sensing and electromagnetic theory. Over the years, Dr. Elachi chaired a number of national and international committees which developed plans for the exploration of our solar system, neighboring solar systems, and Mars. His exceptional career includes over 30 awards and recognitions including the J.E. Hill Lifetime Achievement Award, the Association of Space Explorers Congress Crystal Helmet Award and the NASA Outstanding Leadership Medal in three different years, to name a few.

It is with great appreciation and respect that I congratulate Dr. Charles Elachi upon 46 years of exemplary public service. The time and energy Dr. Elachi put into his work is extraordinary and people across the globe have benefited greatly from his dedicated service. Applauding his commitment and dedication to NASA and JPL and its hospita’s ask you all to join me in commending Dr. Charles Elachi for his lifetime of service to our country.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF GARY EDMONSDON
HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Gary Edmondson, a veteran of the United States Army, Gary recently celebrated 70 years of playing TAPS at military funerals throughout the state of Louisiana at no cost to the families. He played his first military funeral in 1946, as a young Boy Scout at the age of 12 and for the last seven decades has never looked back.

This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
Born in August of 1934 in Brooklyn, N.Y., Gary joined the Army at the age of 21; eventually earning a place in the U.S. Army band in Louisville, Ky. Gary dedicated his life to playing TAPS to honor fellow veterans at their funerals. After relocating to Lafayette, Louisiana, in 1959, he had the opportunity to be part of the local funeral homes to let them know he was always available to play TAPS free of charge.

Since moving to Acadiana, Gary has become a fixture of the community. He has played countless funerals, military, veterans, and community events throughout his lifetime of service. Just this past Memorial Day, he played in services at Lafayette Memorial Park, as well as Green Lawn Memorial Park—a tradition he has kept since 1964.

Gary’s seven decades of heartfelt dedication to our fallen heroes is an inspiration to us all. In 2013, he earned an induction into the Living Legends Hall of Fame in Erath, La. In 2014, he created the Acadiana Veterans Honor Guard and was instrumental in securing funding to ensure every local veteran will receive full military funeral honors. Beloved by the entire community, Gary Edmondson has enriched the lives of countless families during their darkest hours. I rise to ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing his lifetime of service, dedicated to providing the final tribute to our fallen heroes as their families lay them to rest.

IN SUPPORT OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP

HON. JIM MCDERMOTT
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to draw attention to a development that remained largely unnoticed; discontinuation of the Fulbright Congressional Fellowship (Fulbright) Program run by the American Political Science Association (APSA).

My office has regularly welcomed international fellows. We continue to host these talented professionals from different areas around the world. Between 2004 and 2008, I hosted two APSA-Fulbright Congressional Fellows from India; an academic, Medha Nanivadekar, and a New Dehli journalist, Prasad Venkateswara Kunduri.

These Fellows brought a great deal of depth and perspective to the office at a time when relationship between United States of America and India was expanding like never before. Today, the U.S. and India are engaged across all fronts.

The Fulbright-APSA Congressional Fellowship Program was part of APSA's Congressional Fellowship Program. It was established over 60 years ago and remains a highly selective, non-partisan, early-to-mid-career program devoted to expanding knowledge and awareness of Congress. The program enjoys a reputation for excellence among those concerned with the quality of government and the ways in which democracies function. The APSA-Congressional Fellowship ended after a five year run.

Appreciating the initiative and contribution of the program, I urge the Fulbright Board to reconsider and fund APSA Congressional Fellowship.

HONORING KAELIN HAGEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kaelin Hagen. Kaelin is a very special young man who has exemplified the principles of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1099, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout. Kaelin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Kaelin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Kaelin has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Kaelin Hagen for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING EARLINE ROGERS UPON HER RETIREMENT

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today it is with profound respect that I take this time to honor one of Indiana's foremost citizens, State Senator Earline Rogers. A retired public school teacher, Earline has consistently distinguished herself as a pillar of her community, a voice for children, and a selfless public servant. Serving in the Indiana General Assembly for thirty-four years, Senator Rogers will be retiring this year after a truly monumental career.

Born in Gary, Indiana, Earline Rogers was inspired at an early age to be a force for positive change by her father, Earl, and her mother, Robbie. Employed as a steel worker, Earl worked tirelessly alongside his wife to support Earline and her four siblings, Gerry, Bobby, Earl Jr., and Denice. Taking on two part-time jobs in addition to his full-time position at the steel mill, Earl was determined to see his children graduate high school and attend college. Earline fulfilled her parents’ dream and graduated as senior class president with honors from Roosevelt High School in Gary, and went on to earn Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees in Education from Indiana University. Following her undergraduate studies, Earline began her career teaching in the Gary Community School Corporation, and soon became active in the American Federation of Teachers union, working to provide teachers with the best resources to educate their students and provide them with pathways to success. Senator Rogers was elected to the Gary Common Council in 1980, and broke barriers serving as the Council’s first female president. In 1982, Senator Rogers was elected to the Indiana House of Representatives, and in 1990, she became a member of the Indiana Senate where she has served for the past twenty-six years representing Indiana Senate District 3.

In particular, Senator Rogers has most recently served as the Indiana Senate Minority Whip, and as the Ranking Minority Member on the Education and Career Development Committee as well as the Family and Children Services Committee. Senator Rogers has also served on the Appropriations, Appropriations, Homeland Security and Transportation, Veterans Affairs and the Military, and Pensions and Labor Committees, and as a member of the Indiana Education Roundtable.

Since entering public service, Senator Rogers has established herself as one of Indiana’s most accomplished and effective legislators, working across the aisle with her colleagues to improve the lives of all Hoosiers, notably to protect the safety, rights, and educational opportunities of our youngest citizens. In particular, Senator Rogers authored Jojo’s Law, which mandates that all vehicles for ten or more passengers utilized by public schools, preschools, or licensed day care centers must meet the same safety standards as school buses. Senator Rogers also authored Senator Rogers’ Father’s Law, which requires the Indiana Department of Education to develop programs for Indiana schools to better educate students about dating violence. Moreover, she has led efforts to increase anti-bullying education statewide and safeguard our students from forms of harassment outside the classroom, such as cyber-bullying.

In addition, Earline Rogers was instrumental in the passage of legislation that raised the minimum age of the death penalty to 18 years of age in Indiana. Finally, Senator Rogers wrote Indiana’s first bilingual-literacy program and successfully provided funding for Northwest Indiana school repair and prospective teacher training. Earline’s record as an...
advocate for our community’s most vulnerable, and for preparing our next generation of leaders, has and will continue to leave an immeasurable impact on Northwest Indiana, our state, and our country.

In addition to her achievements in the realm of children and education, Senator Rogers' legislative accomplishments include filing the first bill to legalize casino and riverboat gambling in Indiana, spearheading efforts to increase job growth, and most recently, gaining legislative approval to relocate docked riverboat casinos to adjacent land. Thanks to the efforts of Senator Rogers, this industry has generated significant economic investment throughout our state. Furthermore, Senator Rogers was a leader and integral to the creation of the Northwest Indiana Regional Development Authority, an entity that currently works with local, state, and federal partners to spur regional economic development. These projects include the enrichment of the Gary/Chicago International Airport, improving access to our historic lakeshore through the Marquette Plan, investment in the recapitalization and expansion of the South Shore Rail Line, and the development of a regional bus system. Senator Rogers has fought to bring economic prosperity and opportunities to all of her constituents, and has been a transformational figure and the epitome of a public servant.

Earline is married to Chuck Rogers, a retired Gary firefighter, and together they have two children, Keith Sr. and Sara, as well as a number of grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Earline plans to spend her retirement staying active in the Gary community, including in Saint Timothy Community Church, where she has been a member for over fifty years, and looks forward to spending winters visiting her family in Arizona.

I am especially proud to note that the relationship between the Smith/Rogers and Visclosky families spans four generations. As mentioned earlier in my remarks, Earline's father worked two part-time jobs in addition to his full-time employment. One of those part-time positions was working with my father in the Calumet Township Trustee's office in the 1940s. There they began a friendship based on a profound respect for each other. To this day, my 100-year-old father, John, is proud that he attended Earline's high school graduation open house and was able to witness the beginning of her distinguished academic and professional career. That friendship has continued through my relationship with Earline and Chuck, and now spans a fourth generation with her grandson, Keith, who is currently serving in my Washington, DC, Congressional office. The Visclosky family has been blessed to have experienced such a long standing and strong relationship with individuals imbued with integrity, selflessness, and with whom we have had countless good laughs.

I am proud to call Earline my friend, and I wish her the very best in this new chapter of her life. Earline has always served the citizens of Gary, Northwest Indiana, and our entire state as a passionate and compassionate public servant. For this she is worthy of the highest praise.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in honoring Indiana State Senator Earline Rogers for her life of public service, and for teaching generations of young Hoosiers to be a force for positive change, both in and out of the classroom. Senator Rogers' life has truly been a gift to us all.

IN RECOGNITION OF ACTION POTENTIAL

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Action Potential on winning SCORE's 2016 Small Business Achievement Award. SCORE is a national nonprofit that provides free business mentoring and educational workshops to entrepreneurs and small business owners across the country. I am grateful for the services local SCORE chapters provide for our region's innovative entrepreneurs. And I commend the Chester County Chapter on being named "2015 Chapter of the Year," edging out over 300 other chapters around the country.

Kathy Dixon and Kristen Wilson founded Action Potential in 2011 to provide innovative, high-customized rehabilitation services to seniors, neurological and amputee clients. Action Potential is the first outpatient therapy provider to offer these specialized services in Delaware and Chester Counties. In just three years the business more than quadrupled its number of patients.

Kathy and Kristen have been involved with SCORE since they were first considering starting their own business, attending workshops that helped them develop a business plan and working with a SCORE counselor.

Action Potential is actively involved in and giving back to our community, hosting educational luncheon sessions for physicians and charity events like their National Amputee Golf Association First Swing Seminar and Annual Turkey Trot.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Kathy Dixon and Kristen Wilson on their success. It is small businesses like Action Potential that form the backbone of our local economy.

H.R. 5055, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 2017

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep concerns about the proactive management practices displayed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, in regard to their management of West Point Dam and Lake water levels. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should use all appropriated funds to implement and carry out the best practices. For many years, my office and the stakeholders of West Point Lake have worked with the Mobile District to discuss proactive policies and what it will take to put adaptive management practices in place. Upon hearing the announcement that West Point Lake will not remain at full pool this summer as a direct result of the Mobile District's decision to draw down the lake, I once again am concerned that best practices are not being utilized. The construction of the West Point Dam was authorized by Congress through the Flood Control Act of 1962 and completed later in 1975. Of the five intended purposes for the West Point Dam and Lake, general recreation is chief among them. West Point Lake has served this historical purpose for over 40 years, contributing anywhere from $153 million to $710 million in annual economic impact. However, the economic impact depends heavily on the lake’s water levels. West Point Lake guests enjoy fishing, boating, and other water sports, as well as many other outdoor activities centrally located around the lake. There can be no doubt that recreational activities on West Point Lake are the life-blood of the area. The threat of low water levels will have substantial impacts on recreation. I urge the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District to use all appropriated funds to implement adaptive management practices according to the general recreation purpose of West Point Dam and Lake.

RECOGNIZING MR. JOHN BREITSMAN UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

HON. LOU BARLETTA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Mr. John Breitsman on the occasion of his retirement as the Director of the Bureau of Plant Industry at the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture after 34 years of devoted service. Working every day to provide the best possible service to the consumers and producers of Pennsylvania's agriculture, John challenges his team to instill excellence and leadership in meeting the state's agricultural needs. Comprehensive oversight under John's leadership has improved agriculture significantly in my district and throughout Pennsylvania, enhancing the food and healthy ecosystem for generations to come.

Beginning his service to the state in 1982, John quickly advanced from an Agricultural Products Inspector to Agronomic Specialist, eventually holding the titles of Chief of the Division of Agronomic and Regional Services and Director of the Bureau of Plant Industry. His leadership and expertise have earned him positions with state, regional, national, and international organizations such as the Food and Drug Administration, the American Feed Control Officials (A AFCO) where he served as president, and the FBI. John has also worked closely with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture's Rapid Response Team, which is responsible for creating a Best Practices Manual for food and feed related emergency responses. His service and involvement with such diverse organizations has instilled a sense of security in my constituents' food supply and helped my district's farmers meet today's most daunting challenges.

John has always understood the value in surrounding himself with an elite team, mentoring his employees, and providing them with the support needed to fulfill the Bureau's mission of protecting Pennsylvania agriculture and
ensuring consumer safety. With such unique and committed service to his position and employees alike, John has received numerous awards highlighting his service. In 1999, he was recognized with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture’s Outstanding Employee of the Year award and, in 2001, was awarded the AAFCO Distinguished Service Award. John has also been integral in the development of PaPlants, the Bureau’s comprehensive web-based tracking and interactive constituent access program. PaPlants is now a model for USAPlants, a nationwide initiative in use by five other states.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Mr. John Breitsman for his extensive guidance and superior leadership with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. Commitment to his colleagues has allowed John to inspire his coworkers on a daily basis, and his hard work is evident through various achievements and lasting contributions to my community and state. John’s retirement will be accompanied by quality time spent with his wife Kristin and his daughter Stephanie. On behalf of my constituents, I wish Mr. John Breitsman well on the occasion of his retirement, and best of luck in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 2016, on Roll Call Number 269 on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to, as amended, H. Con. Res. 129, Expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

On June 7, 2016, on Roll Call Number 270 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4906, To amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4906.

On June 7, 2016, on Roll Call Number 271 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4904, Making Electronic Government Accountability By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4904.

On June 7, 2016, on Roll Call Number 272 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 1815, Eastern Nevada Land Improvement Improvement Act, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1815, as amended.

TRIBUTE TO LILA AND TED SHOESMITH

HON. DAVID YOUNG
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ted and Lila Shoesmith on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary.

Ted and Lila were married on May 27, 1956 and reside in Guttenberg, Iowa. Their lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa’s values. As the years pass, may their love continue to grow even stronger and may they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many more years to come.

I commend this lovely couple on their 60 years of life together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

RECOGNIZING SYDNEY EISMEIER

HON. KEN BUCK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sydney Eismeier, a Military Appointee from Colorado’s Fourth Congressional District. I believe our greatest assets are America’s brave men and women in uniform. Sydney is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for her service. It is with great pleasure that I give her my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Sydney and her family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Sydney.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Sydney as a Military Appointee for her commitment to protect and serve our nation.

THOMAS BERGMAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Thomas Bergman for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Thomas Bergman is a 12th grader at Stanley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Thomas Bergman is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is an honor to recognize students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Thomas Bergman for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF DAVE BREIDINGER

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Dave Breidinger, a man of commitment and service. Whether we speak of Dave Breidinger’s accomplishments during his career with Comcast or in the community, Dave has served with unwavering dedication. On this special milestone of his retirement, we come to celebrate the positive impact that Dave had on so many people’s lives.

Dave began his career managing a local franchise. He retires today as the Senior Vice President of Government Affairs for Comcast’s Northeast Division States. I had the pleasure to work with Dave on federal government communication related issues. His contributions to Comcast have been unparalleled, as they have significantly expanded communication in the Northeast region.

Equally important to Dave’s accomplishments at Comcast and his commitment to professional associations, is the extensive range of his community involvement. He has been involved with various organizations including the Rotary Club, Salvation Army, and the Boys and Girls Club.

Currently, he serves on numerous boards including the Bucks County Community College Foundation Board and the St. Mary Medical Center Advisory Board. Dave is also Chairman of the Board of Pearl S. Buck International which works to build better lives for children around the world—an organization located in my district which I have great pride representing in the United States House of Representatives.

In honor of his time, hard work, and selfless spirit, Dave has received a multitude of awards including the Rotary District 7510 “Matty” Mathewson Rotarian of the Year award, the Boy Scouts of America “Spirit of America” award, and leadership awards from the NJCTA, the CTAMDDC and from the Broadband Cable Association of Pennsylvania. He was also inducted into the Cable Television Pioneers for his instrumental part in the Cable Television Industry. Dave Breidinger’s 35 years of work for Comcast and outstanding leadership is deeply appreciated. We are grateful for David’s commitment and service and know he will continue to inspire others in the Northampton Township and beyond.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE HOLDING
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I missed roll call vote 269, H. Con. Res. 129 expressing
**TRIBUTE TO THE ZIPP’S PIZZARIA**

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**
**OF IOWA**
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Zipp’s Pizzeria of Adair, Iowa for winning the 2016 Iowa Tourism Office’s Pizza Madness Award from the Iowa Tourism Office.

Iowa Tourism Office announced their contest search for the best pizza in Iowa in mid-March 2016 and after nearly 15,000 entries, the votes cast named Zipp’s Pizzeria, an iconic small establishment nestled in western Iowa. The one-time “take out only” pizza parlor is now a full service restaurant known statewide for its signature taco pizza.

This year’s winning entrant was a local hometown cafe, like so many of those in Iowa.

Zipp’s Pizzaria has all the markings of a great pizza parlor—with extra helpings of community pride and dishing up a tailor-made private recipe for its specialty taco pizza. Owner Jim Zimmerline accepted the award, noting he is humbled by the attention but is willing to give away the winning philosophy: never skimp on the ingredients. He said, “Not every pizza is the same. A lot of love goes into it. Everything is fresh.”

I commend Jim Zimmerline and the staff at Zipp’s Pizzaria for creating an outstanding pizza. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Zipp’s Pizzaria for winning 2016 Iowa Tourism Office’s Pizza Madness Award. I wish Jim and all of the staff nothing but the best.

**RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF VINCENT ROTHWELL**

**HON. TOM REED**
**OF NEW YORK**
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to recognize the life and service of Vincent Rothwell, who recently passed away at the age of 91.

Mr. Rothwell was a long-time resident of Chautauqua County, New York. He graduated from Mayville High School in 1941 and joined the Army Air Corps in 1943. He served as a turret gunner aboard B-24 Bombers in the European Theater during World War II. After the war, he returned stateside and served as a Personnel Sergeant.

Mr. Rothwell was honorably discharged from the Army in 1946. He returned to New York and married the love of his life, Elizabeth “Betty” Pickard, later that year. Mr. Rothwell graduated from Houghton College in 1952 and the Evangelical Theology Seminar of Naperville, Illinois, in 1955. Two years after joining the ministry, he reenlisted in the Army as a chaplain. He served a deployment in Vietnam and presided over more than 1,500 funerals at Arlington National Cemetery. Mr. Rothwell attained the rank of Lt. Colonel and, in 1975 retired as Senior Chaplain after 22 years of service to his country.

Mr. Rothwell returned to Westfield in 1984, where he continued his ministry as a pastor at the Westfield United Methodist Church. Even in retirement, Mr. Rothwell tirelessly served his local community, as a member of the Chautauqua County Jail Chaplaincy, a Westfield Village Trustee, the Westfield Village Clerk, and the Westfield Volunteer Fire Department Chaplain. As a pillar of his community, Mr. Rothwell was admired and respected by everyone who knew him.

Vincent Rothwell dedicated his life to serving his country, his community, and his neighbors. I extend my sincerest condolences to his family and ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and service of this great American.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. CARLOS CURBELO**
**OF FLORIDA**
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, I missed votes on account of a flight delay from Miami to Washington, D.C. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call 269: I would have voted YEA: H.R. 4906—To amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes.

Roll Call 270: I would have voted YEA: H.R. 4904—MEGABYT Act.

Roll Call 272: I would have voted YEA: H.R. 1815—Eastern Nevada Land Implementation Improvement Act.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. ROBERT PITTENGER**
**OF NORTH CAROLINA**
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Votes Number 269, 270, 271, and 272 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 Number 269. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call Number 270. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call Number 271. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call Number 272. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and acknowledge Mr. Jones for his dedicated service to Pinellas County and our beloved community. He has made an impact on the Tampa Bay area, and I ask that this body join me in recognizing his service and congratulating him on his career. I wish him the best of luck as he begins a new chapter in his life.

---

Mr. Speaker, I wish him the best of luck as he begins a new chapter in his life.

---

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Evanell and Arthur Whitworth on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary.

Arthur and Evanell were married on June 12, 1951 and reside in Winterset, Iowa. Their lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa’s values. As the years pass, may their love continue to grow even stronger and may they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many more years to come. I commend this lovely couple on their 65 years of life together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

---

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Evanell and Arthur Whitworth.

---

TRIBUTE TO TAŞMYN DOWD
HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Taşmyn Dowd for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Taşmyn Dowd is an 8th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her dedication and hard work have inspired her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Taşmyn Dowd is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Taşmyn Dowd for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

---

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Evanell and Arthur Whitworth.

---

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that on June 7, 2016, I missed four roll call votes due to prior commitments in my district. Had I been present I would have voted: YES—Roll Call Vote 269—H. Con. Res. 129—Expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to reaffirm its commitment to this goal through a financial commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

YES—Roll Call Vote 270—H.R. 4906—To amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency.


YES—Roll Call Vote 272—H.R. 1815—Eastern Nevada Land Implementation Improvement Act

---

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Evanell and Arthur Whitworth.

---

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, if I was present on Tuesday, June 7, 2016 for Congressional votes I would have voted the following ways:

H. Con. Res. 129—YES
H.R. 4906—YES

---

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Evanell and Arthur Whitworth.

---

Mr. Speaker, I wish him the best of luck as he begins a new chapter in his life.
how hard work and dedication can affect the future of a community and business. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Tim Cappel for his many accomplishments and for his service to the Atlantic community. I wish him continued success in all his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF ALEX MELNIKOW’S RETIREMENT

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to use this time to recognize the tremendous work of my constituent Mr. Alex Melnikow of Clifton, Virginia. Mr. Melnikow retired on February 3rd, 2016, after over 40 years of service to the United States. His dedication to a high standard of conduct allowed him to remain honest and loyal, and allowed him to make a positive impact to the efficiency in our armed services.

During his most recent assignment, Mr. Melnikow served as the lead analyst for Diminishing Manufacturing Sources and Material Shortages (DMSMS) within the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering, Engineering Enterprise, and Defense Standardization Program Office. Mr. Melnikow strove to enhance the efficiency of engineering practices such as operational support, alliance forces interoperability, material configuration, training development and outreach.

In addition to his time at DMSMS, Mr. Melnikow served for 25 years as a logistics program manager for the Defense Logistics Agency, as well as 7 years with the Tennessee Valley Authority as an acquisition program manager. He served as a senior staff engineer for the Defense Logistics Agency in the Logistics Research and Development Program. In 2007, he received the Defense Logistics Agency’s Outstanding Program Manager Award as a result of his efforts on the electronics availability program. These experiences all contributed to his impressive technical background as a test engineer and as a senior program manager.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Mr. Alex Melnikow for the outstanding services he provided to the United States throughout his long-lasting career. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 2016, due to a weather-related travel delay I was absent for recorded votes No. 269, No. 270, No. 271 and No. 272.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here:

On Roll Call No. 269 I would have voted yes.
On Roll Call No. 270 I would have voted yes.
On Roll Call No. 271 I would have voted Yea.
On Roll Call No. 272 I would have voted Yea.

HONORING NATHAN WIRT

HON. SAM GRAVES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nathan Wirt. Nathan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1099, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout. Nathan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Nathan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Nathan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nathan Wirt for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO DANNY WEBER, FIREFIGHTER OF THE YEAR

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a hero in our community, Danny Weber, who was recently named East Lake Firefighter of the Year.

Mr. Weber has been a firefighter-paramedic for seven years, and has served Pinellas County since 2014. Mr. Weber has dedicated his life to assisting individuals and families in our community, but one story in particular demonstrates his courage and selflessness, and inspired his selection as Firefighter of the Year.

On June 12, 2015, a woman lost control of her vehicle and drove into a large pond. Shortly after, the East Lake Fire Rescue arrived on the scene, and Mr. Weber wasted no time making his way to the woman trapped inside of her vehicle. He rescued the woman from inside the sinking car and pulled her to safety. Selfless acts like this one are truly heroic.

This is not the first time Mr. Weber has been recognized for his service. Mr. Weber also won the Morrini Award as the Pinellas County Firefighter of the Year. I am grateful that Mr. Weber is part of our community and continues to make a difference. I ask that this body join me in recognizing Mr. Weber for his service to Pinellas County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETO O’ROURKE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. O’ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, during the roll call votes on Monday, May 23, 2016 through Thursday, May 27, 2016, I was absent due to an invitation from the President to join him on his trip to Vietnam.

Had I been present, on roll call number 229, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 230, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 231, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 232, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 233, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 234, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 235, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 236, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 237, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 238, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 239, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 240, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 241, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 242, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 243, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 244, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 245, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 246, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 247, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 248, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 249, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 250, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 251, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 252, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 253, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 254, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 255, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 256, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 257, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 258, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 259, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 260, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 261, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 262, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 263, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 264, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 265, I would have voted Yea.
On roll call number 266, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 267, I would have voted Nay.
On roll call number 268, I would have voted Nay.

TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT TYLER WHITEHEAD
HON. DAVID YOUNG
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tyler Whitehead of Norwalk, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout. Tyler is a member of Boy Scout Troop 30. The Eagle Scout designation is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Approximately two percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained over the past century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Scout Project to benefit the community. For Tyler’s project, he refurnished the landscaping near the entrance of the Norwalk Police Department, supervising volunteers who removed debris, landscaped and planted foliage to improve the area. He raised the required funds by creating a donation letter and augmenting that effort with personal solicitations to Norwalk business leaders who could see the vision of his project. Raising more money than needed for the landscaping project, Tyler donated the remainder to the D.A.R.E. program to educate young students against drug and alcohol usage.

The work ethic Tyler has shown in his Eagle Scout Project and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank, speaks volumes about his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family and community demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Tyler Whitehead and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him on obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. GEORGE HOLDING
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I missed roll call vote 270, H.R. 4906—to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

ON ROLL CALL VOTE 270

HON. JANE NAY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

On roll call vote 270, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on final passage of H.R. 4906, “To amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes.”

On roll call vote 271, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on final passage of H.R. 4904, “Making Electronic Government Accountable By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016”.

On roll call vote 272, had I been present, I would have vote “aye” on final passage of H.R. 1815, “Eastern Nebraska Land Implementation Improvement Act”.

REMEMBERING JACK KRUMME OF OMAHA
HON. KEVIN YODER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the service of a long-time member of my Military and Veterans’ Advisory Committee, Jack Krumme, who passed away in April. Jack was drafted into the U.S. Army in 1950, serving as a corporal in the ordnance corps during the Korean War. After Jack’s service in the Army, he continued to serve our nation and our community as a member of the Board of Zoning Appeals in Overland Park. Even though he had left the service, Jack continued to work with and advocate on behalf of his fellow veterans, serving as commander of Korean War Veterans’ Association, Chapter 181.

During his tenure as commander, he led the effort to raise funds to construct the Korean War Veterans’ Memorial located in Overland Park. It was a truly proud moment for Jack when the memorial was finished.

For those of us who knew him, the memorial now stands as not only a testament to Korean War veterans, but also to Jack. He always wanted to make sure the service of all Korean War Veterans was acknowledged and “not forgotten.” It’s a wonderful spot in our community.

Jack and I became close as he served on my veterans advisory committee doing so for more than five years. He always provided valuable insight and advice. His service, like the service of so many others, made it possible for our country to flourish and prosper.

Jack’s willingness to serve and commitment to his fellow veterans reflects greatly on him as a soldier. His service will never be forgotten and he will remain, forever, a true patriot.

Mr. Speaker, the Third District lost a selfless and dedicated individual in Jack. He may be gone, but he will not be forgotten. My thoughts and prayers continue to be with Dolores and their wonderful family.

God Bless, Jack.

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my Tax Counsel, Randy Herndon and his wife Christie, on the birth of their daughter, Eliana Joy Herndon. Their bundle of joy was born at 9:25 PM, on June 7, 2016 and weighed 7 pounds, 11 ounces. I would also like to congratulate their children, Micah and Anya, on becoming big siblings who welcomed their baby sister to the world.

I am so excited for this new blessing to the Herndon family and wish them health and happiness.

HON. DAVID YOUNG
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Maxine and Lee Wheeler, Jr. of Lorimor, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary. They were married on May 27, 1951. Lee Jr. and Maxine’s lifelong commitment to each other truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 65th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

I salute this great couple on their 65th year together and I wish them many more memories. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF FRED SHELL
HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fred Shell on his retirement from
DTE Energy for his lifetime of distinguished service to our region and state.

A native of Essexville Michigan, Fred graduated from Garber High School in 1969 and attended Western Michigan University where he majored in History and Political Science. After college, Fred started in on a long and distinguished career in public service, working for both Congressman Paul Todd and Congressman Jim O’Hara before beginning a long career of providing gas and power to the State of Michigan.

Fred started at the Michigan Consolidated Gas Company in 1977 as the Assistant Manager of Media Relations. From that position forward, Fred has held a wide variety of positions, in public relations, media relations, public policy, and management at MichCon and G–Tech. In 2001, after the Detroit Edison and MichCon merger, Fred was named Vice President of Corporate and Government Affairs at DTE Energy. In this role, Fred has been a constant in the Michigan Government and Business scene, guiding policy that has improved the lives of Michigan’s citizens and improved the environment for job creation in our state; we appreciate all that he has done to keep Michigan moving forward.

Fred has spent many years of his career involved in giving back. In 1998, as a testament to his hard work, he was named as the President of the MichCon Foundation. After the merger in 2001, Fred led the staff team and developed a strategic vision that combined the MichCon and Detroit Edison Foundations into the DTE Energy Foundation. Fred’s leadership advanced the DTE Energy Foundation forward to become one of the most important foundations in our state. The foundation has supported a wide range of youth and cultural programming, as well as supporting basic human services. The Foundation’s work of providing support to families in need during the great recession exemplified the extraordinary role that this foundation plays in our community, improving the lives of so many of our friends and neighbors.

Fred has personally gone above and beyond in his involvement with a wide variety of community organizations and non-profits. He has served as the President of the Michigan Economic Development Foundation, the Vice Chairman of the Metropolitan Affairs Coalition, as a board member of the Historical Society of Michigan, the Metro Detroit Visitors and Convention Bureau, the Michigan Political Leadership Program, and the Right Place of Grand Rapids. Just to name a few. Our state has been enriched and advanced by Fred’s commitment to volunteerism and community service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor Fred Shell for his service to our State. I thank him for his leadership and wish him many years of success.

THE GUARDIANS

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Guardians. All were affected by morcellation of an occult uterine cancer—and all lost their precious lives prematurely or unnecessarily, because of deadly defect in our medical device regulatory space.

Erica Kaitz, Danusia Bennett-Taber, Patricia Daley, Sally Newton, Sandra Brown, Mary Ayece Dolan, Nancy Lincoln Davis, Margie Miller, Barbara Leary, Lori Kaufmann, Elizabeth Jacobson, Jenny Proffer, Linda Interlitch, Brenda Leuzzi, Vixivenna Ruschitto, Martha Ariiri, Nancy Curtis.

HONORING ANDREW H. STEWART
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew H. Stewart. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1395, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew H. Stewart for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF ROSE OBERITI PERACCHI

HON. JIM COSTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Rose Oberiti Peracci, who recently passed away on May 26, 2016, at the age of 100. Rose was an extraordinary person, and she will always be remembered as a woman who lived her life with purpose and great dedication to her family, friends, and community.

Rose Peracci was born on August 22, 1915 to Giacomo and Mary Nan Oberiti on her family farm located near Sanger, California. She fell in love and married her teenage sweetheart, Gene Peracci, early on in life, and together they worked hard, raising their two sons, Gene and Don, and took care of Rose’s father, while remaining faithful to family, and her community.

Rose was a self-taught seamstress, establishing her own drapery business and contracting with West Coast Draperies until her retirement in 1977. As a business owner, she was a trailblazer in the industry, and although difficult at times to run a business and raise a family, her dedication and hard work helped her accomplish many successes. She will always be remembered for her culinary skills, an art form enjoyed by family and friends. Rose generously shared her skills, teaching first her sons, then her daughters-in-law and eventually her grandchildren in the art of Italian food preparation.

Rose’s friendship and genuine nature built many lasting friendships during her lifetime. Her long and remarkable life is fondly remembered by the countless friends and family who were fortunate to know her. Rose leaves behind her son Don and his wife Judy, grandchildren, and great grandchildren, and one great great grandchild. It is my honor to join her family in celebrating the life of this amazing woman, who will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the life of Rose Oberti Peracci, whose genuine character and her loving commitment to her family and community will be greatly missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TROOP ONE—SACRAMENTO

HON. DORIS O. MATSU
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Boy Scouts of America (BSA) Troop One—Sacramento as the scouts, their families, leaders, and former scouts join together to celebrate their centennial anniversary. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring BSA Troop One for its dedication to service in our community on the occasion of the troop’s “100 of One” celebration.

Troop One was officially formed in Sacramento in 1916, and is the oldest troop in the western United States. It was one of few Boy Scouts of America troops that remained active during World War II. The first Eagle Scout of Troop One, the late Charles “Muddy” Watters, Sr., was recognized in 1932. Since then, over 400 Troop One scouts have ascended to the rank of Eagle Scout. Troop One is active in molding young leaders in the Sacramento area. Through monthly wilderness adventures, service outings, and jamborees, the 88 current scouts of Troop One learn and maintain the troop’s founding values: a commitment to ethics, behaving responsibly, and serving one’s community.

For 100 years, Troop One has demonstrated an unyielding commitment to Sacramento’s youth and its larger community. From founding Troop One Scoutmaster George W. Spilman, to current scoutmaster Christopher Tileston, Troop One Scoutmasters have dedicated themselves to cultivating scouts into outstanding citizens. In turn, Troop One scouts have worked hard to better Sacramento. Sacramento is a better place thanks to the service and commitment of Troop One’s scouts.

Mr. Speaker, as Troop One celebrates its 100th anniversary, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the troop and its contribution to Sacramento’s youth.
TRIBUTE TO VERNE WELCH
HON. DAVID YOUNG
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Verne Welch of Council Bluffs, Iowa for his many years of dedicated service to the City of Council Bluffs and Pottawattamie County. Verne Welch is a Council Bluffs native who never forgot where he came from.

Verne Welch graduated from Thomas Jefferson High School in 1955. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1955 to 1968. Upon discharge, he joined a California recruitment firm for oversees contractors. In 1972 he joined Harrah’s, Inc. and remained with the company until 1987. He felt a need to help his hometown during some tough economic times so in 1988, Verne Welch returned to Council Bluffs, establishing gaming in Iowa, working tirelessly to develop the industry in Council Bluffs. Former Mayor Tom Hanahan described Verne as “the guy who came home and changed the face of his hometown community.” Tom Schmitt, the publisher of the Daily Nonpareil, said, “Verne Welch’s actions to revitalize his hometown have brought a lot of changes to this community. If there was ever a person who could say, ‘This is what I have done,’ it would be Verne Welch—and he never says that.” Because of Verne’s active community service, he has created a legacy second to none. Verne Welch’s endless dedication, commitment, generosity, and leadership for Council Bluffs has enhanced and improved the quality of life for his community and its citizens.

I commend and congratulate Verne Welch for making a difference in his hometown and influencing the economic future of Council Bluffs and the State of Iowa. I salute his many accomplishments and dedication for serving his community, I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Verne Welch and wishing him the very best in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. GEORGE HOLDING
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I missed roll call 271, H.R. 4904—MEGABYTE Act of 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

OUR UNCONSCIOUSLY NATIONAL DEBT
HON. MIKE COFFMAN
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

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 $19,220,484,557,364.60. We’ve added $8,593,607,508,451.52 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $8.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING ADAM KRATT
HON. KEN BUCK
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Adam Kratt, a Military Appointee from Colorado’s Fourth Congressional district. I believe our greatest assets are America’s brave men and women in uniform. Adam is making an incredible sacrifice for our country and deserves our utmost support for his service. It is with great pleasure that I give him my endorsement to attend this prestigious institution. Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than to those who fight to protect our freedom and liberty. I commend Adam and his family for their commitment. On behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes to Adam.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Adam as a Military Appointee for his commitment to protect and serve our nation.

RECOGNIZING JAIRAM HATHWAR
HON. TOM REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jairam Hathwar on winning the 2016 Scripps National Spelling Bee. Jairam was crowned co-champion after correctly spelling Feldenkrais in the final round of the competition.

Jairam is a seventh-grade student at the Alternative School for Math and Science in my hometown of Cortland, New York. He participated in the National Spelling Bee for the second year in a row, after barely missing the finals last year, Jairam outlasted 285 other contestants en route to his first place finish this year.

Jairam’s achievement is a testament to his work ethic, dedication to learning, and commitment to reaching his highest potential. After spending countless hours studying complex definitions, parts of speech, and languages of origin, he correctly spelled several of the most challenging words in the English language. Despite the high level of difficulty, Jairam demonstrated confidence and composure throughout the competition. Most importantly, he treated his fellow competitors with respect and showed humility and sportsmanship from the first word to the last.

Jairam Hathwar is a remarkable young man with an incredibly bright future ahead of him. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jairam on this remarkable accomplishment and wishing him the best in his future endeavors.
then advanced the mentoring program from Grade 8 to the kindergarten program. Allowing the 40 students of the chess and math club the capacity to participate after school and on Saturdays; the Earle STEM mentoring program has been effective in getting kids to mentor one another while competing against each other. This provides the school economical way of mastering skills and yet offering opportunities for students to be productive after school instead of being in the streets.

In closing, the Charles W. Earle STEM Elementary School’s Chess Team is a prime example of students excelling beyond their environment and striving for excellence. Congratulations to the children of Earle Stem: Joshua Johnson, Erik Tolbert, Brandon Burgess, Taahir Levi, Tamaya Fultz, Breanna Shaw, Gavin Harry, Semaj Lowe, Xavier Rosado, Angelique Wilson, Monique Williams, Gelita Woodlow, Devion Dukes, Tyorne Dellar and Shawn Palmer. I am proud to acknowledge the school and the students for their achievements and I look forward to hearing about their great works for years to come.

HONORING MISHAWAKA FIRE CHIEF DALE FREEMAN FOR A DISTINGUISHED CAREER IN PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JEFF MILLER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to being unavoidably detained, I missed the following Roll Call Vote: No. 273 on June 7, 2016. If present, I would have voted: Roll Call Vote No. 273—On Ordering the Previous Question, “AYE.”

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding efforts of the Charles W. Earle STEM Elementary School’s Chess Team.

Earle STEM Elementary School is among the top 10 percent of chess teams in Chicago. Considering this small school is located in a crime-prone area in the Englewood neighborhood of my Congressional District, I am very pleased of the involvement and leadership of chess coach Joseph M. Ocol and the many teachers at the school. I would like to acknowledge the contributions of the Earle STEM School Principal, Cederall Petties, and Assistant Principal Elwanda Butler, along with the help Network 11 Chief Megan Hougard, the families and parents in the Local School Council Community headed by Darlene O’Banner.

On Sunday, April 24th, 2016, the all-girls chess team of Earle STEM Elementary School won 1st Place in the 2016 All-Girls National Chess Tournament. Out of 65 schools and 450 female students from all over the USA, only four CPS schools qualified to form an all-girl, grade sixth to eighth, chess team to compete in this biggest all-girl national chess tournament in the USA. The Earle STEM all-girls chess team was one of only two all-African American girls’ chess team in that 2016 All-Girls National Chess Tournament.

Another notable victory for the Earle STEM Chess Team, composed this time of boys and girls from grades fourth to eighth, took place at the 2016 National Junior High School Championship where they won the 5th Place Trophy. This tournament was held at Marriott Hotel in Indianapolis, Indiana, April 15 to 17. With more than a hundred schools and about 2,000 students from all over the country competing, this is considered the biggest junior high school chess tournament in the USA.

Six months at the 2015–2016 academic year, and during its initial year as a chess team, the Earle STEM Elementary School Chess Team garnered five 1st Place team trophies, including a 4th Place trophy in the State of Illinois chess championship, and a 3rd Place Chicago Public Schools academic chess trophy. At its inception, the Earle STEM Elementary School Chess Team members started mentoring one another on the rudiments of chess

TRIBUTE TO CAROL AND JACK SWANGER

HON. DAVID YOUNG
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Carol and Jack Swanger of Council Bluffs, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They were married in 1966. Carol is retired from Risen Son Christian Village and is active in the Red Hats and other women’s group at Southside Christian Church. Jack is retired from Campbell’s Soup Company, enjoys being a score keeper for local athletic teams, and volunteers at the food pantry at the Southside Christian Church.

Carol and Jack’s lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their anniversary they may feel that their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Carol and Jack Swanger on this momentous occasion.

HONORING MISHAWAKA FIRE CHIEF DALE FREEMAN FOR A DISTINGUISHED CAREER IN PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JACQUIE WALORSKI
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fire Chief Dale Freeman and honor him for his selfless service helping Hoosiers throughout Mishawaka.

Chief Freeman began his storied journey with the Mishawaka Fire Department 36 years ago. Since then, he has gone on to lead the brave men and women who protect members of the northern Indiana community on a daily basis, responding to their calls for both emergency medical assistance and fire rescue. As chief, Freeman’s rise has been marked by incredible dedication and courage.

His commitment to excellence just recently resulted in over 5,100 people, mostly children, receiving critical fire safety education through “Survive Alive House,” Little Red, and other local programs and school assemblies. Furthermore, under Chief Freeman’s leadership, more than half of Mishawaka’s firefighting force is now cross-trained as Emergency Medical Technicians. These efforts have significantly strengthened the northern Indiana community’s level of preparedness, allowing Hoosiers throughout Mishawaka to feel safe knowing that their local fire department is ready to respond at a moment’s notice.

Chief Freeman’s passion for serving the greater good is truly remarkable and deserves the praise of many. His continued dedication to aiding those in desperate need of assistance has undoubtedly reduced significant cases of fire-related injuries, deaths, and property damage. Since first joining the Mishawaka Fire Department, Chief Freeman has truly epitomized the ideal of servant leadership. On behalf of the Hoosiers of the 6th Congressional District, it is my honor to thank him for his service and sacrifice for our community.
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Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fire Chief Dale Freeman and honor him for his selfless service helping Hoosiers throughout Mishawaka.

Chief Freeman began his storied journey with the Mishawaka Fire Department 36 years ago. Since then, he has gone on to lead the brave men and women who protect members of the northern Indiana community on a daily basis, responding to their calls for both emergency medical assistance and fire rescue. As chief, Freeman’s rise has been marked by incredible dedication and courage.

His commitment to excellence just recently resulted in over 5,100 people, mostly children, receiving critical fire safety education through “Survive Alive House,” Little Red, and other local programs and school assemblies. Furthermore, under Chief Freeman’s leadership, more than half of Mishawaka’s firefighting force is now cross-trained as Emergency Medical Technicians. These efforts have significantly strengthened the northern Indiana community’s level of preparedness, allowing Hoosiers throughout Mishawaka to feel safe knowing that their local fire department is ready to respond at a moment’s notice.
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His commitment to excellence just recently resulted in over 5,100 people, mostly children, receiving critical fire safety education through “Survive Alive House,” Little Red, and other local programs and school assemblies. Furthermore, under Chief Freeman’s leadership, more than half of Mishawaka’s firefighting force is now cross-trained as Emergency Medical Technicians. These efforts have significantly strengthened the northern Indiana community’s level of preparedness, allowing Hoosiers throughout Mishawaka to feel safe knowing that their local fire department is ready to respond at a moment’s notice.

Chief Freeman’s passion for serving the greater good is truly remarkable and deserves the praise of many. His continued dedication to aiding those in desperate need of assistance has undoubtedly reduced significant cases of fire-related injuries, deaths, and property damage. Since first joining the Mishawaka Fire Department, Chief Freeman has truly epitomized the ideal of servant leadership. On behalf of the Hoosiers of the 6th Congressional District, it is my honor to thank him for his service and sacrifice for our community.
Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Senior Chief Petty Officer Christopher Gibbs for his duty and service to Pinellas County and to our country.

On May 4, 2016, Officer Gibbs returned home after a year-long deployment and 21 years of military service. While enlisted, served as a Senior Chief Master at Arms and eventually earned the title of Senior Chief Petty Officer. We are eternally grateful for his service overseas.

Since returning home, Officer Gibbs continued his dedication to serving others through his work as an officer with the Pinellas Park Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Senior Chief Petty Officer Christopher Gibbs for his service to our community and this country. Pinellas Park is a safer place with him protecting us and we are very grateful and appreciative of his efforts. I ask this body to join me in recognizing Officer Gibbs’ efforts and expressing our appreciation for his service.

May God bless Officer Gibbs and his family.

TRIBUTE TO CASEY BLAKE

HON. DAVID YOUNG
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Casey Blake of Indianola, Iowa, for receiving the 2016 Robert D. Ray Pillar of Character Award from The Robert D. and Billie Ray Center in Des Moines, Iowa. The Award is given to those who live a life full of good character and foster greater character in others. This non-profit organization, formerly known as Character Counts in Iowa, was created in 1997 by former Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray and former First Lady Billie Ray. It showcases humanitarian and civilly endeavors impacting Iowans. The six character pillars are: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship.

Mr. Blake and his wife Abbie, as well as their six children, reside in Indianola, Iowa but for 13 years, he was defined a professional baseball player for several teams including Toronto Blue Jays, Minnesota Twins, Baltimore Orioles, Cleveland Indians, Los Angeles Dodgers and the Colorado Rockies organizations.

Upon his retirement, the family returned home to Iowa and his hometown of Indianola. In 2010, they founded the Indianola Community Youth Foundation, built the Blake Fieldhouse and other community athletic complexes. Mr. Blake was inducted into the National High School Hall of Fame in 2014 and the Iowa High School Baseball Coaches Association Hall of Fame in 2016.

I applaud and congratulate Casey Blake as a shining example of how hard work, determination, and dedication can affect the future of a community. It is with great honor that I recognize him today. I know that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in honoring his accomplishments. I wish him continued success in his future endeavors.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 9, 2016 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m. Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, “Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 2017”.

10 a.m. Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Securities and Exchange Commission.

3:30 p.m. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine oil and gas pipeline infrastructure and the economic, safety, environmental, permitting, construction, and maintenance considerations associated with that infrastructure.

Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine energy tax policy in 2016 and beyond.

3 p.m. Committee on Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency’s progress in implementing Inspector General and Government Accountability Office recommendations.

JUNE 15

10 a.m. Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, “Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 2017”.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine implementing the Child Care Development Block Grant Act of 2014, focusing on perspectives of stakeholders.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine America’s insatiable demand for drugs, focusing on examining solutions.

2 p.m. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard
To hold hearings to examine assessing the Coast Guard’s increasing duties, focusing on drug and migrant interdiction.

Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine challenges and opportunities for United States business in the digital age.

2:30 p.m. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on National Parks
To hold hearings to examine S. 2839 and H.R. 3004, bills to amend the Gulf/Gechee Cultural Heritage Act to extend the authorization for the Gulf/
Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Commission, H.R. 3036, to designate the National September 11 Memorial located at the World Trade Center site in New York City, New York, as a national memorial, H.R. 3620, to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, H.R. 4119, to authorize the exchange of certain land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore, Jackson County, Mississippi, between the National Park Service and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, S. 211, to establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania, S. 630, to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area, S. 1007, to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to rename a site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, S. 1623, to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, S. 1682, to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area, S. 1690, to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, S. 1696 and H.R. 482, bills to redesignate the Ocmetalgee National Monument in the State of Georgia, to revise the boundary of that monument, S. 1624, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Finger Lakes National Heritage Area, S. 2087, to modify the boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, S. 2412, to establish the Tule Lake National Historic Site in the State of California, S. 2548, to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission, S. 2627, to adjust the boundary of the Mojave National Preserve, S. 2807, to amend title 54, United States Code, to require State approval before the Secretary of the Interior restricts access to waters under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service for recreational or commercial fishing, S. 2855, to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, S. 2954, to establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, S. 3020, to update the map of, and modify the acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument, S. 3022, to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, and S. 3028, to redesignate the Olympic Wilderness as the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness.

Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine innovations to promote Americans' financial security.

JUNE 16
9:30 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine our evolving understanding and response to transnational criminal threats.

10 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management
To hold hearings to examine reviewing the rulemaking records of independent regulatory agencies.

JUNE 21
10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the semi-annual monetary policy report to the Congress.

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Land Management’s Planning 2.0 initiative.

JULY 13
10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine a review of the Department of Veterans Affairs’ electronic health record (Vista), progress toward interoperability with the Department of Defense’s electronic health record, and plans for the future.
HIGHLIGHTS
House and Senate met in a Joint Meeting to receive His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of India.

Senate

Chamber Action
Routine Proceedings, pages S3599–S3665

Measures Introduced: Nine bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3030–3038.

Measures Reported:
S. 1935, to require the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities to support waterfront community revitalization and resiliency, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–272)

Measures Considered:
National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pending:
McCain Amendment No. 4229, to address unfunded priorities of the Armed Forces.
Reed/Mikulski Amendment No. 4549 (to Amendment No. 4229), to authorize parity for defense and nondefense spending pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of McCain Amendment No. 4229.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 9, 2016; that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions with respect to Reed/Mikulski Amendment No. 4549 (to Amendment No. 4229) (listed above), and McCain Amendment No. 4229 (listed above), ripen at 11:15 a.m., on Thursday, June 9, 2016.

House Messages:
Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act: Senate disagreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2577, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, agreed to the request from the House for a conference, and authorized the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees, after taking action on the following motions to instruct conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill to be instructed to insist on the inclusion in the final conference report the following motions proposed thereto:

Rejected:
By 46 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 93), Nelson Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that any conference report shall not include proposals that would rescind existing Ebola emergency funds provided by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235), and designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as such funds support Ebola preparedness and response efforts which are critical to preventing, detecting, and responding to potential future Ebola outbreaks, and to insist that the final conference report include $510,000,000 to reimburse Ebola accounts, as provided for in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235) and designated by Congress as an
emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, for obligations incurred for Zika virus response, as such emergency Ebola funds support critical initiatives to prevent Ebola outbreaks, such as country operations and public health infrastructure in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea, public health research on infection control, including detection of person to person transmission of Ebola, and advanced research and development of new Ebola vaccines and therapeutics. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to instruct, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.)

By 56 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. 94), Sullivan Motion to Instruct Conferees to insist that any conference report shall include the provisions contained in Senate amendment 4065 (relating to the reconstruction of certain bridges). (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to instruct, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.)

By 93 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 92), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendment to the Senate amendment, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees.

The Chair was authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Collins, Kirk, McConnell, Murkowski, Hoeven, Boozman, Capito, Cochran, Blunt, Graham, Tester, Murray, Reed, Udall, Schatz, Baldwin, Murphy, Mikulski, and Leahy.

Committee Meetings

FAST ACT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine implementation of the FAST Act, after receiving testimony from Anthony R. Foxx, Secretary of Transportation.

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy concluded a hearing to examine United States sanctions policy in Sub-Saharan Africa, after receiving testimony from Sue E. Eckert, Brown University Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, Providence, Rhode Island; and Todd J. Moss, Center for Global Development, Princeton N. Lyman, United States Institute of Peace, and Brad Brooks-Rubin, Enough Project, all of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Geeta Pasi, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad, Anne S. Casper, of Nevada, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Burundi, and Mary Beth Leonard, of Massachusetts, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2417, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to allow the Indian Health Service to cover the cost of a copayment of an Indian or Alaska
Native veteran receiving medical care or services from the Department of Veterans Affairs; and
S. 2916, to provide that the pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land.

INTERAGENCY FOREST MANAGEMENT
Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine improving interagency forest management to strengthen tribal capabilities for responding to and preventing wildfires, including S. 3014, to improve the management of Indian forest land, after receiving testimony from Mike Black, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; James Hubbard, Deputy Chief, State and Private Forestry, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; William Nicholson, Intertribal Timber Council, Coulee Dam, Washington; and Carole Lankford, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Pablo, Montana.

H–2B TEMPORARY FOREIGN WORKER PROGRAM
Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest concluded a hearing to examine the H–2B Temporary Foreign Worker Program, focusing on examining the effects on Americans’ job opportunities and wages, after receiving testimony from Michael Cunningham, Texas State Building and Construction Trades Council, Austin; Meredith B. Stewart, Southern Poverty Law Center, Montgomery, Alabama; and Daniel Costa, Economic Policy Institute, Stephen G. Bronars, Edgeworth Economics, and Steven A. Camarota, Center for Immigration Studies, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:
S. 2992, to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management of the Small Business Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
S. 3009, to support entrepreneurs serving in the National Guard and Reserve, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and
S. 3024, to improve cyber security for small businesses.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 12 public bills, H.R. 5403–5414; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 769, 772, were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:
H.R. 3738, to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to improve the transparency, accountability, governance, and operations of the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–608);
H.R. 4638, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the creation of venture exchanges to promote liquidity of venture securities, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–609);
H. Res. 770, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5278) to establish an Oversight Board to assist the Government of Puerto Rico, including instrumentalities, in managing its public finances, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–610); and
H. Res. 771, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–611).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bost to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Brian Britton, The Dwelling Place Churches, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by voice vote.

Recess: The House recessed at 10:06 a.m. for the purpose of receiving His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of India. The House reconvened at 12:46 p.m., and agreed that the proceedings had during the Joint Meeting be printed in the Record.

Joint Meeting To Receive His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of India: The House and Senate met in a joint session to receive His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of India.
India. He was escorted into the Chamber by a committee comprised of Representatives Scalise, Morris Rodgers, Walden, Messer, Jenkins (KS), Royce, Holding, Poe (TX), Wilson (SC), Lummis, Pelosi, Hoyer, Becerra, Crowley, Bera, McDermott, Pallone, Gabbard, Lowey, Edwards, Van Hollen, and Eshoo; and Senators McConnell, Cornyn, Hatch, Blunt, Barasso, Wicker, Corker, Portman, Durbin, Murray, Stabenow, Klobuchar, and Cardin. Pages H3506–08

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Tuesday, June 7th:


Rejected the Rush motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 281. Pages H3517–37

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule.

Page H3525

Agreed to:

Gosar amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that ensures that the study on Ozone formation contained in the bill analyzes the relative contribution from wildfires; and Pages H3529–30

Whitfield amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that provides that no additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act; such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized (by a recorded vote of 236 ayes to 170 noes, Roll No. 276). Pages H3526–27, H3532

Rejected:

Rush amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that sought to provide federal, state, local, or tribal permitting agencies the ability to opt-out of section 3(d) if they determine that issuing a preconstruction permit under an outdated and less protective air quality standard will increase air pollution, slow permitting, increase regulatory uncertainty, foster litigation, shift the burden of pollution control from new sources to existing sources, or increase the overall cost of achieving the new or revised national ambient air quality standard in the applicable area (by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 277); Pages H3527–28, H3532–34

Pallone amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that sought to strike the consideration of technological feasibility when determining national ambient air quality standards to preserve health based standards (by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 278); Pages H3528–29, H3533–34

Polis amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that sought to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the prohibitions against aggregating emissions from any oil or gas exploration or production well and emissions; additionally, it requires the EPA to issue a rule adding hydrogen sulfide to the list of hazardous air pollutants (by a recorded vote of 160 ayes to 251 noes, Roll No. 279); and Pages H3530–31, H3534

Norton amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 114–607) that sought to provide that the provisions of the bill would not apply if the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Administration, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, finds that the application of any section could harm human health or the environment (by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 280).

H. Res. 767, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) and the concurrent resolutions (H. Con. Res. 89) and (H. Con. Res. 112) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 163 noes, Roll No. 274, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 163 nays, Roll No. 273. Pages H3509–17

Consideration of Presidential Veto Message: Agreed by unanimous consent that when a veto message on House Joint Resolution 88 is laid before the House on this legislative day, then after the message is read and the objections of the President are spread at large upon the Journal, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution shall be postponed until the legislative day of June 22, 2016, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

Page H3537

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Securing America’s Future Energy: Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act: S. 2276, amended, to amend title 49,
United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation.

Recess: The House recessed at 7:46 p.m. and reconvened at 10:03 p.m.

Presidential Veto Message—Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term “Fiduciary”: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted his Memorandum of Disapproval of H.J. Res. 88, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term “Fiduciary”, and explained his reasons therefore—ordered printed (H. Doc. 114–140).

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution are postponed until the legislative day of June 22, 2016, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H3505.

Senate Referral: S. 2487 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3515–16, H3516, H3517, H3532, H3532–33, H3533–34, H3534, H3534–35, H3536–37, and H3537. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:04 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health concluded a markup on H.R. 3299, the “Strengthening Public Health Emergency Response Act of 2015”; and H.R. 921, the “Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act of 2015”. H.R. 3299 and H.R. 921 were forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES


THE ENEMY IN OUR BACKYARD: EXAMINING TERROR FUNDING STREAMS FROM SOUTH AMERICA

Committee on Financial Services: Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing held a hearing entitled “The Enemy in Our Backyard: Examining Terror Funding Streams from South America”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5064, the “Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016”; H.R. 5253, the “Strong Visa Integrity Secures America Act”; H.R. 5390, the “Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Agency Act of 2016”; H.R. 5388, the “Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016”; H.R. 5389, the “Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016”; H.R. 5391, the “Gains in Global Nuclear Detection Architecture Act”; and H.R. 5385, the “Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Correction Act of 2016”. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 5064, H.R. 5253, H.R. 5385, and H.R. 5390. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 5388, H.R. 5389, and H.R. 5391.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4768, the “Separation of Powers Restoration Act of 2016”. H.R. 4768 was ordered reported, as amended.

PUERTO RICO OVERSIGHT, MANAGEMENT, AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT; LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 5278, the “Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act”; and H.R. 5325, the “Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2017”. The committee granted, by record vote of 9–2, a structured rule for H.R. 5325. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order only those 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
MEMBER PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE AND SUSTAIN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Member proposals to improve and sustain the Medicare program. Testimony was heard from Representatives Boustany, Dold, Noem, Reichert, Crowley, Larson of Connecticut, Meehan, Renacci, Mooney of West Virginia, Smith of New Jersey, and Zeldin.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate


Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine implications of the Supreme Court stay of the Clean Power Plan, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management, to hold hearings to examine the use of agency regulatory guidance, 11:15 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 247, to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, S. 356, to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications, S. 2944, to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers’ Benefit program, and the nominations of Donald Karl Schott, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Stephanie A. Finley, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, Claude J. Kelly III, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and Winfield D. Ong, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: business meeting to consider the nomination of Carla D. Hayden, of Maryland, to be Librarian of Congress for a term of ten years, 2 p.m., SR–301.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

PRIVATE SECTOR WEATHER FORECASTING: ASSESSING PRODUCTS AND TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled "Private Sector Weather Forecasting: Assessing Products and Technologies". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.
House


Full Committee, markup on the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill for FY 2017; and Report on the Revised Interim Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2017, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities; and Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, joint hearing entitled “Stopping the Money Flow: The War on Terror Finance”, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Congressional Budgeting: The Need To Control Automatic Spending and Unauthorized Programs”, 9:30 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Administration’s Overtime Rule and Its Consequences for Workers, Students, Nonprofits, and Small Businesses”, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, markup on the “FTC Process and Transparency Reform Act of 2016”; H.R. 5111, the “Consumer Review Fairness Act”; H.R. 5092, the “Reinforcing American Made Products Act”; and H.R. 5104, the “Better Online Ticket Sales Act” (continued), 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled “The Impact of Low Oil Prices on Energy Security in the Americas”, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, hearing entitled “Examining the President’s FY 2017 Budget Proposal Europe and Eurasia”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.


Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled “Sri Lanka’s Democratic Transition: A New Era for the U.S.-Sri Lanka Relationship”, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Census 2020: Examining the Readiness of Key Aspects of the Census Bureau’s 2020 Census Preparation”, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Operations; and Subcommittee on the Interior, joint hearing hearing entitled “SNAP: Examining Efforts to Combat Fraud and Improve Program Integrity”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax and Capital Access, hearing entitled “Bearing the Burden: Over-regulation’s Impact on Small Banks and Rural Communities”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 9
Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 2943, National Defense Authorization Act, with votes on the motions to invoke cloture on Reed/Mikulski Amendment No. 4549 (to Amendment No. 4229), and McCain Amendment No. 4229, at 11:15 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Thursday, June 9
House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 5278—Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (Subject to a Rule). Begin consideration of H.R. 5325—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2017 (Subject to a Rule).
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