



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 2016

No. 92

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 10, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You once again that we, Your creatures, can come before You and ask guidance for the men and women of this assembly.

Bless the people of this great Nation with wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, that they might responsibly participate in our American democracy as both political parties anticipate their conventions.

Help us all to be good citizens, respectful in our disagreements, and generous in our behavior toward one another.

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

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DELBENE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

STATE EFFORTS TO CRACK DOWN ON OPIOID EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently I was proud to vote for a package of bills here on the floor of the United States House intended to help crack down on the terrible epidemic of prescription opioid abuse and heroin abuse across our Nation.

Today, I want to recognize the efforts in the Pennsylvania General Assembly to assist in the goal of fighting back against all drug use. Specifically, a new law authored by State Representative Matt Baker, who represents a portion of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, would go after designer drugs in which different chemicals are combined to create new drugs.

This new law will speed up the process in adding these drugs to the State's list of banned drugs, enabling law enforcement to arrest and prosecute the individuals responsible. Giving members of our law enforcement commu-

nity the tools that they need to thwart illegal drug manufacturers will save lives.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to successfully fight back against a problem, you surround it. I am proud to see great lifesaving solutions coming from both the Federal and the State levels, with additional community action in the form of local roundtables and townhall meetings.

LGBT EQUALITY DAY

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

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, this is Pride Month, and we have much to celebrate.

In the last two decades, our Nation has seen the Defense of Marriage Act overturned, an end to the criminalization of same-sex conduct, and nationwide marriage equality, all through Supreme Court decisions that were handed down on June 26. But even with these incredible strides, we cannot forget that LGBT Americans continue to face inequality and discrimination simply for who they are and who they love.

That is why I have introduced legislation to designate June 26 as LGBT Equality Day, not only to celebrate how far we have come, but also to acknowledge how much work remains to be done.

I urge my colleagues and all Americans to join me in celebrating the first LGBT Equality Day on June 26.

As opponents of equality double down in their attempts to legalize discrimination, we must keep fighting until all Americans have equal rights and protections under the law.

HONORING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE AUBURN CITIZEN

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

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3667

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important milestone in my congressional district: the bicentennial of the Auburn Citizen.

Two hundred years ago today, this daily publication began serving the people of Cayuga County by providing news and community announcements. Born in 1816 as the Auburn Gazette, this community newspaper has been known by many names over the years.

In an editorial placed this past weekend, publisher Rob Forcey noted that the Auburn Citizen began publishing just 40 years after the birth of our country.

The history of accomplished journalists at this publication includes William Dapping, a community hero who was awarded the very first special Pulitzer in 1930 for his esteemed work in covering the bloody 1929 Auburn State Prison riots.

Today, the Citizen has evolved to cover a wide area of central New York, with web-based access to local and national news, weather, and community events. What is more, the publication has expanded into western Onondaga County, with the Skaneateles Journal and West Onondaga County Journal.

Congratulations again to this community-based publication on two centuries of being the voice of the Auburn community.

REMEMBERING DAVID GILKEY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, David Gilkey, an NPR photojournalist from Portland, Oregon, was killed with his Afghani translator in a Taliban ambush in Afghanistan.

I cannot fully express my gratitude for David's tireless commitment to his profession. His evocative, beautiful work, and many contributions to NPR will be remembered for generations.

He covered conflict areas around the globe. Since 2001, he extensively covered the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

He was one of the most decorated of photo journalists, including an Emmy, and the first multimedia journalist to be awarded the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's prestigious Edward R. Murrow Award for Journalism.

David played an essential role in helping us understand the global events. He was one of those who put themselves in harm's way to open the world's window for the rest of us. They are true heroes.

Our hearts go out to the Gilkey family and to his NPR family for their loss.

APPRECIATING PRIME MINISTER NARENDRA MODI

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, I was grateful to serve on the escort committee for Prime Minister Narendra Modi of India, due to my former co-chairmanship of the Caucus on India and Indian Americans, with my father having served in India during World War II.

The Prime Minister was warmly received with his positive presentation:

As a representative of the world's largest democracy, it is indeed a privilege to speak with the leaders of its oldest.

Connecting our two nations is also a unique and dynamic bridge of 3 million Indian Americans. Threats of terror are expanding, and new challenges are emerging in cyber and outer space. India is undergoing a profound social and economic change.

A commitment to rebuild a peaceful and stable and prosperous Afghanistan is our shared objective. In every sector of India's forward march, I see the U.S. as an indispensable partner.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

South Carolina especially recognizes the success of Indian Americans, with their Governor, Nikki Haley, the second Indian American Governor elected in history.

CONGRATULATING TWIN SCHOLARS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell you a really cool story about two smart sisters, Estrella and Perla Ortiz, identical twins who earned the valedictorian and salutatorian status at their high school in Fort Worth.

Estrella and Perla are the two youngest of seven siblings in the Ortiz family. The sisters worked hard and excelled academically at North Side High School, the home of the Steers.

In their spare time, the Ortiz sisters participated in the National Honor Society, Health Occupations Students of America, tutored their peers, and even helped adults obtain their GED.

Their hard work paid off in academia when they were awarded scholarships at Texas Christian University, where the sisters will receive a full ride to TCU to continue their studies in biology and premed.

The Ortiz sisters demonstrate that anything is possible with dedication and perseverance. And, oh, I want to also mention that their sister, Maria, was also valedictorian in 2014 at the same school.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Estrella and Perla on their extraordinary academic achievement.

CHEROKEE TRAIL BOYS BASEBALL TEAM

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the boys baseball team of Cherokee Trail High School on winning the 2016 Colorado 5A State championship game on May 29, 2016.

The students and staff who were a part of the title-winning Cougars team deserve to be honored for winning the State championship for the first time since they won the 4A State championship in 2007. The Cougars beat Rocky Mountain High School 5-1 in the series, and ended the season with a winning 22-5 record.

Throughout the season, the boys of the Cherokee Trail baseball team were dedicated, worked hard, and persevered. These traits were a key factor in their endeavor to win the championship, but winning could not have been possible without the tireless leadership of their head coach, Allan Dyer, and his commendable staff.

It is with great pride that I join all of the residents of Aurora, Colorado, in congratulating the Cherokee Trail Cougars on their State championship.

EXPAND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the families who are still struggling to make ends meet.

Our economy has made great strides since the end of the recession. Like my colleagues, I have watched the unemployment rate tick down each month from 10 percent in 2009 to 5 percent today.

According to the story that these numbers tell, our economy has recovered. But for nearly 8 million Americans still looking for work, our economy is still in a state of crisis.

In my home district, more than 16 percent live in poverty, and the unemployment rate is three times the national rate, at 15 percent. I have met hundreds of these unemployed constituents at my annual job fair. They aren't looking for a handout; they are looking for a hand up, an opportunity to work, a chance to live a better life, a shot at the American Dream.

As we enter the second half of 2016, I urge my colleagues to stand with me and take action to expand economic opportunities and to ensure that all Americans who want to work have the chance to do so.

RECOGNIZING COACH LORI BLADE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone who has a lot of heart, who carries herself with class and humility, and who pushes her players to be better on and off the court.

Coach Lori Blade's incredible success has produced 624 wins, dozens of conference titles, and two State championships.

On April 30, Coach Blade was enshrined into the Illinois Basketball Coaches Association Hall of Fame. Her 22 seasons of accomplishments have vaulted both Edwardsville and Carrollton High Schools' programs to statewide dominance.

Beyond the victories, Coach Blade has made a profound impact on countless lives, teaching players to take pride not just in the game, but in everything they do. Pushing her players never to be satisfied or content, Coach Blade has had a phenomenal career on the court and on the softball diamond, being the only coach in IHSA history to have over 600 wins in two sports.

Congratulations, Coach Blade, on all of your accomplishments. Thank you for your commitment to our students, and I wish you all the best in your future seasons, unless you play my hometown Taylorville Tornados.

□ 0915

LYNN WOOLSEY'S VISIT

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, 444. That is the number of times Lynn Woolsey came to this floor, stood at that podium right over there, and addressed this House during Special Orders, speaking against war and in support of peace.

Lynn Woolsey, for 20 years, represented much of my congressional district. My colleagues here in Congress will remember her as a passionate and outspoken advocate—a leader—in the effort to strengthen our national security without war. One of the ways that she did that was through her hundreds of Special Order hour speeches. In the final one of these, No. 444, she said the following:

“Sometimes I've been accused of wanting a 'perfect world.' But I consider that a compliment. Our Founders strove to form a 'more perfect Union.' Why shouldn't we aim for a perfect world? You see, I'm absolutely certain that if we don't work toward a perfect world, we won't ever come close to providing a safe, healthy, and secure world for our grandchildren and their grandchildren.”

She is with her grandchildren Carlo and Luca here today.

Let us thank Lynn Woolsey for her service, and let's urge all Members of Congress to approach our work with the same tenacity and resolve to work together toward peace, health, and security for all.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 767, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 89

Whereas a carbon tax is a Federal tax on carbon released from fossil fuels;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase energy prices, including the price of gasoline, electricity, natural gas, and home heating oil;

Whereas a carbon tax will mean that families and consumers will pay more for essentials like food, gasoline, and electricity;

Whereas a carbon tax will fall hardest on the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to more jobs and businesses moving overseas;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to less economic growth;

Whereas American families will be harmed the most from a carbon tax;

Whereas, according to the Energy Information Administration, in 2011, fossil fuels share of energy consumption was 82 percent;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase the cost of every good manufactured in the United States;

Whereas a carbon tax will impose disproportionate burdens on certain industries, jobs, States, and geographic regions and would further restrict the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas American ingenuity has led to innovations in energy exploration and development and has increased production of domestic energy resources on private and State-owned land which has created significant job growth and private capital investment;

Whereas United States energy policy should encourage continued private sector innovation and development and not increase the existing tax burden on manufacturers;

Whereas the production of American energy resources increases the United States ability to maintain a competitive advantage in today's global economy;

Whereas a carbon tax would reduce America's global competitiveness and would encourage development abroad in countries that do not impose this exorbitant tax burden; and

Whereas the Congress and the President should focus on pro-growth solutions that encourage increased development of domestic resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 89, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 89, which takes a strong stand against the carbon tax that would hurt American families, workers, and job creators.

As the President closes out his time in office, he would like nothing more than to ram through more of his harmful energy agenda. Just look at the President's budget this year. Among the \$3.4 trillion in tax hikes he proposed, the President included a \$10 per barrel tax on oil. This tax alone would cause gas prices to increase by an estimated 25 cents per gallon. With a carbon tax, there would be a tax hike on production, distribution, and the use of not only oil but also of natural gas and any other form of energy that emits carbon. Such a tax would have many serious impacts on our economy by making day-to-day life more expensive for families throughout this country.

First, a carbon tax could drive up the cost of energy for both the producers and the consumers. This translates to larger energy bills that eat up even more of Americans' take-home pay, especially during the hottest and coldest months of the year.

Second, a carbon tax would destroy well-paying jobs throughout the American energy sector—a sector that has fueled significant job growth throughout the country.

Third, a carbon tax would deliver a direct hit to working families and have compound effects that would reach all corners of the economy. In fact, a carbon tax would increase the cost of, virtually, every good manufactured or service performed in the United States, including everyday necessities. If a good requires energy to make or transport, which most do, taxes on that energy are, essentially, a tax on that good. As a result, Americans would have to pay more for everything—from milk to clothing to school supplies.

Finally, to make this bad idea even worse, we know that a carbon tax would hurt those who are living in poverty and those who are on fixed incomes more than anyone else.

Put simply, a carbon tax would make it harder for us to grow our economy and help working families and small businesses succeed.

We all want an all-of-the-above energy approach that supports new innovations, not a targeted tax hike on specific industries. Thanks to the leadership of Whip SCALISE, Congress will pass this bill today and send it to the Senate, and we will send a clear message to the people in our districts, as well as to the Obama White House, that we do not support this extreme tax.

Instead, we will continue to pass legislation that grows our economy and that helps more Americans get back to work. After all, last week, we received the worst jobs report in almost 6 years. It is more important than ever that we move forward with a bold, pro-growth agenda, not another expensive Washington tax.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What is happening today is further evidence that the Republicans are simply not doing their job. There is real work to be done. It is simply inexcusable that action has not yet happened to prepare for the Zika virus. That would be real action. Helping the people of Flint get clean drinking water, in my home State, would be something real. There is no budget resolution that has been considered here on the House floor. Raising the minimum wage would also be real, and it would help lift many families out of poverty. Closing tax loopholes and making the Tax Code fairer would be real.

Instead, today, we are voting on two senses of Congress resolutions. Doing so provides further evidence that the Republicans not only are not acting on those real problems mentioned earlier but are in denial on another real issue that needs action—climate change. The scientific evidence of climate change is overwhelming, and the consensus is clear, and we have seen the impacts of climate change, virtually, every day in our country and around the world.

This week, the CBO, led by a Director appointed by the majority here, released a report that identified the effects of climate change as a potential risk to the Federal budget. According to that report, the cost of hurricane damage is projected to be \$35 billion more than it is today because of climate change.

The report stated:

“Human activities around the world, primarily the burning of fossil fuels and widespread changes in land use, are producing growing emissions of greenhouse gases.”

Climate change requires all of us, including the Republicans here who are in total denial, to come to our senses and to act on the challenge of climate change.

This sense of Congress resolution, like the second one, completely fails to meet that challenge. I urge its rejection.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman

from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Tax Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my colleague and friend on the Ways and Means Committee, Mrs. BLACK, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 89, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

At a time when 80 percent of domestic energy consumption comes from natural gas, from oil, from coal, it is, clearly, counterproductive to make these necessary resources more expensive by imposing an indirect tax on these fuels. A carbon tax means higher utility bills for families, more expensive goods and services for consumers, decreased economic activity, and it would really hurt job creation. We already heard about the dismal numbers last week that were released—38,000 non-farm-related jobs.

Let me just be clear. When we were in the recession, one of the prime drivers economically that took us out of the recession was the shale revolution—a real energy renaissance in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this type of tax is not just a tax on carbon—it is a tax on working families; it is a tax on the American economy; it is a tax on American competitiveness; it is a tax on our energy security. It strikes right at the foundation of our national security. It is the wrong thing to do. It is a regressive tax. It hurts the people who are most dependent on fixed incomes—seniors. It hurts them most.

Why would we even consider doing this?

There are better ways to set up taxation for this country that meet our needs. I just don't understand why one would propose this type of tax, other than the fact that there is a radical environmental agenda, which would hurt manufacturing and American competitiveness. We can't do this. We need to grow this economy. We need growth around 3 to 4 percent minimum to create jobs, to let American business create value, to assert American leadership globally. We are not going to do this with a carbon tax. We won't do it. We need pro-growth policies.

Mr. Speaker, the American people understand this. A recent study by the Institute for Energy Policy found that over 60 percent of Americans oppose this type of idea.

I applaud Whip SCALISE for offering this sensible resolution because it then puts forth a very strong, affirmative statement that we are not going to dis-

arm the American economy, that we are not going to strike a blow at American competitiveness when we are struggling already as it is.

I am sick and tired of the fact that American leadership is eroding around the world. I am sick and tired of the fact that we are walking around with timidity. We ought to be embracing the concept of American leadership. This gives us an opportunity, based on American innovation and energy—the clearest example of which I know of American exceptionalism—to rewrite the rules of energy security based on open markets, transparent pricing, and diversity of supply source.

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

I am pleased to hear my friend from Louisiana with his impassioned presentation today; but his presentation, coming on the heels of what we all heard from the Prime Minister of India—calling for a low carbon, sustainable, innovative future—makes me sad.

If we would have had our economy take these issues seriously—maybe have a week of hearings—we would have been able to demonstrate to the gentleman with an impartial panel of independent experts all across the political spectrum—Conservative, Liberal, Republican, and Democrat—that a carbon tax, revenue neutral, is, actually, the key to the innovative future they want.

There are all sorts of ways to design a carbon tax, to, actually, enhance the role—the economic status—of low- and moderate-income people, but we never had a hearing on that. It is just simply dismissed as something that we can't do, but they have done it elsewhere in the world. If the committee had done its job, we would be dealing with facts, not hyperbole.

□ 0930

If the committee had done its job, we would have heard that we have very real challenges today to American security, which our Department of Defense has pointed out.

Climate change, despite denial from some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, is a threat today to the American military posture. Climate change is disrupting industries like fishing. It is producing unprecedented flooding, forest fires, and a wildly unpredictable weather future. The reduction of arctic ice at unprecedented levels ought to be of concern to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Maybe if we had some open, honest hearings that were balanced and independent, that case would have been made and they may support it.

But whether or not they care about climate change and global warming, a carbon tax makes sense for American innovation, the economy, and our competitiveness. It is the areas of low-carbon energy that have seen the job growth. There are now more people

working in wind and solar than the coal industry by far. That is where the job growth has been undertaken.

A carbon tax would enhance America's global competitiveness. And if we had hearings, listening to independent experts across the board, that case would be made, and I don't think we would have this foolish resolution on the floor.

These are elements that would inject into our energy policy an even, balanced approach using market forces, which are much easier than some of the incentives that we have, which are important, which people on both sides of the aisle have supported in the past. But a carbon tax is a more effective way of achieving those objectives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sad that we didn't have that debate in committee. I am sad that we didn't hear from independent experts. I think of our friend Bob Inglis, former Congressperson, who is on a personal crusade working with the evangelical community about the merits of a carbon tax. It would have been great to have heard from Bob and others like him to be able to present a balanced picture and be able to deal with meaningful policy.

I still hope that someday, that time will come that our Ways and Means Committee actually takes the time to dive into one of the most important issues of the day and to examine one of the tools that independent experts all across the spectrum agree would be a solid addition and actually simplify the Tax Code while we can help people in low income and small business and provide incentives for America's global competitiveness, like we heard from the Prime Minister of India from that very rostrum just 2 days ago.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a colleague of mine and a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK). We see eye to eye on almost everything in our lives, and it is really good to be able to stand here today and speak so strongly in favor of H. Con. Res. 89. I really do appreciate the passion and sincerity of my colleagues across the aisle.

What we are talking today is about policy. What we are talking about today is the all-important, unintended consequences that so often are put to blame for bad things that happen to American people. They are well intended, yes, at their conception, but very harmful.

We are talking about a carbon tax, \$10 a barrel on oil. And we are saying: Well, don't worry about that because that is going to be charged upstream. That is going to be charged when it is taken out of the ground.

But we all know that every single tax, every single cost is paid downstream.

What do I mean by that?

Every day hardworking Americans get up in the morning and want to put a roof over the heads of their families, food on the table, clothes on their back, and a little bit of money put away for their future. But every day we continue to come up with policies that somehow, although well intended, make it harder for them to make a living, make it harder for them to live the American Dream, make it harder for them to get ready for the future.

Now, I know there are always going to be existential threats. I get that. My grandson is afraid to get out of bed at night because he thinks there is a monster under it. He thinks that if you get up in the middle of the night, maybe there is somebody in the closet or maybe there is something else.

Now, I am not a climate change denier. Of course, the climate changes. I have seen it happen in my life. I have seen it where people say it is getting too cold and now it is getting too warm.

Well, you know what?

It just changes. I get that.

What doesn't change is the assault on the American people to pick up the tab on all of these costs. There is nothing that makes less sense to me than what we are doing. And back home where I come from, there is an old saying that goes something like this: Measure twice and cut once.

Why?

Because once you do that cut, it is permanent. That is why you want to measure twice to make sure that the cut you make is the right cut. That is why you need to take the policies that affect everyday American people and make sure that you are not hurting them.

Well intended, I get it. I know it is well intended. I just don't think the American people have to pay the brunt of this.

I am very aware of the Prime Minister of India being here Wednesday. And I also know that between India and China, that is where the greatest pollution comes from. I get it. I get it.

Putting \$10 a barrel on oil coming out of the ground just doesn't make sense. I would just like my friends on both sides of the aisle to think about somebody named Steven Jobs. Steven Jobs did not invent the PC because we taxed typewriters too high and caused the cost of that. Innovation, of course, is the answer. And we have seen great innovation.

I know where I am from in western Pennsylvania, that clean coal is real. But the President promised, when he was running as a candidate, that he would put those who chose to make electricity by burning coal out of business. So we regulate them to the point where it is no longer cost efficient to do that, but we keep moving that way.

The fact that 40,000 Pennsylvanians make a living that way, well, don't worry about that, they will have to find something else to do. You can go down to West Virginia and you can

hear where candidates told them: Listen, you are going to be out of business, but we will find something else for you to do and we will just get to that later.

Look, we have an opportunity today. This is a sense of Congress to tell the American people what it is that we think goes on with this policy. For far too long we have turned a deaf ear and a blind eye to the people who sent us here to represent them. We talk very loftily about what it is that we would like to see, how it is that we would like it to go, our dream for the future. But we forget that every day, hardworking American taxpayers get up, throw their feet out over the side of the bed, and go to work for a very particular reason: their families, their churches, their schools, their communities and, more importantly, all of America.

Well intended, yes. But the results would be devastating.

And who would pay this carbon tax? Who would pay this \$10 a barrel?

It would be any man or woman who has to go out and buy anything for his or her family. It would be reflected in the cost of everything we put on our backs and everything we put in our mouths. It would affect everything we do when we travel from one point to another, but we say it is necessary. It is necessary because we have to tax this so high that we drive people away from it.

I would hope that we could come together in America's House and do what is right for America's people, to do what is right for the people who sent us here to represent them because they are working so hard to make sure that there is a future for their children.

In the last month when we created one job for every 8,000 Americans—one job for every 8,000 Americans, are you kidding me?—in the greatest country the world has ever known, in a Nation that leads the world in defending freedom and liberty, in a Nation that knows that the best way to help others is through American participation—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I do want to make sure that this final point comes across: We can work together for solutions. We can work together to do the same things for the same people that we all came here to represent. I do not think that there are ill-intended ideas on the other side. I think they are well-intended. I just think they are wrong. I think they are wrong for the times, and I think they are wrong for the American people.

As I said earlier, where I am from, there are a lot of old adages. And one of them is: don't worry about the mule, just load the wagon.

I will tell you right now that the mule is trying to find a way to unhook

itself from the wagon because that load has gotten too heavy to pay. I know that the people who are loading the wagon think it is okay because at some point, that is going to have to be delivered somewhere. The truth of the matter is it is not.

We have put too heavy a burden on American taxpayers, hardworking American taxpayers, hardworking Americans. 1.4 million American lives have been sacrificed for the freedom and liberty not just of this country—our country and our Nation—but for the whole world. So I say let's be careful before we do these well-intended but careless things. Let's be careful before we turn our backs on the people who we actually represent here, and that is hardworking American people.

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

I couldn't agree more with my good friend from Butler, Pennsylvania, that we can actually come together and fashion solutions. That is why it is such a tragedy that this resolution comes to the floor without ever having our committee work on it, because we could have had hearings that could have narrowed those gaps.

I include in the RECORD a letter from six conservative advocates for climate change action.

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Later this week Congress will take up a resolution sponsored by Congressman Scalise (R-LA1) 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 include regulatory and tax reforms 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 present 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 need for action, 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 has the support of free market economists, a majority of the global business community, and a large number of the largest multinational private oil and gas 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, unevenly 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 (chiefly 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 deregulate 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 energy costs; the poor, the elderly, and individuals and families living on fixed incomes.

Unfortunately, none of those options are presently available because Members of Congress have neglected opportunities 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 about sensible carbon 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.

ELI LEHRER,
President, R Street Institute.

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

ALAN VIARD,
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Pennsylvania could have heard them talk about the need for action and how you can design a carbon tax that meets the objectives he is talking about, but we never did that. We didn't listen to experts across the spectrum—Republican, Democrat, conservative, liberal, economists, and scientists—to be able to examine the facts.

Instead, we have a cartoon proposal that they are arguing against as opposed to something that we could have worked on together that is promoted by most of the independent experts in the field. And someday within our lifetime this Congress will consider and, I think, probably approve.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Seattle, Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who has looked at some of these challenges around the globe.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as I come to speak on the floor, I think I

am in the House of the deniers. Now, in 2007, that liberal journal, National Geographic, had an article called "The Big Thaw." And it says:

"It's no surprise that a warming climate is melting the world's glaciers and polar ice. But no one expected it to happen this fast."

That was in 2007. That was 9 years ago.

I was taken, along with GERRY CONNOLLY, up to the Arctic with the Norwegian Government. They are worried about what is happening.

This resolution is just burying your head in the sand. I think you are thinking that if you put your head in the sand long enough, it will go away and, when you pull your head out, it won't be there.

The CBO just put a report out: Texas, Louisiana, and Florida are going to have hurricane damage that is unbelievable. FEMA already accounts for 45 percent of money spent on hurricane damage, \$95 billion since 2000.

Now, if you think the insurance companies are going to keep insuring against hurricanes, you have another thing coming. At some point, they are going to say: We are not doing hurricane insurance in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and a whole bunch of other places. That is the economics.

You say: Let's not pay anything right now, let's not change anything, let's not work on it.

But if we don't work on it, we are going to pay later. I am old enough to remember a FRAM commercial on the television. It was an air cleaner on your car, and it said: Pay me now or pay me later. And this is what this is about today.

Now, there are things going on in this country which just absolutely boggle my mind. In North Carolina, the assembly got together and they said: You know what? We are not going to spend any money to measure the sea levels.

Now, you have hundreds of miles of coastline in North Carolina where the sea is rising and property values are going to be lost. We are talking money here. We are not talking soft, liberal stuff. This is real, and people don't want to even look at it.

In Florida and Wisconsin, they took a novel approach and they said: We are not even going to use the words "climate change" in anything.

Now, here in Congress, the climate deniers take many forms, from blocking the words "social cost of carbon" to directing the Department of Defense to ignore climate change. All the while, the DOD itself highlights the threat of climate change to national security. Republicans like to talk about national security.

□ 0945

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. If you are serious about talking about national security,

you better start talking about the climate change that is going on in the world. Sea lanes across the North Pole are coming, boats are already coming, we are building the Panama Canal wider, and it is opening up on the north end of the globe.

Now, this absurdity cannot last, and we have got to begin to do what Mr. BLUMENAUER suggested. There have to be hearings. Bob Inglis, I knew him when he was here. God, he was a wild-eyed liberal. I couldn't believe what a wild-eyed liberal he was. He came down here talking about a carbon tax. I had a carbon tax. Mr. LARSON had a carbon tax.

This is not a partisan issue, Democrat versus Republican; it is whether or not you are going to look at the science of what is happening on the globe. I urge people to vote "no" on this. You will come back and do it in a couple of years.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding. I am proud to bring forward this legislation, Mr. Speaker, that expresses the strong sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

If you look at what this administration has done through radical rules and regulations, through all of its agencies, starting with the EPA, with the IRS, with the NLRB, the whole alphabet soup of Federal agencies that every morning wake up trying to figure out how to make it harder for our economy to get moving again, how to make it harder for people to create jobs in America, frankly, the results of these radical regulations are shifting and running jobs away, out of our country to foreign countries like China, like India, and they want to keep it going.

This is not a new concept, Mr. Speaker. They tried this years ago when they brought through the cap-and-trade bill. Passed out of the House, it couldn't even pass in the Senate when they had a supermajority in the Senate with 60 votes because it was such a detrimental idea that would devastate our economy. Yet even with that defeat, President Obama still tries to come back with a carbon tax through other means, whether it is regulations or whether it is superimposed carbon taxes through the EPA and some of the other things they are doing.

We have had hearings on this, Mr. Speaker. There is data all around that confirms how devastating a carbon tax would be to the United States economy. You can just look at what some of the outside groups that look at this said. The National Association of Manufacturers, the people that make things in America, have confirmed we would lose more than a million jobs in America if a carbon tax was imposed.

Where would those jobs go? They would go to countries, ironically, that

don't have the good environmental standards we already have. So they would go to countries like China and India where, if you are concerned about carbon going into the atmosphere, the things that they do to produce the same things we produce here in America, it creates more than five times the amount of carbon in those countries. So you are shifting jobs out of America to send it to countries where you would actually create more carbon.

They talk about somehow being able to create policy that will stop hurricanes and change the sea level rising, for goodness sake, as if some policy is going to do that.

By the way, the result of their policies will increase carbon in the Earth's atmosphere. But let's not even talk about that. Let's actually talk about the track record of this administration that now wants to control the Earth's temperature.

They spent over \$500 million and couldn't even create a Web site to take your health insurance requests, healthcare.gov. Remember that? Well, this same group now thinks they can control the Earth's temperature through radical policies.

Again, let's look at the devastating impact these policies would have. They wouldn't work, first of all, but they would have a devastating impact on the middle class of this country. The Congressional Budget Office, our own Congressional Budget Office that looked at this, said a carbon tax would actually hit low-income people the hardest, even harder than high-income people.

It would have a devastating impact on those people who are least able to afford it because it would increase the cost of everything they do. It would increase your food costs at the grocery store. It would increase, of course, what you pay at the pump. It would increase your electricity prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SCALISE. The Heritage Foundation looked at this and said that this kind of carbon tax would actually increase the cost of everything that families buy by over \$1,400 per family. Families are going to pay \$1,400 more every year for the cost of a carbon tax that the other side wants to defend. And to yield what? To just yield an opportunity for countries like China and India to grow their economies at the expense of ours.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you look at what they are trying to do—and, again, if you want to do this, bring it forward as an idea in legislation. They tried it with cap-and-trade, and it got defeated when Democrats controlled everything. There is bipartisanship on this issue, and the bipartisanship is in opposition to a carbon tax.

So why don't we go on record and be very clear about it, not just that it is bad policy, but also to reaffirm how

devastating it would be for the United States economy.

It shouldn't move forward. The President needs to stop this radical agenda and instead focus on reversing the depressing economic activity that we have seen in this country since he has been President because of these kinds of policies.

Let's get real economic growth. Let's bring those jobs back to the United States. Let's reject a carbon tax.

I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed my friend from Louisiana's impassioned presentation. It is too bad that the Committee on Ways and Means didn't actually sit down and go through the elements that would be in a balanced carbon tax. He is debating a cartoon version, not one that we worked on.

I am going to yield, in a moment, to one of the gentlemen who, earlier in this carbon debate several Congresses ago, has been involved with crafting a realistic carbon tax.

We had the reference to the inability to move the cap-and-trade, which I don't think is as good as a carbon tax. It failed because there were a minority of the Senate who were opposed to allowing it to go forward. It wasn't that we didn't have a majority that were interested. In the Senate, you can have a veto with 41 people who are decided that they are not going to allow things to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON). He has been a student of a carbon tax, who has listened to those people across the political spectrum and has been a champion of a reasonable, thoughtful approach to promote American innovation.

I would just point out the areas where we have had the greatest job growth in the energy sector have not been petroleum or coal. It has been solar and wind. A carbon tax would help accelerate that by leveling the playing field and allowing the forces of economics to dictate the next steps.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be on the floor and join in this debate.

I must, along with my colleague from Oregon, express frustration. This body should be about the vitality of ideas. Whatever those ideas are, in a democracy, there ought to be the willingness to express them.

Mr. BLUMENAUER has detailed, at length, the lack of public hearings. Listen, I get it. This is a messaging opportunity. This has no force of law. All this does is say what the sensibilities are of the Congress.

Now, what does the public think of the sensibilities of the Congress? What the public thinks is that we are all bluster and no solution and that we never take the time to sit down and measure twice and then cut. We just simply don't do that in our committees.

And so the vitality of ideas, a very noble idea expressed by a Republican, Mr. Inglis, many sessions ago and embraced by many conservative economists in the Reagan, in the Nixon, and in the Bush administrations about providing certainty in terms of what we need to do and a revenue stream that has this at its core: tax pollution—tax pollution—at its source, and pass the savings on to the consumers.

We know the volumes that are produced. We know the science behind this. There should be an open and clear-eyed debate on this; but not only a debate about the pros and cons, but how about something refreshing for the American people—a solution. It may not be the bill that I proposed or that Bob Inglis proposed or that any number of people have embraced, but you have major companies, including major oil companies that will be taxed, say, no, this is a sensible way for us to embrace this, and we are enjoined by the very people who this would tax and by conservative economists who say, yeah, we ought to take a look at this not only from the standpoint of the certainty that it will provide, but the known certainty of what pollution does. And it is not just about climate change. It is about the health of the air that we breathe, what we are poisoning in the atmosphere for our children, what happens with respect to the effects of asthma and what happens in terms of the people in coal mines from black lung disease.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. These debilitating diseases scream out for the Congress not to have a message opportunity that may or may not advantage one side or the other in the realm of politics, but how about a solution?

How about us doing what MIKE KELLY suggested, to work together in the committee to come up with a positive solution as to how to address this? Pass the savings along to the consumer. Develop a revenue system that will, in fact, allow us to rebuild our country that is crumbling around us.

Let's take those steps and the responsibility that we all have to the citizens to provide them with solutions, not bluster.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. BLACK and Mr. BOUSTANY on these two concurrent resolutions that are being offered today. I appreciate the time.

I recall in this debate here that there was a whole movie back in the 1960s called "If It's Tuesday, This Must Be Belgium." Well, if it is tax-raising time, this must be Washington, D.C., because there are more schemes all the

time to come hit not just big, evil corporations and big energy producers; this always ends up hitting the bottom line of American working families and the economy.

The President's plan to raise a tax on each and every barrel of oil produced by \$10 translates out to 25 cents at the pump. We heard earlier some of my colleagues talk about what the carbon tax would mean to working families—much more than they can afford in this bad economy and a time where the jobless rate is higher than is even measurable by this administration.

This continues the antidomestically produced energy narrative of this administration. It only hurts U.S. energy jobs and takes productive U.S. fields, such as what we have in California, out of production that are on the margins of being profitable. Instead of having domestically produced energy, we are going to shift more of that burden to other sources: foreign energy or the need for exploring more here or offshore.

Why don't we allow the profitable energy and oilfields we have in California and this country to continue to be productive and not hamper them with another additional tax that will take them out of production and rely more on foreign oil?

Now, how popular is this amongst regular people? In my own district, we conducted a survey recently where people actually took time to send postcards back into my office that came in at approximately a 90 percent rate in opposition to this \$10-per-barrel oil tax, which they understand means 25 cents, again, per gallon at the gas pump.

This really, really hurts all Americans. It hurts working families, people on the lower end of the income scale, but even more so, districts like mine that are very rural and all the other rural districts around this country where people have to travel farther to get to their work, to take their kids to school or to healthcare appointments, their ball games, maybe even save up occasionally in this economy for a travel vacation they might like to take and visit the beauty of America.

□ 1000

So the rural economy is even more devastated by this—the rural economy that also would be productive with energy—with these schemes that are being pondered.

Additionally, there are other ideas, like a tax on every mile driven, which is being contemplated at some level here federally as well as in my own State. Tax people for every mile they drive, tax them at the gas pump, tax them for carbon. Again, this hits real people in America, not just some idea of a big, evil corporation.

The answer in Washington always seems to be more government and taxation that hurts working families. Perhaps first, these dollars should be channeled into projects that people can use. Not more environmental projects, but

more highways, more bridges, more water storage. Not boondoggles like we have in California, such as the high-speed rail money pit, or the cost of frivolous environmental measures that drive up the costs of construction projects and sometimes even completely eliminate them.

We talk about a green economy a lot, especially on that side of the floor over there. Why don't we focus on a green economy that is not based on importing solar panels from China or wind machines from Europe? How about we get out and do the forestry that is needed to be done to thin the forests?

We are talking about the air we breathe. Each summer, for months, the air is brown in northern California—lots of California—and lots of the Western States from forests that are burning because they are not managed, because they are not thinned. Instead, they are overgrown.

That would be a green economy. We could turn this into biomass if you want to have real energy that works for the equation of renewable energy. Channel that effort into that instead of chasing these wind machines and solar panels.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I support H. Con. Res. 112 and H. Con. Res. 89, to send a message that this is more job-killing taxes and schemes that will fix our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. LAMALFA. It is the freedom to explore for and produce low-cost domestic energy that will help Americans and our economy to recover once again.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), a gentleman who brings his private sector business success to commonsense solutions in policy.

Mr. DELANEY. I want to thank my friend from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, my friends on the other side of the aisle are making four points.

The first point they are making is that they don't believe in science, because the science around climate change is unassailable.

The second point they are making is that they don't worry about American prosperity, because from an economic perspective and national security, the military, we should be reminded, has called climate change a threat multiplier. This is a very significant risk to long-term American prosperity.

The third point they are making is that they don't believe in the power of markets to change behavior at its core. They are not acknowledging the power of a capitalistic economic model to change people's behavior.

And the fourth thing they are saying is that they don't trust U.S. businesses to innovate into opportunities and around challenges.

These are extraordinary statements. And contrast that with our approach. I have a piece of legislation called the Tax Pollution, Not Profits Act, which puts in place a carbon pricing mechanism, which has been proven to be the most effective way—more effective than a regulatory approach—to change behavior and reverse some of the trends and bend the curve on climate change.

We take the revenues that are generated by that bill and we use it to offset all of the costs that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say exist through tax credits to individuals. We set aside money to take care of the retirement of all the coal workers in the United States of America for the rest of their lives, and then we take the remaining revenues and we pay for a significant and substantial cut to business taxes.

So this piece of legislation, unlike what my colleagues are proposing, has a double bottom line. It will reverse the negative effects of climate change and the threat to our prosperity, and it is a pro-growth policy because it puts money back in the economy and it makes a bet on U.S. businesses that they can innovate and grow into opportunities and around challenges. It is reflective of the view of businesses in 2016, not the view of businesses from the 1950s.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), my friend, who has spent a lot of time thinking about these environmental issues and acting on them.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to these two resolutions.

The first one, H. Con. Res. 89, says that a carbon tax would necessarily be detrimental to the United States economy. This is false. Plain and simple.

The truth is that we can and we must design carbon pollution reduction strategies to spur advancements in clean energy technology, reduce carbon pollution, and fight climate change.

These strategies, including a carbon tax or a fee, can easily be designed to be revenue-neutral, and we know from long experience at the State and Federal level that fighting pollution is good for jobs and good for the economy. California is a perfect example. If anyone has questions about this, come to California, where you will see that climate leadership is actually also good economics.

It doesn't seem to matter to my colleagues who have offered these resolutions. In the year 2016, they continue to deny the reality of climate change. Literally, our friends across the aisle

are the last policymakers on the planet Earth to hold this view. Even in other oil-producing companies, the conservative parties in those countries acknowledge climate change, and they have positions in their party platforms that acknowledge we need to do something about it.

Now, the other resolution, H. Con. Res. 112, similarly demonstrates a lack of leadership by opposing President Obama's proposal to finance infrastructure investments. Those who don't support the President's infrastructure financing mechanism, I think, have a responsibility to offer their own solutions for our infrastructure crisis. This bill doesn't do that. Instead, it simply describes a desire to support Big Oil.

So here we have it: climate denial; the party that doesn't want to fill vacancies on the Supreme Court; a party that doesn't want to do its job to respond to public health crises, like Zika; a party that prefers not to offer any solutions on our critical infrastructure funding needs.

Is this how we are going to make America great again?

I don't think so. Let's move forward in the 21st century and not let our energy and infrastructure policies be driven by 18th century thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose both of these bills.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we are here debating H. Con. Res. 89, which purports to express the sense of Congress. But really, nothing could be further from the truth, because what it does is express the nonsense of Congress.

We are here witnessing the latest example of climate denial brought to the floor by the majority. The entire world agrees that climate change is a pressing problem, except this extreme wing of the Republican Party.

Climate change is already affecting people across the globe. As Dr. MCDERMOTT from Washington pointed out already, the nonpartisan CBO recently noted the increasing and enormous budgetary impact future storms will have on our Nation, and attributed the majority of this problem to climate change. And I am here to tell you these costs will fall disproportionately on low-income people, low-income communities, and people of color in our country.

Are we here on the floor debating a real solution brought forward by the majority? Are we here having hearings?

No, we are not. We are here debating a resolution cutting off a solution that economists from all corners of the Earth believe is the most efficient way to address climate change.

A properly designed price on carbon can improve the overall performance of the U.S. economy, protect competitive-

ness, create jobs, promote investment, and lead us toward American energy independence.

The gentleman from Oregon is right: instead of debating this resolution, we should be having hearings discussing ways that we can sensibly lead the transition to renewable fuels and clean energy sources.

Even big oil companies like Royal Dutch Shell and BP have voiced support for carbon taxes in recent years, acknowledging that climate change is real and that we should be doing something about it.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on H. Con. Res. 89, and let's start a real debate, a sensible debate on this existential threat to our Nation and to the globe.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I really appreciate this little window of an opportunity to talk about a carbon tax. I hope that the day will come when we will have an opportunity to have that discussion in a robust and thoughtful way in our Ways and Means Committee. Heaven knows it is important.

Lots of people have opinions and ideas. I think we would benefit from it, but I hope that we will have that discussion after we hear from a balanced, wide-ranging group of independent experts across the spectrum to be able to give us meaningful information about it.

I include in the RECORD a letter from Greg Dotson, who is the Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress.

CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS,

Washington, DC, June 8, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Later this week, the U.S. House of Representatives will consider H. Con. Res. 89, a resolution that rejects the pricing of carbon pollution. On behalf of the Center for American Progress, I am writing to urge you to oppose this resolution. It is time for Congress to develop sensible policies that address the serious and potentially catastrophic impacts of climate change. Science informs us that we need an urgent solution to this problem. Although the current Administration has made historic progress on climate change, it is clear that we need to do more to achieve additional carbon pollution reductions and lead the world in responding to this global challenge.

Top economic advisors to both Democratic and Republican Presidents have expressed their support for putting a price on carbon as an effective and efficient approach for reducing pollution. Joseph Stiglitz, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) under President Bill Clinton, has stated, "Economic efficiency requires that those who generate emissions pay the cost, and the simplest way of forcing them to do so is through a carbon tax." Gregory Mankiw, former Chairman of the CEA under President George W. Bush, has stated, "Basic economics tells us that when you tax something, you normally get less of it. So if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax."

In fact, carbon pollution is already priced in a significant portion of the world. In total, about 40 national jurisdictions and more than 20 cities, states, and regions on

five continents—representing almost a quarter of global greenhouse gas emissions—have placed a price on carbon. In the United States, 25 percent of the population lives in a jurisdiction where carbon pollution is currently priced and where one-third of the country's economic activity takes place. The price on carbon in California is the highest of any state in the country at almost \$13 per ton of carbon dioxide equivalent, and yet the California economy is projected to grow at a faster pace than the rest of the United States over the next two years.

In recent years, momentum to expand the adoption of carbon pricing policies has been growing. More than 400 investors with more than \$24 trillion in assets have called on governments to establish "stable, economically meaningful carbon pricing." Already, more than 1,000 businesses apply a price on carbon to inform their investments and operations or plan to do so in the next two years. In addition, at the United Nations climate talks in Paris last December, governments, businesses, and nongovernmental organizations announced the new Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition to accelerate and expand the adoption of carbon pricing worldwide.

In order to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change, the United States needs to consider all possible tools at its disposal, including the effective market-based mechanisms of carbon pricing. Members of Congress need to work together on a bipartisan basis to find ways to cut carbon pollution rather than advance polarizing measures that take useful tools off the table. I urge you to reject this ill-advised resolution.

Sincerely,

GREG DOTSON,
Vice President for Energy Policy,
Center for American Progress.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Let me just read a couple of items from Mr. Dotson's letter.

He points out that "top economic advisors to both Democratic and Republican Presidents have expressed their support for putting a price on carbon as an effective and efficient approach for reducing pollution."

He cites Gregory Mankiw, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President George W. Bush, who says: "Basic economics tells us that when you tax something, you normally get less of it. So if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax."

"In fact, carbon pollution is already priced in a significant portion of the world. In total, about 40 national jurisdictions and more than 20 cities, states, and regions on five continents—representing almost a quarter of global greenhouse gas emissions—have placed a price on carbon. In the United States, 25 percent of the population lives in jurisdictions where carbon pollution is currently priced and where one-third of the country's economic activity takes place."

That is in America right now. There is no acknowledgment of that in this debate. We could have talked about that in the committee.

"The price on carbon in California," referenced by my friend, Mr. HUFFMAN, "is the highest of any state in the country at almost \$13 per ton . . . yet the California economy is projected to grow at a faster pace than the rest of the United States over the next two years."

They reference the fact that "more than 400 investors with more than \$24

trillion in assets have called on governments to establish 'stable, economically meaningful carbon pricing.' Already, more than 1,000 businesses apply a price on carbon to inform their investments and operations or plan to do so in the next two years. In addition, at the United Nations climate talks in Paris last December, governments, business, nongovernmental organizations announced the new Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition to accelerate and expand the adoption of carbon pricing worldwide," in keeping with what we heard from Prime Minister Modi in this Chamber just 2 days ago.

□ 1015

Yet my friends on the other side of the aisle are not involved with our being able to discuss this in depth, being able to bring in the experts, being able to work together to design a pricing mechanism that avoids some of the cartoon characteristics that they establish here. We had that chance, and we haven't done it.

But this will not be the last word. This meaningless resolution will undoubtedly pass today. It is not going to have any impact in terms of the long term. The long term, we are on a path to price carbon, and we have the capacity to do so in a thoughtful and an effective way, like the conservative leaders, whose correspondence I put into the RECORD earlier, suggest.

It can be revenue neutral. It can be effective. It can help reverse the more damaging effects of climate change, and it is a way to promote economic opportunity and global competitiveness.

I appreciate the opportunity to express my views on this.

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

You know, although my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made this a conversation about climate change—which I agree that we can have and we should have in another venue, and that is in the committee structure—this is about a President who decided on his own, without coming to Congress to discuss this tax, this \$10 tax on a barrel of gasoline, because he was unable to get this carbon tax, when, by the way, the House and the Senate were both in his own party, he couldn't even get this passed. So this is a discussion for another day about climate change, which we can all have, and have in a very gentle way.

However, let me sum up what this would do if this were to pass, the impact that this carbon tax would have on the American people:

It would drive up the cost of energy, which would most affect those at the lower income.

It would destroy well-paying jobs in the energy industry, well-paying jobs. Right now, when we look at what our loss of jobs are here in this country, we have the lowest rate of jobs in 6 years.

Number three, it would directly hit working families the most, those at the very lowest income, and especially those who are elderly.

None of these help to grow our economy and get our economy moving or people back to work or raise their incomes. Therefore, I urge a "yes" vote on H. Con. Res. 89.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter from opponents of H. Con. Res. 89:

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 89. This resolution is the latest example of climate action denial being advanced by extreme members of the House of Representatives. Instead of listening to the national security experts, faith leaders, scientists, energy innovators, health professionals and many others who are sounding the alarm on climate change and have implored our nation's elected officials to support action, Rep. Scalise and the co-sponsors of H. Con. Res. 89 appear to be looking for another way to say "no." The sponsors of the resolution have no plan to address climate change and have opposed every proposal to do something about the planet's gravest environmental problem. Many of them don't even accept the scientific fact that climate change is occurring.

H. Con. Res. 89 ignores the huge costs that our country is already experiencing due to climate change—costs that fall disproportionately on low-income communities and communities of color. It is clear this resolution is meant to put the interests of the polluting fossil fuel companies ahead of the American public's best interest.

Instead of holding another just-for-show vote against climate action, the U.S. House of Representatives should be debating how it can best position our country to lead the global transition to clean energy sources. Last year more than half of the world's new energy came from renewable energy sources and the landmark Paris climate agreement sends a powerful signal to investors that this trend toward low-carbon energy will accelerate. More and more countries and hundreds of forward-looking companies are adopting policies to limit carbon pollution and correct the markets failure to capture the health and environmental costs of burning fossil fuels.

At a time when the American taxpayer is already paying to move vulnerable American communities to higher ground because of climate-driven sea level rise, we have no time to waste on empty resolutions that seek to take potential climate solutions off the table.

Sincerely,

Center for Biological Diversity, Clean Water Action, Earthjustice, Environment America, Environmental Defense Action Fund, Fresh Energy, League of Conservation Voters, League of Women Voters, Natural Resources Defense Council, Public Citizen, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Union of Concerned Scientists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS OPPOSING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED \$10 TAX ON EVERY BARREL OF OIL

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 767, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 112

Whereas raising revenue and spending money are powers reserved to Congress by the Constitution;

Whereas according to global economists, the United States oil and gas industry is currently experiencing the worst industry decline since similar commodity price collapses in the 1980s and 1990s forced oil companies to slash payrolls and dividends;

Whereas global oil production exceeds demand by more than one million barrels a day, and Iran has promised to provide an additional 500,000 barrels a day to the world market, now that several sanctions have been lifted after the recent implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action;

Whereas the price of a barrel of oil is currently around \$30, less than a third of the \$90-plus it was selling for 18 months ago; which would mean the President's proposal would be equivalent to a 33.3 percent tax, making the United States Federal excise tax on oil the highest of any domestic product;

Whereas this tax could translate into as much as an additional 25 cents on a gallon of gas, when the Federal tax on gasoline is currently 18.40 cents per gallon;

Whereas the oil and gas industry accounts for significant employment and is an even more significant driver of investment spending and growth along the supply chain, ranging from aggregates to steelmaking and specialist equipment;

Whereas more than 258,000 people employed in oil and gas extraction and support activities globally, including more than 100,000 across the United States, have lost their jobs since October 2014;

Whereas every lost oil and gas job leads to an additional 3.43 jobs cut in other sectors;

Whereas that means the 114,000 job losses in the oil and gas sector wiped out an additional 391,000 jobs in other sectors last year and sliced economic growth to about 2.1 percent from 2.6 percent;

Whereas more layoffs are virtually certain in the months ahead in oil and gas production, as well as along the supply chain and in petroleum-dependent economies, as the continued price slump filters through to even less drilling activity;

Whereas the number of rigs drilling for oil and gas has fallen from over 1,900 in October 2014, to 744 at the end of November 2015, and just 619 at the end of January 2016, according to oilfield services firm Baker Hughes;

Whereas manufacturers, for example, announced 37,221 layoffs in the past 12 months;

Whereas shipments of steel in the United States—used to make oil and gas pipelines—were down 11.4 percent through the first 11 months of 2015 and the industry announced more than 12,000 layoffs during the past year, according to the American Steel and Iron Institute;

Whereas believing that oil companies will pay the fee with no effect on consumer prices requires also believing that the producers won't pass their increased cost on to refiners, who won't in turn pass their costs on to the public; in other words, requires suspending belief in basic economics;

Whereas this tax could also put American oil companies, at a competitive disadvantage with foreign oil companies, as imported oil may not face the same treatment;

Whereas the domestic midstream and downstream stages of oil and gas production will be at a competitive disadvantage to their global competitors due to a \$10 higher cost for every barrel of oil;

Whereas in combination with a stronger dollar, slowing growth in international markets, and an overaccumulation of inventories through much of the economy, the oil slump is creating headwinds for manufacturers, freight firms, and the wider economy; and

Whereas the oil and natural gas industry anchors our economy in terms of jobs, economic activity, and even State and local tax revenue in a challenging price environment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress finds that—

(1) any new tax placed on the struggling oil and gas industry will further prevent growth and development throughout the sector and encourage additional layoffs; and

(2) the effect of a \$10 tax on each barrel of oil sold in the United States—

(A) would raise the price of oil, and by extension gasoline; and

(B) would result in a decrease in the consumption of oil.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a new tax should not be placed on oil, and

(2) in considering future policy, Congress should carefully review the detrimental impacts of placing any new taxes on any industry that has seen a slash in jobs, revenue, and production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 112, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the Obama administration, in its budget proposal, proposed a \$10.25 tax on each barrel of oil. This will severely harm

America's already struggling energy industry, but it will have a very detrimental impact throughout the American economy, and that is why I introduced H. Con. Res. 112, sending a very clear message that Congress and the American people refuse to allow this administration to fund an environmental agenda on the backs of working families.

It is pretty simple. At \$10.25 per barrel of oil, this increase would not only add significantly to the cost of a gallon of gasoline at the pump, certainly disproportionately hurting fixed-income families, seniors, and so forth, it would also have a detrimental impact on job creation, on wages, and on the Nation's overall economic health.

This also would effectively act as an export tax on oil, just as we opened up the door to export crude oil to allow American producers to have market access worldwide, just like our Iranian opponents worldwide currently have the luxury to do.

Why would we tie up the hands of American energy producers and allow the Iranians and OPEC to dominate world markets? Wrong.

Secondly, at a time when, in Louisiana and Texas and other States on the coast, we understand how important our environment, our economy and energy policies are, we are looking to use revenue sharing to help us rebuild coastline and marsh and replenish our beaches, the administration opposes this. They have listed that in their budget proposal.

This tax is a tax on hardworking American families. It is a tax on American competitiveness; it is a tax on American innovation; it is a tax on our energy security; and it is a tax on the very foundation of our national security.

Now, the oil and gas industry has watched as market conditions have changed because of slow growth globally—low demand and abundant supply thanks to American innovation, largely. We have seen the oil price drop from \$115 a barrel in November of 2014 to as low as \$27 a barrel in January 2016. Right now, prices are hovering around \$48, \$49, \$50 a barrel. This industry is struggling. This is the industry that took us out of recession with job creation and economic growth.

Now, I know in my home State of Louisiana, just last year, we lost 11,700 jobs alone in Louisiana in the oil and gas sector, 5,500 in my hometown of Lafayette alone. Even worse, globally, over 250,000 people have lost their jobs.

Of course, if you look at what happened in the first quarter of this year, the revised statistics on economic growth, 0.8 percent. How is American business going to create value and jobs with that kind of growth, that kind of private sector growth?

Not only that, just last week, the Bureau of Labor Statistics release showed

38,000 jobs created last month, the worst number since 2010. That is a terrible statistic, with real human dimensions.

This tax will make it worse if it were to go forward. In fact, the Tax Foundation created an economic model to show the impact of a \$10.25-per-barrel tax over 10 years; and what this would do, if implemented, an estimated 137,000 Americans in full-time employment in this sector would lose their jobs.

It is important to remember that oil is used for a lot more than just gasoline in our automobiles. The U.S. Energy Information Administration points out that a quarter of a barrel of crude—a quarter of each barrel of crude oil—is used for nonfuel goods such as plastic, asphalt, dyes, lubricants, power plants, home heating, and other nontransportation uses. In fact, products throughout the American economy have, as their base ingredient, these fossil fuel ingredients. This tax, \$10.25, will be passed on to those industries and consumers across this country.

The oil and gas industry supports more than 9 million American jobs, and what happens through this industry and within this industry reverberates throughout our entire U.S. economy.

But it is also important to look at what this proposal would do as we view it through a national security lens.

American innovation, the energy renaissance we saw with shale exploration and hydraulic fracturing, horizontal drilling, as well as new deepwater technology and better assessments of our reserves, has given us this tremendous opportunity to change global energy security away from an OPEC- or Russian-driven model, where state-owned enterprises control pricing and control supply, to an American view of energy security, which our allies desperately want. It is a view of energy security with diversity of supply sources, transparent pricing, open markets, a view of energy security globally, uniquely American, that would help economic growth globally and help so many countries that are struggling today, many currently in recession.

But energy security is linked to our national security, and we have an opportunity to create a Western Hemisphere energy trading bloc based on these principles rather than an OPEC or a Russian model. This is an opportunity for America to change not only energy security, but the entire national security environment in a more pro-American way. This tax would really be a stab in the heart of that. It is the wrong thing to do.

And, of course, this tax would increase the cost of domestic production, translating into higher prices for oil and all petroleum products, potentially eroding America's price competitiveness in the global marketplace.

If the purpose of this proposal was to increase revenue, then I would say that the President should be, instead, pur-

suing sound energy policies consisting of embracing this energy sector, American energy production, one of the clearest examples of American exceptionalism, not an unfettered drastic tax increase.

If you want to build roads, we need economic growth and sensible tax policies that will help us build out our transportation.

According to a report released by the American Petroleum Institute, our energy producers could create 1 million new jobs in just 7 years and increase revenue to Federal and State governments by \$800 billion by 2030 if we allow this energy sector to do its work responsibly.

It is time for our Nation to fully embrace the vast opportunities unleashed by this U.S. energy renaissance. Let's embrace this new era of abundance. Let's embrace this new era of energy diplomacy that puts America in a strong position.

It is time for the President to stop his relentless tax and regulatory assault on the oil and gas industry that is only worsening our economic problems. This resolution shows very clearly that Congress stands for job creation over a radical political agenda, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans don't like the President's budget proposal. They have never been able to bring their own to the floor—never.

They talk about economic growth and jobs. This administration has a proud record of creating jobs. They haven't done all we want, but they are successful in important respects.

This administration has had an energy policy that has really been working well, as can be seen by what has happened. There remain problems with it, and we will have some debate about where we go in the future.

The problem is that the Republicans start from a premise that is grievously wrong. They are in denial of climate change, and everything they do relating to energy stems from that. They are out of step with the American people.

A recent Gallup Poll showed this: 64 percent of Americans are worried a great deal or a fair amount about global warming. Fifty-nine percent of Americans say the effects of global warming have already begun. Only 10 percent of Americans say the effects of global warming will never happen—only 10 percent. Sixty-five percent of Americans, according to this Gallup Poll of recent times, say our planet's temperature increases over the last 100 years are primarily caused by human activities rather than natural causes.

□ 1030

But what do we hear from the now-leading Republican?

Well, going back a few years, this is what he had to say: "The concept of global warming was created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing noncompetitive."

That was 4 years ago, more or less.

Now the same person, who is now leading the Republican Party, says this: "I am not a great believer in man-made climate change." "If you look, they had global cooling in the 1920s, and now they have global warming, although now they don't know if they have global warming."

So we have today, from the Republican majority, our two sense of Congress resolutions. What is really needed instead is for the Republican Party to come to their senses on climate change, like the vast majority of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), one of our many Members—but this person in particular—who has devoted so much of his deep intelligence and his energy to this issue, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a very important member of the House Ways and Means Committee and someone who has extensive private sector experience.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. Speaker, again, before we came on to the floor, we were in the Cloakroom talking about what the debate was going to be. And I thought the debate was going to be about what was actually happening today, and not a scientific debate, not a debate about what people believe or what they don't believe, but on the reality that the President proposed a \$10 tax on a barrel of oil. That comes out to 25 cents per gallon at the pump.

Now, what do I mean by that? What I am talking about is, when hard-working American taxpayers go to fill up their car or their truck, it is going to cost them 25 cents more per gallon. It also translates into everything that they put on their backs, that they put in their mouths. Every aspect of life is going to be increased.

Now, keep in mind that, while there may be some kind of science that we want to turn this debate into, here are the facts: middle-income Americans and lower-income Americans have seen a drop in their wages—a significant drop in their wages. Last month, we saw that we have created one job for every 8,000 Americans.

So we talk about today how we need to talk about climate change. No. Here is what we need to talk about: we need to talk about real change in the marketplace. We need to talk about how

we are hurting the American economy. We need to talk about how we are eliminating the ability of America to compete in a global economy—an economy that I just don't want to participate in but I think America should dominate.

America is so blessed with so many assets. And while we worry about all the energy above, let's not forget all the energy below. Let's not forget what America's strongest card is to play, and that is energy self-sustainability. We are able to do that.

Why in the world would anybody think that by adding \$10 on a barrel of oil, somehow that is going to help the climate worldwide, when we know that we are the only ones proposing this? Other people around the world are looking and saying: I can't agree more with the President's ideas because we compete against the United States, and I would love to be on the shelf with a product that costs more than the one we are putting on the shelf.

So America is hurting America. America's policies are hurting everyday Americans. And if we truly want to make America great again, let's make America great again for every single American. That is not a political aspiration; that is a responsibility in America's House, and that is the House of Representatives.

Our sense that somehow this would be positive is absolutely wrongheaded and wrong thinking. It just doesn't work that way.

Why would we sit here and debate this today? Because we know it is going to hurt every single hard-working American taxpayer. It is going to add to our cost of living. It is going to increase the cost of everything we consume. We are going to do it with the idea that somehow, the rest of the world will follow suit, and we know that they won't.

What they will do is look at us and say: You know what? Let's take advantage of America's wrong-headedness. Let's make sure that we are able to buy up more of the market, the global market, because America continues to hurt itself and hurt its everyday citizens.

My goodness. This is America's House of Representatives. We do not come here representing ourselves—we come here representing 705,687 Americans who live back in our districts. We do not come here just representing Republican policy and Republican agenda. We do not just come here representing Democrat policy and Democrat agenda. We come here representing America. And if we cannot get it through our heads that, at the end of the day, the policy that comes out of this town—a town that is a wash in prosperity, good jobs, great restaurants.

I have never seen a town with more cranes in it. I am talking about industrial cranes. I would love some of my colleagues to walk back home with me and go into the cities, the towns, and the little villages that I represent. And

you tell those people: things are really getting good; we are on the right stage; we are on the right trajectory; that we are going to become good again. But the question is: When?

I would just suggest that—and I said this earlier—you cannot continue to put the burden of these policies—well-intended, though they may be—on the backs of hardworking American taxpayers, men and women who get up every day with one resolve and one resolve only, and that is to take care of their families, to build a better community, and to build a better life.

Why in the world do we have to waste time debating something today that could be debated elsewhere? But we come here today with a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President's ideas in his budget are absolutely wrong for every single American.

We can debate these things later. But we have to come to agreement at some point here, that we just don't represent our parties—we represent people. That is far more important than any party that we represent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Look, I have only been here 5 years. But I come out of the private sector. I never, ever thought I would be serving in Congress because I never, ever thought I would have to. I thought people would come here representing me and my family; my community, my State, and my Nation; and that they would do the right thing. And I don't say that they don't think they are doing the right thing. But at the end of the day, the final results don't look very good.

In a Nation that is quickly approaching \$20 trillion in debt and burdening every single American taxpayer with more and more cost of being here while not increasing their opportunity, I think we need to take a hard look, take a look in the mirror and understand that it all changes, it all starts with each of us. We can change this. We can make it better. But we can't make it better by putting a heavy burden on our taxpayers. It just doesn't make sense.

As I said earlier, America can dominate a global economy. Just participating isn't enough. I would just suggest that that is all possible in a land that has been so graced by gifts from God that make it possible for us to do that. The only thing that can keep it from happening are policies coming out of Washington, D.C.

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

I always enjoy sharing the debate with my good friend from Butler, Pennsylvania, who cares passionately about this country. He has some, I think, great ideas. We often find areas that we

can agree. I think even the issue that we are debating today could be an area where we could find agreement, because what the President is proposing is not to levy a fee and have the money burned up. The President is proposing a fee to fix America's damaged infrastructure.

I know my friend from Butler cares passionately about the people who he represents. They are paying a tax today for poor infrastructure. The average American pays three times with annual damage to their cars than what this fee would be, if it were translated directly to a gas tax increase.

I note that his State of Pennsylvania actually has imposed an oil franchise fee which is the equivalent of about another 9.5 cent increase. Pennsylvania did that because their infrastructure is damaged.

Well, that is what we should have as part of this discussion today. Again, we have a cartoon proposal that assumes that there is just a barrel fee that is just a burden on the American public and not look at what the fee is for, what benefits would accrue if, again, we had actually had the Ways and Means Committee meet and discuss the legislation that was referred to us. We didn't have a hearing on this.

One of the things I have pleaded with Ways and Means leadership for as long as I have been on the committee: Let's sit down and actually have meaningful discussions with the men and women who manage, design, build, and operate America's infrastructure. If we would have had that debate in this Congress, we could have had arrayed before us the president of the AFL-CIO, the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the president—actually, we did have the president of the American Trucking Association, the one witness the Democrats were allowed, who said: Raise the tax on my people, along with everybody else, to rebuild and renew America.

But we never had a robust, broad debate before our committee. If we did, we would have had the broadest coalition of any major issue that we considered: the people who design roads, the people who come forward with the asphalt, and the people who are the delivery services.

We are paying a tremendous price today because America is falling apart and falling behind. You don't have to go very far to ask people in Louisiana; Portland, Oregon; or Houston, Texas, if we have got a problem. This is an investment that more than pays for itself. Again, this isn't money down some rat hole. This is money that would be invested to rebuild and renew America.

If we would have had a real hearing on this proposal—which we didn't—we could have had the people from Standard & Poor's research come in and review their report. Every \$1.2 billion we spend on infrastructure creates \$2 billion of economic activity. These are the people who would have family-wage

jobs from coast to coast who would help revitalize local economies, while we make our infrastructure safer and more effective.

And it isn't just economic activity. That Standard & Poor's report would have revealed that that \$1.2 billion in infrastructure would have reduced the deficit by \$200 million, but we didn't have that debate. So we have people coming up here on the floor somehow claiming that the President's responsible proposal to fund infrastructure would be an economic disaster, ignoring the fact that we have an infrastructure crisis in this country right now.

The American Society of Civil Engineers points out that our failure to deal with this is a tax of over \$3,000 per family.

If we would be honest, have independent experts, if the committee would do its job, we wouldn't be having bizarre debates like this that suggest that the President's proposal would hurt the economy or would be costly. To the contrary, it would strengthen the economy, put millions of people to work at family-wage jobs, and improve the conditions of families from coast to coast.

We are going to have, I hope, more heard about this in the future. But I hope that we don't have proposals that are rushed to the floor without thoughtful committee action and making strange assertions that simply are not supported by facts.

□ 1045

If we impose the fee that the President is talking about to rebuild and renew America, it will create more economic activity, it will put people to work, and it will give Americans the infrastructure they deserve and enhance our economic security at home and abroad.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to something before I yield to my colleague.

Let me just say that I appreciate the gentleman's passion for transportation infrastructure. I share it. We have had many conversations. But he well knows that the ideal way to solve this is with a specific user fee for that purpose.

This particular tax, \$10.25 on a barrel of oil, has such a huge detrimental economic impact across all sectors of our economy. That is not the way to go. That is why I don't think this is something we should entertain as the President has proposed. I think we need thoughtful discussion about this, and that will come in due time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and someone I have great respect for.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate him bringing this up.

Mr. Speaker, I really regret the fact that this has devolved into a big par-

tisan debate or a big partisan discussion.

Everyone in this Chamber supports the concept of infrastructure investment. That is not what this is about. That is not what this is about. All of us support infrastructure investment, and all of us agree that we have underfunded infrastructure, that we need more investment in infrastructure.

In my home State, in Baton Rouge, in the capital region, we have the worst traffic in the Nation for a midsize city. Our people sit in traffic an average of 47 hours above the national average at home. It is ridiculous.

Here is what is going on right now. Here is what is going on. The gas tax was set up to be a user fee. It was set up to be a user fee that the more you drove, the more you used the roads, the more you paid for it. That is the way that this is supposed to work.

What has happened is that the President has come out and offered a proposal that disconnects the user fee. We support a user fee model. We support lock-boxing the dollars and making sure that they are dedicated to infrastructure as opposed to what has happened, for example, another issue that the sponsor of this legislation has worked on—the harbor maintenance trust fund—where billions of dollars have been charged on the auspices of one thing and diverted to something else. We support infrastructure investment.

Now, what is going on right now is we are seeing this continuation of policies out of this administration that is contrary to American interests, and I want to explain that.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon State probably—and I haven't verified this—but probably depended upon the State of Louisiana, one of the top producers of oil and gas in this country, to power their cars, to power their vehicles, and to power their airplanes that they fly back and forth from Washington, D.C., to the West Coast. We provide that. But at home, in our State of Louisiana, we have lost one-third of our oil and gas jobs. We are killing this industry because of overregulation.

Something that just shocks me is, last year, we listened to the Secretary of State, John Kerry, stand up and say: We need to allow Iran to export their oil so their economy can recover. Our Secretary of State said that. Yet, at the same time, at home, in Louisiana, we were prohibited from exporting our oil.

Why in the world would we treat Iran better than Louisiana, better than Texas, better than Oklahoma, and all of these energy-producing States across the United States?

So do you know what we did? After opposition from the White House, we finally lifted the 40-year-old oil export ban. So what happens? Within a month and a half, we get a proposal from the President to put a \$10.25-a-barrel tax on American oil.

What does that do? If we try and take our oil out to global markets, we are immediately met with a premium of 30 to 40 percent over global prices. It further kills our industry. It further kills our domestic production that we have lost one-third of the jobs on. And I know everybody wants to see us fly solar airplanes. It is not happening right now. We need to continue to rely on these fuels moving forward.

This should not be a partisan debate. We support infrastructure investment. It needs to continue to be a user fee. We should not divorce it from a user fee, and we should not do it in a way that is going to kill our energy industry in the United States to further increase our reliance upon foreign energy sources.

It is a flawed policy. This is consistent with what we saw last year when the President of the United States was standing up and saying, "Give us free trade authority. We need the ability to engage in free trade because we can outcompete other countries," and, at the exact same time, standing up and overregulating our economy to where we send American workers out there in the workforce trying to compete with these other countries with our arms tied behind our back. These policies aren't consistent, and they are not in the interest of the United States.

I agree with the gentleman from Oregon; we need to work together. We need to work together in a bipartisan manner to come up with a new user fee concept to get us additional dollars for infrastructure.

This was a unilateral proposal. This was not subject to hearings, and it is not appropriate. It is contrary to our economy; it is contrary to American interests; and it is going to increase our trade deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that we support this legislation and that we move forward in a bipartisan manner to fix the user fee concept to increase the investment in infrastructure to where we can improve our roadways.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Louisiana and his assessment. Actually, I agree with him. We should have a different mechanism.

I have had proposals to have different approaches to funding infrastructure. Some of them have been embedded in the more recent transportation reauthorization, but this is something that we never took up in our Ways and Means Committee. I have had legislation there for several Congresses. It is time for people to stop saying that they support infrastructure and then not work with us to figure out ways to fund it going forward.

Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in Congress in my tenure who has done more to think about what we do for America's infrastructure. He has had many innovative proposals to fund infrastructure. He has been a tireless champion of it. He is the ranking Democrat

on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Those watching or listening might be a little confused what this is about. It is about a meaningless piece of paper. It is called House Concurrent Resolution 112. It is expressing the sense of Congress that something that the President proposed is bad and they don't like it.

Well, he proposed it and they are not going to take it up. Why are we wasting time debating something that they are not going to put on the schedule and isn't a reality? I don't know. Because they are trying to fill up time? It is not clear to me.

What they are doing is continuing to avoid the discussion of how we are going to pay for America's infrastructure. Dwight David Eisenhower said, Let's have a user fee, a gas tax. The last time we increased the gas tax federally was 1993—18.4 cents a gallon. That figured out to be about 15 percent of every gallon you bought. I paid \$2.50 a gallon in Oregon last weekend. The Federal tax is still 18.4 cents. That is about 7 percent per gallon, and those dollars are worth less.

We are talking about what it is going to do to jobs if we have some sort of tax on oil that we use to pay for infrastructure. Let's talk about the other side where we can create one heck of a lot of jobs. Every penny for a gas tax, every penny, raises about \$1.7 billion for the Federal trust fund. \$1.7 billion, under the most conservative estimates, most conservative, is more than 25,000 jobs. So one penny, 25,000 jobs. But, no, we can't go there.

I proposed we index the existing gas tax to inflation. No, we can't do that. All right. Didn't want to do that.

I proposed that we tax the fraction of a barrel of oil that goes into taxable transportation uses, not manufacturing, not agriculture, not any of this other stuff that they are talking about. I put that proposal forward 7 years ago. I put it forward to my colleagues and to the White House. Now, the White House has burped out something different here—this more indiscriminate tax—which would go to other uses.

The point is that there are thoughtful ways to approach this and pay for what we need. America is falling apart. 140,000 bridges nationwide—including the highest proportion in the State of Pennsylvania, by the way, which we heard from earlier—are in need of replacement or significant repair. Trucks are detouring around them. People are being detoured around them.

There are potholed roads. Forty percent of the national highway system needs not just to be resurfaced, it needs to be dug up it has failed so badly. People are breaking their rims, blowing out tires, and damaging their cars. It is costing Americans a lot. People are locked in congestion because we are not dealing with the growth in traffic.

And, oh, let's just look out just a little way outside the capital here to the worst example. We are killing people, killing people, on our transit systems unnecessarily because Congress has failed to partner with the cities of America and the rural areas who have transit. We have an \$84 billion backlog to bring transit up to a state of good repair, not new transit options to get people out of their cars and help them deal with congestion to get around. \$84 billion just so we are not killing people.

And we are talking about, oh, we can't be competitive. Yeah, we are not competitive in the world economy. I go around talking about how we are now degraded. We used to have an infrastructure that was the envy of the world.

And I talked about how we are becoming Third World. My colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) criticized me very, very adamantly about that one day. I said, What do you mean, EARL, you know how bad it is? He said, No, no, that is insulting to Third World countries. They are investing a larger percentage of their gross domestic product in infrastructure than we are here in the United States of America. And that is true. So now I have taken to calling us Fourth World.

We used to be the world's leader in infrastructure, and now we are vaulting over everybody, including places like Zimbabwe, to the back of the pack. Give me a break.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. And where is the discussion? It is no, no, no. No, can't have a barrel tax. No, can't increase the gas tax. No, can't index the gas tax.

Oh, but we want to talk about a user fee. What user fee? Why are we wasting time on this? You are not going to bring it up. You are in charge. You set the agenda. Why are we passing a bill to say we are not going to take something up?

I would be kind of embarrassed if I was in the majority and that is what I was wasting time on while people are trapped in traffic, while people are dying, because we can't maintain our transit systems. People are blowing out tires because we can't repair the roads.

And, oh, we are all for infrastructure until it comes to paying for it. We passed a 5-year bill. We paid for it with phony money. We pretended that when we have private tax collection, that it will make money—private tax collection. Republicans have passed that twice before. It kind of pissed off the American people. And guess what, it lost money each time, and then we put it back in the IRS.

But, no, this time it is going to make money and we are going to use it and pay for infrastructure. Give me a

break. And the Federal Reserve makes that money and puts it in a reserve account with a computer. Let's take that money and spend it.

Basically, you are just averting the real problem here, which is we need to have a serious discussion about how we are going to pay to build America's infrastructure and become a world leader again and be the envy of the world again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members of the House to refrain from vulgarity in debate.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my friend and colleague from across the Potomac River, who cares a great deal about environmental policy and infrastructure.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution and add my strong opposition to the resolution before, also.

As I read the text of H. Con. Res. 89, whereas by whereas, I found myself in disagreement with virtually every alleged predictive statement. This resolution is framed as long-term economic wisdom, yet exemplifies short-term thinking and economic folly.

A carbon tax should, in fact, increase the cost of fossil fuels, but will also accelerate the rapidly falling cost of all other fuels: solar, wind, geothermal, hydro, and perhaps even nuclear.

A carbon tax absolutely must not fall hardest on the poor, the elderly, and those with fixed incomes. The best of the carbon tax plans, Representative VAN HOLLEN's carbon cap and economic dividend, returns every dollar gathered by a carbon cap to every U.S. citizen with a Social Security number.

This carbon cap is actually progressive, with a net increase in the disposable income for most Americans, and certainly our neediest citizens. This will be a net job creator.

□ 1100

The resolution suggests that jobs and businesses will move overseas and that a carbon tax will restrain economic growth. British Columbia instituted a carbon tax in July 2008, and over the following 5-year period, its GDP growth actually outpaced the rest of non-carbon-priced Canada.

In one "whereas," it states that U.S. energy policy should encourage private sector innovation and development, but nothing would stimulate and sustain such innovation as powerfully as would appropriate carbon pricing. Every manufacturer, perhaps every family, would continue to search out the best ways to minimize the costs of production and to maximize family welfare. We are resilient, creative, and adaptive.

For a long time, conservative and liberal economists have agreed that a carbon tax is the most efficient and effective way to deal with climate change.

Let me quote from a recent letter from four conservative and libertarian leaders to Members of Congress:

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 a market response. That is why carbon pricing has the support of free market economists, a majority of the global business community, and a large number of the largest multinational private oil and gas companies in the world.

One of the policy issues that most divides our Congress is the debate on the appropriate level of governmental regulation. But to quote again from the same letter:

An economy-wide carbon tax that replaces existing regulatory interventions could reduce the cost of climate policy and deregulate the economy.

Jerry Taylor of the Niskanen Center wrote a paper called "The Conservative Case for a Carbon Tax." He argues that, if conservative denial of climate science is grounded in ideological aversion to command-and-control regulation, as proposed in the EPA's proposed Clean Power Plan, conservatives should embrace and promote a revenue-neutral carbon tax as a more efficient, less burdensome, free market alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose both resolutions as they are unwise, unnecessary, and of backward thinking.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, as I have no further requests for time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I appreciate the opportunity for us to visit on this proposal today. I don't agree with the resolution by any stretch of the imagination, but at least it is an opportunity for us to have a little bit of the conversation that we should have been having all along.

I enjoy debating with my good friend from Louisiana. I respect his intellect and his humor, and it is fun to do a little bit of this today. It would have been far better if we would have been able to do so in the context of a full committee hearing where we would have been able to dig deeply into these issues. For example, we could have had the Transportation Construction Coalition.

I include in the RECORD a letter on this resolution, a letter which is dated June 9 of this year.

JUNE 9, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House is scheduled to consider later this week a resolution opposing President Obama's proposal for a \$10.25 per barrel of oil tax. While H. Con. Res. 112 makes many statements regarding an oil barrel tax, the resolution fails to mention the intent of the President's proposal is to generate resources to stabilize and grow federal surface transportation investment. The resolution also does not remind members that recurring Highway Trust Fund revenue shortfalls caused repeated disruptions to their state's transportation program over the past eight years.

Since 2008, Congress has approved seven pieces of legislation transferring a total \$143 billion in borrowed or General Fund revenue into the Highway Trust Fund to prevent cuts in federal highway and transit investment. Over that same period, the trust fund's permanent revenue deficit has led to 14 temporary extensions of the surface transportation programs and one short-term reauthorization bill. Furthermore, upon the expiration of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act at the end of FY 2020, the Congressional Budget Office projects the trust fund's average annual shortfall will grow to \$18 billion.

While the sincerity of the Obama Administration's proposal for a Highway Trust Fund solution is dubious given its release three months after the President signed the FAST Act into law, a per barrel oil tax of that magnitude would be a real and permanent solution. And its nexus to highway users as a revenue mechanism is far more honest than the budget gimmicks, deficit spending and burdens placed on non-transportation sectors of the economy that the Congress has deployed since 2008 to keep investment in the surface transportation programs essentially static.

We certainly respect the right of members of Congress to disagree with the President's proposal, but it is incumbent upon anyone who does so to bring forward an alternative way to achieve the same objective. We strongly believe all potential revenue options should be on the table. Preliminarily disparaging one significant solution just makes it more difficult to resolve a problem that has plagued Congress for nearly a decade.

Rather than making rhetorical statements about taxes five months before an election, Congress should be working in a bipartisan manner to ensure that a permanent mechanism to preserve and grow federal highway and public transportation investment is in place well before the U.S. Department of Transportation starts warning states of the next highway program shutdown.

Sincerely,

THE TRANSPORTATION
CONSTRUCTION COALITION.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, they point out that the resolution fails to mention that the intent of the President's proposal is to generate resources to stabilize and grow Federal surface transportation investment. The resolution does not remind Members that the recurring Highway Trust Fund revenue shortfalls caused repeated disruptions to their States' transportation programs over the past eight years.

We have had to have 14 temporary extensions of the Surface Transportation Act, and the only way we got the FAST Act passed, as my friend Congressman DEFAZIO pointed out, was with a series of budget gimmicks, not real solutions. At the end of 2020, when that legislation expires, we are going to face a \$20 billion annual deficit.

The per barrel oil tax of this magnitude, according to the Transportation Construction Coalition, would be a real and a permanent solution. We wouldn't be chasing our tails all the time. And its nexus to highway users as a revenue mechanism is far more honest than the budget gimmicks, deficit spending, and burdens placed on non-transportation sectors of the economy that Congress has deployed since

2008 to keep investment, essentially, static.

They state that they believe all potential revenue options should be on the table, that it is incumbent upon anybody who wants to disagree with the President to bring forward an alternative way to meet the same objective, which, sadly, has not happened. We haven't even been able to discuss it in the Ways and Means Committee.

They write:

Preliminarily disparaging one significant solution just makes it more difficult to resolve a problem that has plagued Congress for more than a decade.

Rather than making rhetorical statements about taxes 5 months before an election, Congress should be working in a bipartisan manner to ensure that a permanent mechanism to preserve and grow Federal highway and public transportation investment is in place well before the Department of Transportation starts warning States about the next program shutdown.

I seldom read statements from other groups on the floor, but I couldn't have said it better myself.

That is what we should be doing rather than this exercise today, which completely misses the point. This oil barrel fee may not be perfect, but it would go a long way toward solving the problem. It will put millions of Americans to work at family-wage jobs. It will create more economic activity than the cost of the program. For every \$1.2 billion that it generates, it will generate \$2 billion of economic activity, and it will reduce the deficit \$200 million. If we had actually had the committee do a deep dive and spend a week in working on it, this would have been on the table, and I think we would have found wide areas of agreement.

Rather than engaging in this exercise regarding H. Con. Res. 112, I would like to think of what Ronald Reagan did in 1982. The economy was pretty rocky in 1982. There were some contentious politics in Congress. Ronald Reagan, in his Thanksgiving Day speech on November 29, 1982, called on Congress to come back from their Thanksgiving recess and work together to more than double the Federal gas tax, because in one of the best speeches, frankly, I have ever heard anybody give, he pointed out the little cost to the American consumer would be more than offset by damage, for example, for a couple pair of shock absorbers.

Congress reacted to President Reagan's call for a gas tax increase on a bipartisan basis. It more than doubled it. It added hundreds of thousands of jobs, and it improved the quality of life for Americans. It did so in keeping the bipartisan tradition surrounding infrastructure. Rather than this partisan partial debate, we ought to go back to the basics, follow Ronald Reagan's example, and have a spirited, comprehensive approach to solving the problem rather than tilting at straw men.

I strongly urge the rejection of the resolution, but, more important, the rejection of this approach to continue to stick our heads in the sand and

avoid our responsibility to fund American infrastructure and to rebuild and renew this great country.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the gentleman's passion and intellect, and we have had many conversations. We do agree that we have to fix our deplorable infrastructure, and he and I have worked on some of these things together; but I have to say this: When I was in medical school—and I am a heart surgeon and I have had years of medical training—one of the things we learned a long time ago in medicine was to avoid iatrogenic treatment, which is a fancy, Greek-derived word which means to avoid a treatment that makes the problem worse. That is what this \$10.25 tax would do on a barrel of oil.

I have often referred to that plaque above the Speaker's desk. It is a quote from Daniel Webster. The very first line of that reads: "Let us develop the resources of our land." I think it goes beyond simple concepts of highway transportation. It is all the resources of our land.

We should be embracing the energy revolution that has been unleashed by American innovation, not taxing it into oblivion, not overregulating it into oblivion. This has offered tremendous hope not only for Americans, but for the world over, to offer a new view of energy security, taking us away from the Iranian approach or the OPEC approach or a Russian view by which they hoard resources and use this for their own political purposes. America can reshape it by embracing this energy revolution, and we can grow the economy, create jobs, improve wages, and have the revenues to take care of our infrastructure.

As the gentleman well knows, Ronald Reagan believed that a user fee was important, a specific user fee. I think he and I would both agree that a specific user fee is important for infrastructure. This is not a user fee. This is a detrimental tax on American competitiveness, on American jobs, on American wages, on American energy security, and it hits at the very foundation of our national security. It is the wrong way to go. It is an iatrogenic solution, a harmful solution. It is not pro-growth. We are not proud of the economic performance we have seen in recent months: 0.8 percent economic growth in the first quarter, only 38,000 non-farm jobs created last month, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor. That is deplorable.

America must lead, and America can lead by embracing the energy revolution. Let's look at all of the impacts it will have across our entire economy, and then we can fashion specific solutions for transportation and infrastructure and for the other things we need to do.

This is why I stand here. That is why I oppose this tax. That is why I think

this debate was important, and that is why I think it is very important to go on record as opposing this very detrimental tax.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in opposition to H. Con. Res. 112, expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil.

During my time in Congress, I have represented all five major refineries and countless energy production firms in East Harris County.

I know the importance of the domestically produced and refined oil to the U.S. economy.

I also know the importance of a well-funded transportation system. Houston is growing rapidly and our transportation system needs to expand with our population.

I stand in opposition to today's Sense of Congress because of this knowledge and experience.

But to clarify, we shouldn't make things tougher on American companies and domestically-produced crude.

I do not support a \$10 dollar tax on our natural resources.

I do not support a \$10 dollar tax on wildcaters in West Texas, North Dakota or any other areas in the U.S. that supply crude to the Texas Gulf Coast.

It is these companies that are responsible for the energy renaissance in the U.S.

These entrepreneurs lowered our gas prices, reduced our foreign dependence and made the U.S. the largest producer of oil in the world.

I do support a \$10 dollar tax on imported oil from foreign sources.

Imported oil from countries that may or may not be our friends does not benefit our national security or domestic economy.

We should sharpen our competitive edge and expand our 21st century transportation system by taxing imported oil.

I stand with our domestic companies, we should continue to produce and refine U.S. crude for the benefit of U.S. consumers and workers.

But I stand in opposition of this overly expansive Sense of Congress and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, putting a regressive tax on hardworking Americans is not the way to strengthen the economy, balance the budget, or create jobs.

The President's proposed \$10.25 per barrel tax on crude oil is an administrative grab to increase spending and tax a targeted industry.

Thousands of jobs have been lost in these uncertain times for the oil and gas industry and impacted communities.

Now is not the time to make matters worse for an important economic engine and slow an already weak economic recovery.

The Obama Administration knows this tax would be passed down to American families.

The non-partisan Congressional Research Service reported that this tax could increase the price of a gallon of gasoline by 25 cents—which is a 10 percent hike on today's prices.

That would increase the cost of a wide range of goods for all consumers.

The resolution before us takes a strong stand and makes perfectly clear that Congress will not allow the President's harmful tax to go forward.

It also pushes for a tough review of the effects of ill-conceived tax proposals that target

specific industries, as the President's tax does.

We must ensure that tax policy decisions are made in a reasoned way that protects working families—rather than harms them in a single-minded hunt for revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 112 and voting for its passage.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives will consider H. Con. Res. 112—Expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil. This unserious, non-binding resolution is simply nothing more than a cynical Republican political messaging bill.

Indeed, the resolution purposely fails to include that the proposal was a serious attempt by the President to finance the critical infrastructure needs our country most certainly requires. The energy industry is critical to the global economy. Unfortunately, the manner in which the majority has decided to have this discussion leaves little room for thought or earnest debate. For these reasons, I will vote Present, and will encourage my colleagues to continue to work in earnest to find a long-term, sustainable solution to move forward with putting Americans to work in building out our transportation needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. 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 the further consideration of H.R. 5325 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 771 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5325.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

□ 1114

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 9, 2016, the Chair had announced that it was in order to consider amendment No. 7, printed in House Report 114-611.

□ 1115

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the United States House of Representatives Telephone Directory to the office of any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment that will prevent wasteful spending in this bill and the unsolicited delivery of printed copies of the House telephone directory to 435 House congressional offices.

I hold here the United States House of Representatives Telephone Directory for 2016. This book, printed by the Government Publishing Office, contains 378 pages of names, addresses, and the contact information for Members of Congress and their staffs. While the Clerk of the House does get a deal from the GPO on these printing costs, this directory is sold to the public online at a cost of \$52 per book. GPO stated that 14,080 copies of this directory were sent this year to the House Postal Operations for delivery.

This year, all 435 House Member offices received this stack—this whole stack right here—unsolicited from the Office of the Clerk, 20 copies, total, for each office.

Each year we get this directory and, to be frank, it is not needed. All the information contained within these pages is readily available online, both publicly and through House Web sites.

To make matters worse, often, the information contained is out of date by the time we receive these bound copies. For example, by the time I received my 20 copies of this directory, the information listed for my staff was no longer current.

According to a CRS report from 2011, approximately 97 percent of all government documents originate in digital form and are distributed electronically but are not printed. This same CRS report estimated that it costs Congress about \$134 per page for prepress costs for miscellaneous publications, of which this directory is one.

Madam Chairman, I don't think I need to remind anyone here that we are currently \$19 trillion-plus in debt as a result of excessive and unnecessary spending. I will be the first to admit that this amendment will not be saving millions of dollars this year alone, but in a time of such financial crisis, we should remain vigilant and save every penny we can.

This book is unnecessary, and its unsolicited distribution en masse is excessive. Why does each D.C. office get 20 unsolicited copies? My D.C. office only has eight employees, none of which utilize these wasteful directories.

I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that will save precious taxpayer money and prevent future unsolicited deliveries of this directory in every single House office on the Hill.

I thank the distinguished chair and ranking member for their work on this bill.

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 amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the Budget of the United States Government; Analytical Perspectives, Budget of the United States Government; or the Appendix, Budget of the United States Government, to the office of any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer another commonsense amendment that will prevent wasteful spending in this bill by preventing the delivery of this packet of nearly 2,000 pages containing the President's budget request to 435 House congressional offices.

In its 2017 budget justification, the Government Publishing Office states:

“Since 2012, GPO has made the annual Budget of the U.S. Government available as a mobile app. The FY 2016 Budget app, released in January of 2015, provided users with access to the text and images of the Budget, including the Budget Message of the President, information on the President's priorities, and budget overviews organized by agency. This app provides links to GPO's FDsys where summary tables and additional books of the Budget, including the Analytical Perspectives, Appendix, and Historical Tables, are available.”

This package, which contains the President's budget, analytical perspectives of the budget, and the appendix of the budget are all available on an app for your phone for free. Furthermore, all three are available in their entirety online at www.whitehouse.gov/omb/, where they are more easily searchable.

While the Office of Management and Budget does get a great deal from GPO on printing costs, each individual copy sells online for \$38, \$56, and \$79, respectively. These documents comprise 170 pages, 409 pages, and 1,413 pages, respectively. OMB orders one copy of the budget for all 435 Members of the House, and this publication is then printed by the Government Publishing Office and delivered by House Postal Operations.

In a time when our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis and has a \$19 trillion-plus debt as a result of excessive and unnecessary spending, we should not be squandering more money printing nearly 2,000 pages of the President's budget that most Members throw in the trash, recycle, or don't even open.

Furthermore, this massive document is not even a serious proposal and has been routinely rejected with strong bipartisan support. The Senate defeated President Obama's budget by a vote of 97-0 for fiscal year 2011, 99-0 in fiscal year 2012, and 98-1 last year.

Again, I will be the first one to admit that this amendment will not save millions of dollars this year alone, but, in a time of such fiscal crisis, we should remember the old adage that a penny saved is a penny earned.

The printing and distribution of the President's budget to 435 House offices is excessive. I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and we will save precious taxpayer money and prevent future mass deliveries. Again, all these publications are online in their entirety, where they are more easily searchable, and they are also on a free mobile app.

I thank the distinguished chair and ranking member for their work on this bill.

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 amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding the offer, has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property;

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding the offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, this is an amendment that is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule during the 113th and 114th Congresses. I extend my thanks to the Rules Committee for ruling this amendment in order.

My amendment expands the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of the contractors. I hope that this amendment remains noncontroversial, as it has been, and will again be passed unanimously by the House.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I support the gentleman's amendment.

This is a commonsense amendment which would prohibit funding in this bill from being used to pay contractors engaged in fraud or tax evasion. As the gentleman said, similar amendments have been adopted on other appropriations bills.

I urge Members to vote "aye."

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. There is appropriated, for salaries and expenses of the Office of Technology Assessment as authorized by the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 471 et seq.) \$2,500,000, to be derived from a reduction of \$2,500,000 in the amount provided in this Act for the item for "Architect of the Capitol, Capital Construction and Operations".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise today in support of my amendment, which would restore funding to the Office of Technology Assessment, or OTA. The foundation for good policy is accurate and objective analysis; and for more than two decades, the OTA set that foundation by providing relevant, unbiased technical and scientific assessments for Members of Congress and staff.

In 1995, the OTA was defunded, stripping Congress of a valuable resource to understand both emerging technologies as well as the nuances of the legislative process. In its absence, the need for OTA has only grown. Many of the issues OTA studied 20 years ago are even more pressing today: antibiotic-resistant bacteria, electronic surveillance in the digital age, and testing in America's schools. These are the complex challenges our Nation will continue to face, and Congress should have access to the thorough and insightful analysis OTA can provide.

Investing in the OTA now will actually save us money in the future. In the last year it operated, OTA's budget was \$23 million, but its studies on the Synthetics Fuels Corporation saved taxpayers tens of billions of dollars.

Our amendment restores a modest \$2.5 million to the OTA account for salaries and expenses to begin rebuilding the office. The cost is offset by a reduction of the same amount to the AOC's capital construction and operations account, which is an administrative account. So this will not take resources from specific construction projects.

Madam Chair, a great surgeon does not operate without modern tools, a master chef does not cook without fresh ingredients, and Members of Congress should not make policy decisions without relevant and unbiased information.

I urge Members to vote "yes" on this amendment to restore funding to the Office of Technology Assessment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from California. I know he has great intentions with this amendment.

As we discuss the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, we are really discussing what is important to the House of Representatives, because that is what this bill reflects.

I know that this office was created in 1972 and was eliminated years later, but in 1972, I was 2 years old. Technology was very different. I see no need to re-create something that was started dealing with technology when I was 2 years old, almost two decades prior to the first Web site.

Currently, these tasks are being handled by GAO. They are being handled sufficiently. They are being handled with the \$2.5 million already, and we have yet to receive any complaints.

Now, if there is a more comprehensive need for technology assessment, I think that is a bigger discussion for cyber policy in general, and that is a conversation that should take place outside of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee's jurisdiction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I rise in support of the amendment to revive the Office of Technology Assessment.

When I was chair of the subcommittee, we tried to restart it within the Government Accountability Office. In fiscal years 2008 to 2010, I included \$2.5 million in this bill with GAO to support that initiative. However, the supporters of the amendment make an impassioned case that the Office of Technology Assessment should be a part of Congress itself, rather than GAO, in order to provide objective analysis of complex, scientific, and technical issues which certainly, I think we can all agree, actually exist today.

We are not trying to go back to 20th century technology. We have important issues that need to be reviewed, and we don't always have the expertise in Congress necessary to be able to make sure we can get that cogent analysis, particularly when we are still at funding levels back to 2010 in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

This is a bill in which we are tackling copyright modernization, specifically dealing with technology challenges, and an OTA would add to the rigor of our analysis on that topic and others.

I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, I will just point out that one of our focuses in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill is to be very responsible with taxpayer dollars. During these lean times when we are \$19 trillion in debt, we have really led the

charge when it comes to reducing spending from our operations, down 13.2 percent. We have eliminated some agencies and programs and even, in this bill, eliminate the Open World Center.

□ 1130

I don't see this as the time that we need to restart a new program that was eliminated 20 years ago.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining on my side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and a respected physicist.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chair, thank you to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and to my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for helping to bring this amendment to the floor.

This amendment would provide \$2.5 million to resurrect the Office of Technology Assessment to revive this crucial service of providing Congress with unbiased, nonpartisan reports on a wide range of issues in science and technology.

This office is no less necessary today than when it first started in 1972. As technology continues to advance at an increasingly rapid pace and our partisan divide seems to grow deeper, Congress needs this now more than ever.

I ask my colleagues to consider just one single one of the recommendations from the Office of Technology Assessment, that the United States rapidly adopt a standardized electronic medical record format. Had this been done, we would have been able to save hundreds of millions of dollars in medical costs over the last decades and hundreds of thousands of lives of Americans through prevention of preventable medical accidents.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to restore this vital source of credible and nonpartisan scientific expertise in Congress.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I reiterate my support for the Office of Technology Assessment. Congress does not suffer from a lack of information, but it suffers from a lack of trusted information to help make wise policy decisions. We need information that is not spun even by our own agencies, the FBI or other agencies. We need information that is not spun from particular sectors. This agency, this Office of Technology Assessment, will be overseen by a bipartisan group of lawmakers who will vet the experts that work for it.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, I will just again thank my colleague from California for his thoughtful and well-debated argument here for the need, as he sees it. I will again reiterate that the GAO provides a valuable service which I believe can continue doing the job that is necessary.

In these lean times, I would encourage our colleagues to oppose this amendment not because of the gentleman from California, but just because of the lean times and the concept in which it is just not the right time to adopt that. I will oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. RUSSELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the Federal Register to a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) unless the Member requests a copy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam Chair, the fiscal year 2017 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act contains several excellent provisions to cut down on unnecessary printing of paper documents in the House of Representatives. Section 102 of the act, for example, prohibits printed copies of bills from being sent to Members of Congress unless they specifically request them. This amendment is very similar. It prohibits the Federal Register from being sent to Members unless they specifically request it. It uses the exact same terminology as section 102.

The Federal Register, while important because it contains rules, proposals, and various other publications released by Federal agencies, unfortunately every business day Members of Congress receive paper copies of this

Register, while it is available online and queryable. Sadly, most of these hundreds of pages in length end up in the waste bin.

The Federal Register, being available online, is a better way to go with this measure. The Government Printing Office sends 617 copies of the Register every single day to House Members alone. This includes subscriptions for personal offices, committees, archival offices, and others. Each annual subscription costs the Government Printing Office \$750 a year to produce in paper and ink alone. These costs are charged to Federal agencies that publish in the Federal Register.

Among all the Members of Congress and six nonvoting Members in the House, paying for an annual subscription for all of these costs and other estimated delivery costs exceeds \$400,000 annually. To put that into perspective, that could pay for the annual salaries of a dozen Special Forces sergeants who are defending our country abroad.

None of the funds made available by this act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the Federal Register to a Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress, unless the Members request specifically a copy.

This simple amendment will build on the reforms of the congressional printing of sections 102, 103, and 105, allowing Federal agencies to better use precious taxpayer dollars. I encourage support for this amendment, Madam Chair, because, once again, we will never win the war on our national debt in some giant spending measure that will only divide us within our respective parties and within the Chamber. Instead, we will win it by combating waste one agency at a time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam 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 2, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$190,970)".

Page 5, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$190,970)".

Page 6, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$190,970)".

Page 42, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$190,970)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

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

Madam Chair, despite what has been said about this amendment, it is very simple. There are two bodies that are funded through the appropriations process in the U.S. Congress. One is the House Committee on Ethics. That is the one that we all know as Members of Congress. But there is another body called the Office of Congressional Ethics that works pretty well outside of this body.

Now, my amendment is simply taking this year's increase away from that outside body. Again, no change to the ethical process inside the body, the one that we are all familiar with and feel accountable to. But we are deducting \$191,000 from this outside group because in this time of budget constraints, when I look at my office and all the other offices, our spending has been reduced. Our budgets have been reduced by approximately \$200,000 since 2008.

Now, we have to deal with 750,000 to 900,000 constituents. I have five field offices. Generally we drive, as a staff, somewhere between 50,000 and 100,000 miles per year to deal with our constituents. Our budgets have gone down \$200,000, with a small increase this year of \$12,000.

Then, on the other hand, I see a \$191,000 increase on this outside group. I just feel like that is extraordinary and would suggest that the appropriations bill, H.R. 5325, be reduced in that amount in this budget area.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, the Office of Congressional Ethics is crucial to ensuring accountability and transparency in this body. Any attempts to cut its budget would only serve to erode our constituents' trust and faith in Congress, which certainly has already suffered a significant amount of erosion.

As many of my colleagues will recall, the House created the Office of Congressional Ethics nearly a decade ago to improve the integrity of the ethics process in the House. The House was recovering from the Mark Foley scandal, and it was clear that we needed to do something to rebuild the American people's trust in their elected Representatives. That is why OCE's core "mission is to assist the U.S. House in upholding high ethical standards with an eye toward increasing transparency and providing information to the public."

I acknowledge that there are proposals to improve the operations of the Office of Congressional Ethics, and we should certainly take a look at those, Madam Chair, but it is common sense that these improvements can't be made by cutting funding for the office that we are actually seeking to improve.

Moreover, the issue of congressional ethics is far too important to reduce to a 10-minute debate on the House floor. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I find it odd that we received the words today on the House floor that we are going to increase transparency through the Office of Congressional Ethics. That is exactly what they do not do.

The Sixth Amendment of the Constitution gives the accused the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him. I will quote from a letter, a legal letter that was given to the OCE:

This investigation has again revealed due process deficiencies within the OCE rules. While the Sixth Amendment of the United States provides for the fundamental right to confront one's accusers, the OCE rules do not allow to confront the accused with the accusers.

Secondly, the Sixth Amendment gives us the right to a lawyer. I will again quote from PAUL SOLIS, an employee of the OCE, in an email to my chief of staff:

I forgot to mention on our call that should you retain a lawyer for the office, that lawyer would most likely be prohibited under our rules from representing a subject of this review to the extent that subject is a current staff member.

So the OCE, in their email to our office, says you don't have the right to legal counsel, even though the Sixth Amendment of the Constitution says that you do.

The third thing that I see is that we should be able to find out the nature of the charges under the Sixth Amendment. Again, our experience and the experience of others who have confronted OCE realizes you do not know what the charges are, you are not going to get to get a lawyer, and you cannot know who is accusing you. This hardly meets the word "transparency" that my good friend alluded to.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, while I can appreciate the gentleman's concerns, he has listed a number of substantive differences of opinion with the way the Office of Congressional Ethics handles their work. This appropriations bill is not the appropriate place to address those.

The Office of Congressional Ethics was created through legislation. It is a substantive issue, and it is one that should be debated and discussed on an authorizing bill, not on the funding of the legislative branch. You don't just cut the budget of an office with whose decisions you disagree. We can debate and discuss these concerns, but cutting \$190,000 out of the OCE's budget is not the way to address that.

For those reasons and the fact that the public already has some pretty significant concerns with the way we do business here, this would send the wrong message. If we are going to have

this discussion, we should do it in a forum that allows for more robust discussion and debate over how to address those challenges long term.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1145

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I would remind my friend and colleague that this amendment only addresses the funding. I simply used my time in order to advertise for this agency and the way that they operate.

I would like to quote from an email that I got this morning:

I cried when I saw what your boss did last night on the Leg Branch.

This is referring to my amendment.

I was unfairly targeted by OCE in 2013, for an action in 2008, which had been approved by the Ethics Committee. OCE even admitted there was no evidence. I complied with every provision of the policy, without exception. One of the staffers that was being investigated in this same circumstance left the Hill early on. I considered doing the same thing. I certainly had to endure all the phases of the OCE process, including referral to the Ethics Committee.

The Ethics Committee dismissed the case against us, but it is, by far, the worst thing that has ever happened to me in my 21 years on the Hill. I am a strong person with resources, and was an emotional wreck over the thought of losing my credibility over an ethics investigation. I cried virtually every day for several months. And the prolonged process over many, many months took a toll on my life.

And we are asking to give this agency another \$191,000 to continue this kind of action? I think this debate is exactly called for at this moment on this bill and on this spending.

Madam Chair, I urge Members to support the amendment to give notice to the OCE that we are watching what they are doing.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from New Mexico and his concerns for the operation of the Office of Congressional Ethics. However, all that we would be doing here, if his amendment were to pass, is to send a \$190,000 message to the Office of Congressional Ethics. It would not achieve any of the gentleman's goals.

If we do need to take a look at the way the office functions, then there is a process for doing that. The only thing we achieve here by adopting this amendment is cutting their budget by \$190,000.

So, if the majority believes that it is important to take a look at the function of this office, then there is a process for doing that and to take up legislation to change the way they do business. That is certainly appropriate. But we don't accomplish any of the gentleman's goals by cutting \$190,000.

In fact, the public has certainly already sent multiple messages to the United States Congress that they don't have a whole lot of confidence in the business that we are doing here. This would send the absolute wrong message back to them—that we don't get it.

So I urge Members to oppose the amendment because it would not achieve the gentleman's goals and because we have a more appropriate place to actually achieve those goals in the authorizing committee.

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

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

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam 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 Mexico 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 114-611 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 6 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 241, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—157

Ashford	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)
Bera	Bustos	Chu, Judy
Beyer	Butterfield	Cicilline
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Clark (MA)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Clarke (NY)
Bonamici	Cárdenas	Clay
Boyle, Brendan	Carney	Cleaver
F.	Carson (IN)	Connolly

Conyers	Kennedy	Rangel	Palazzo	Roskam	Trott
Courtney	Kildeer	Rice (NY)	Palmer	Ross	Turner
Crowley	Kilmer	Richmond	Paulsen	Rothfus	Upton
Cuellar	Kind	Roybal-Allard	Pearce	Rouzer	Valadao
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz	Perry	Royce	Wagner
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Ruppersberger	Peterson	Russell	Walberg
DeFazio	Langevin	Rush	Pittenger	Salmon	Walden
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)	Pitts	Sanford	Walker
Delaney	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda T.	Poe (TX)	Scalise	Walorski
DeLauro	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta	Poliquin	Schrader	Walters, Mimi
DeBene	Loebsack	Sarbanes	Polis	Schweikert	Weber (TX)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Schakowsky	Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Webster (FL)
Deutch	Lowenthal	Schiff	Posey	Sensenbrenner	Wenstrup
Dingell	Lowe	Scott (VA)	Price, Tom	Sessions	Westerman
Doggett	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Scott, David	Ratcliffe	Shimkus	Westmoreland
Doyle, Michael F.	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Serrano	Reed	Shuster	Whitfield
Duckworth	Lynch	Sewell (AL)	Reichert	Simpson	Williams
Edwards	Maloney, Carolyn	Sherman	Renacci	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Sinema	Ribble	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Eshoo	Matsui	Slaughter	Rice (SC)	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Smith (WA)	Rigell	Smith (TX)	Woodall
Gabbard	McDermott	Speier	Roby	Stefanik	Yoder
Gallego	McGovern	Swalwell (CA)	Roe (TN)	Stewart	Yoho
Garamendi	McNerney	Takai	Rogers (AL)	Stivers	Young (AK)
Graham	Meng	Takano	Rogers (KY)	Stutzman	Young (IA)
Grayson	Moore	Thompson (CA)	Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Green, Al	Moulton	Thompson (MS)	Rokita	Thornberry	Zeldin
Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)	Titus	Rooney (FL)	Tiberi	Zinke
Grijalva	Nadler	Tonko	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton	
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Torres			
Hahn	Nolan	Tsongas	Adams	Farr	Larson (CT)
Hastings	Norcross	Van Hollen	Amodei	Fattah	Lee
Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Vargas	Barletta	Fincher	Lewis
Higgins	Pallone	Veasey	Bass	Franks (AZ)	Lieu, Ted
Honda	Pascrell	Vela	Black	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Hoyer	Pelosi	Velázquez	Brat	Gosar	Meeks
Huffman	Perlmutter	Visclosky	Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Miller (MI)
Israel	Peters	Walz	Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Neal
Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Wasserman Schultz	Cohen	Hinojosa	Payne
Johnson, E. B.	Kaptur	Watson Coleman	Davis, Danny	Hunter	Sires
Kaptur	Keating	Welch	Duffy	Jackson Lee	Waters, Maxine
Keating	Kelly (IL)	Quigley	Engel	Jeffries	Yarmuth

NOES—241

Abraham	Dold	Jones
Aderholt	Donovan	Jordan
Aguilar	Duncan (SC)	Joyce
Allen	Duncan (TN)	Katko
Amash	Ellmers (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Babin	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Farenthold	King (IA)
Barton	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Benishek	Fleischmann	Kinzinger (IL)
Bilirakis	Fleming	Kline
Bishop (MI)	Flores	Knight
Bishop (UT)	Forbes	Labrador
Blackburn	Fortenberry	LaHood
Blum	Foster	LaMalfa
Bost	Foxx	Lamborn
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Latta
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Lipinski
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	LoBiondo
Buchanan	Gohmert	Long
Buck	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Bucshon	Gowdy	Love
Burgess	Granger	Lucas
Byrne	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Calvert	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Marino
Chabot	Grothman	Massie
Chaffetz	Guinta	McCarthy
Clawson (FL)	Guthrie	McCaul
Coffman	Hanna	McClintock
Cole	Harper	McHenry
Collins (GA)	Harris	McKinley
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	McMorris
Comstock	Heck (NV)	Rodgers
Conaway	Hensarling	McSally
Cook	Hice, Jody B.	Meadows
Cooper	Hill	Meehan
Costa	Himes	Messer
Costello (PA)	Holding	Mica
Cramer	Hudson	Miller (FL)
Crawford	Huelskamp	Moolenaar
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Mooney (WV)
Culberson	Hultgren	Mullin
Curbelo (FL)	Hurd (TX)	Mulvaney
Davidson	Hurt (VA)	Murphy (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Neugebauer
Denham	Jenkins (KS)	Newhouse
Dent	Jenkins (WV)	Noem
DeSantis	Johnson (OH)	Nugent
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Nunes
Diaz-Balart	Jolly	Olson

NOT VOTING—36

Adams	Farr	Larson (CT)
Amodei	Fattah	Lee
Barletta	Fincher	Lewis
Bass	Franks (AZ)	Lieu, Ted
Black	Fudge	Luetkemeyer
Brat	Gosar	Meeks
Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Miller (MI)
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Neal
Cohen	Hinojosa	Payne
Davis, Danny	Hunter	Sires
Duffy	Jackson Lee	Waters, Maxine
Engel	Jeffries	Yarmuth

□ 1208

Messrs. DIAZ-BALART, WITTMAN, and COLLINS of New York changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

Stated against: Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 289 on agreeing to the Ellison Amendment for H.R. 5325, I am not recorded because I was unavoidable detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 237, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—165

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Brady (TX)
Allen	Black	Brat
Amash	Blackburn	Bridenstine
Babin	Blum	Brooks (AL)
Barton	Bost	Brooks (IN)
Bilirakis	Boustany	Buchanan

Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson

Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Lummis
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pitts
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom

Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—237

Aderholt
Aguilar
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishkek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings

Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)

Higgins
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean

Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNeerney
Meehan
Meng
Mica
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Price (NC)

Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)

NOT VOTING—32

Adams
Amodei
Barletta
Cohen
Costa
Davis, Danny
Duffy
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Fincher

Fudge
Gosar
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Honda
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jackson Lee
Jordan
Lee

Lieu, Ted
Luetkemeyer
Meeks
Miller (MI)
Neal
Payne
Rush
Sires
Waters, Maxine
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1212

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

Stated for:
Mr. HURT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I was
not present for rollcall vote No. 290 on the
Blackburn of Tennessee Amendment No. 6.
Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr.
TAKANO) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 179, noes 223,
not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—179

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford

Bass
Beatty
Becerra

Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al

Grothman
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean

Pallone
Pascarell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Roybal-Allard
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Ros-Lehtinen
Royal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Young (AK)

NOES—223

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishkek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)

Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Freyling
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith

Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta

Long	Peterson	Smith (MO)	Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Reichert	McClintock	Rice (NY)	Takano
Loudermilk	Pittenger	Smith (NE)	Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Renacci	McCollum	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Love	Pitts	Smith (NJ)	Chaffetz	King (IA)	Ribble	McDermott	Rigell	Thompson (MS)
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)	Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rice (SC)	McGovern	Roby	Thompson (PA)
Lummis	Poliquin	Stewart	Collins (GA)	Kline	Roe (TN)	McKinley	Rooney (FL)	Tiberi
MacArthur	Pompeo	Stutzman	Conaway	Labrador	Rogers (AL)	McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Marino	Posey	Thompson (PA)	Crawford	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Rodgers	Rothfus	Titus
Massie	Price, Tom	Thornberry	Crenshaw	Lance	Rohrabacher	McNerney	Rouzer	Tonko
McCarthy	Ratcliffe	Tiberi	Culberson	Long	Rokita	McSally	Roybal-Allard	Torres
McCauley	Reed	Tipton	Davidson	Loudermilk	Roskam	Meehan	Royce	Trott
McClintock	Reichert	Trott	DesJarlais	Lucas	Ross	Meng	Ruiz	Tsongas
McHenry	Renacci	Turner	Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Russell	Mica	Ruppersberger	Turner
McKinley	Ribble	Upton	Duncan (SC)	MacArthur	Salmon	Moore	Rush	Valadao
McMorris	Rice (SC)	Valadao	Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Schweikert	Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Rodgers	Rigell	Wagner	Farenthold	Marino	Scott, Austin	Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Vargas
McSally	Roby	Walberg	Fleischmann	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner	Murphy (PA)	T.	Veasey
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Walden	Flores	McCauley	Sessions	Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Vela
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Walker	Foxx	McHenry	Simpson	Napolitano	Sanford	Velázquez
Messer	Rogers (KY)	Walorski	Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Sinema	Noem	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Mica	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi	Frelinghuysen	Messer	Smith (MO)	Nolan	Scalise	Wagner
Miller (FL)	Rokita	Weber (TX)	Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)	Norcross	Schakowsky	Walden
Moolenaar	Rooney (FL)	Webster (FL)	Gohmert	Moolenaar	Smith (TX)	O'Rourke	Schiff	Walker
Mooney (WV)	Roskam	Wenstrup	Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Stewart	Pallone	Schrader	Walorski
Mullin	Ross	Westerman	Gowdy	Mullin	Stivers	Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Walters, Mimi
Mulvaney	Rothfus	Westmoreland	Granger	Mulvaney	Stutzman	Paulsen	Scott, David	Walz
Murphy (PA)	Rouzer	Whitfield	Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Thornberry	Pelosi	Serrano	Wasserman
Neugebauer	Royce	Williams	Graves (MO)	Newhouse	Upton	Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Newhouse	Sanford	Wilson (SC)	Griffith	Nugent	Walberg	Peters	Sherman	Watson Coleman
Noem	Scalise	Womack	Grothman	Nunes	Weber (TX)	Pingree	Shimkus	Welch
Nugent	Schrader	Woodall	Harper	Olson	Webster (FL)	Pittenger	Shuster	Wilson (FL)
Nunes	Schweikert	Yoder	Harris	Palazzo	Wenstrup	Pocan	Slaughter	Wittman
Olson	Scott, Austin	Yoho	Hastings	Palmer	Westerman	Poliquin	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)	Hensarling	Pearce	Westmoreland	Polis	Smith (WA)	Young (IA)
Palmer	Sessions	Young (IA)	Hice, Jody B.	Perry	Whitfield	Price (NC)	Speier	Young (IN)
Paulsen	Shimkus	Young (IN)	Hill	Peterson	Williams	Quigley	Stefanik	Zeldin
Pearce	Shuster	Zeldin	Holding	Pitts	Wilson (SC)	Rangel	Swalwell (CA)	Zinke
Perry	Simpson		Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)	Womack	Reed	Takai	
			Hultgren	Pompeo	Woodall			
			Hunter	Price, Tom	Yoho			
			Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe	Young (AK)			
			Jordan					

NOT VOTING—32

Adams	Fudge	Marchant
Amodei	Gosar	Meeks
Barletta	Grijalva	Miller (MI)
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	Neal
Cohen	Hardy	Payne
Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler	Sires
Duffy	Hinojosa	Stivers
Engel	Jackson Lee	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Lee	Wittman
Fattah	Lieu, Ted	Yarmuth
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1216

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 270, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—137

Abraham	Benishek	Boustany
Allen	Bilirakis	Brat
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Babin	Black	Burgess
Barton	Blackburn	Carter (GA)

NOES—270

Aderholt	Crowley
Aguilar	Cuellar
Ashford	Cummings
Barr	Curbelo (FL)
Bass	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Davis, Rodney
Becerra	DeFazio
Bera	DeGette
Beyer	Delaney
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro
Bishop (MI)	DelBene
Blum	Denham
Blumenauer	Dent
Bonamici	DeSantis
Bost	DeSaunier
Boyle, Brendan	Deutch
F.	Dingell
Brady (PA)	Doggett
Bridenstine	Dold
Brooks (IN)	Donovan
Brown (FL)	Doyle, Michael
Brownley (CA)	F.
Buchanan	Duckworth
Buck	Edwards
Bucshon	Ellison
Bustos	Ellmers (NC)
Butterfield	Emmer (MN)
Byrne	Eshoo
Calvert	Esty
Capps	Fitzpatrick
Capuano	Fleming
Cárdenas	Forbes
Carney	Fortenberry
Carson (IN)	Poster
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)
Castor (FL)	Gabbard
Castro (TX)	Galleo
Chu, Judy	Garamendi
Cicilline	Garrett
Clark (MA)	Gibson
Clarke (NY)	Graham
Clay	Graves (LA)
Cleaver	Grayson
Clyburn	Green, Al
Coffman	Green, Gene
Cole	Grijalva
Collins (NY)	Guinta
Comstock	Guthrie
Connolly	Gutiérrez
Conyers	Hahn
Cook	Hanna
Cooper	Hartzler
Costa	Heck (NV)
Costello (PA)	Heck (WA)
Courtney	Higgins
Cramer	Himes

Honda	
Hoyer	
Hudson	
Huelskamp	
Huffman	
Hurd (TX)	
Hurt (VA)	
Israel	
Issa	
Jeffries	
Jenkins (KS)	
Jenkins (WV)	
Johnson (GA)	
Johnson (OH)	
Johnson, E. B.	
Jolly	
Jones	
Joyce	
Kaptur	
Katko	
Keating	
Kelly (IL)	
Kennedy	
Kildee	
Kilmer	
Kind	
King (NY)	
Kirkpatrick	
Knight	
Kuster	
LaHood	
LaMalfa	
Langevin	
Larsen (WA)	
Larson (CT)	
Latta	
Lawrence	
Levin	
Lewis	
Lipinski	
LoBiondo	
Loeb	
Loeb	
Lofgren	
Love	
Lowenthal	
Lowe	
Lujan Grisham	
(NM)	
Luján, Ben Ray	
(NM)	
Lynch	
Maloney,	
Carolyn	
Maloney, Sean	
Massie	
Matsui	

NOT VOTING—27

Adams	Fattah	Lieu, Ted
Amodei	Fincher	Luetkemeyer
Barletta	Fudge	Meeks
Brady (TX)	Gosar	Miller (MI)
Cohen	Hardy	Neal
Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler	Payne
Duffy	Hinojosa	Sires
Engel	Jackson Lee	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Lee	Yarmuth

□ 1220

Mr. DELANEY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 771, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Castro of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5325 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the "Capital Construction and Operations" account, on page 17, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000)".

In the "Library of Congress—Salaries and Expenses" account, on page 25, line 24, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. 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, before I speak on this amendment, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who has been a strong advocate and leader on this issue, for an opportunity to say a few words.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague, Congressman JOAQUIN CASTRO, to urge the majority to finally allow the House to strike a destructive political provision that has made its way into the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

If those listening are wondering why we are talking about the pejorative term "illegal aliens" on the bill that funds the legislative branch, then you are not alone. This legislation's accompanying report includes language that would have the Library continue to use the term "illegal aliens," "to the extent practicable"—even though the Library itself has said that there is no practicable means to continue to use the term "illegal aliens."

The Library changes thousands of subject headings each year without interference from Congress. Why this one? Why now?

The Library once used the subject heading "Negro," then moved to "Afro-American," and now "African American." They didn't wait until the entire U.S. Code was free of the pejorative term "Negro" before they changed their subject heading. As a matter of fact, Congress only recently removed the last vestiges of the terms "Negro" and "Oriental" from the U.S. Code in May of 2016.

That bill passed with a unanimous vote, including the "yes" vote of the chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee. If we removed "Negro" and "Oriental" in the subject headings of the Library of Congress before we changed the U.S. Code, then we should do the same for the now-pejorative term, "illegal alien."

The Library of Congress is our Nation's first established cultural institution, and it is hard to fathom why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would try to tie its hands to the slow-moving wheels of the U.S. Code.

Entering into an immigration debate on the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill is a terrible precedent. If the majority is really serious about debating the U.S. Code, then let's have the Republican Rules Committee bring up the Castro bill that would remove the hurtful and inaccurate term "illegal aliens" once and for all from the U.S. Code.

We are Members of Congress, not captains of the word police. Free the card catalog and depoliticize this bill.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes and 35 seconds remaining.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1922, the only grandparent I would come to know came from Mexico to the United States. She was not a rapist or a murderer or an alien. She was a 6-year-old girl whose parents had died around the time of the Mexican Revolution, and the closest relatives who could take her and her sister in were in Texas.

I bet if we went around this Chamber, I know there would be beautiful stories, similar stories, of ancestors who came from Italy, Germany, Ireland, Africa, Asia, and every corner of the world. They are the immigrants to this country. They are the strength of this country.

Language matters. Recently, the Library of Congress decided to retire the term "illegal alien" because it is dehumanizing. For the first time in American history, today, the Congress is ready to interfere with the business of the Library of Congress.

In the years of the Congress and the Library, language has evolved. That is why we have done away with terms like "Negro," "Oriental," "lunatic," and "retarded," because we understand that even words that start off as neutral descriptors can, over time, become used as verbal weapons and knives to inflict pain and disrespect and sow division. That is the case today.

There are times in our country's history where our politics have also been a race to the bottom. Those Irish ancestors were greeted by signs that read "no Irish need apply" in cities like New York and Boston. The Japanese, German, and Italian Americans even were interned during World War II. Chinese were excluded from this coun-

try for decades. During the Eisenhower administration, many Hispanics in this country were rounded up and deported to Mexico even if they were American.

□ 1230

What I am asking is for us not to fuel the flames of this season and for us to take a better course and do the right thing. I am asking you to support this motion to recommit because the words "illegal alien" will be retired. This will change, whether it is now or 6 months from now or 10 years from now. The question for all of us is whether we, today, will do the right thing or whether a few years from now we apologize for doing the wrong thing.

Please support this motion to recommit and do the right thing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this quick because I want to make sure the House knows what offensive language is in this bill. It is so offensive that I am going to read it.

To the extent practicable, the committee instructs the Library to maintain certain subject headings that reflect terminology used in title 8, United States Code.

That is what is so offensive to the minority party.

For 7½ years, we have had a President who wants to ignore the intent of the laws of our land. We will not allow this body, this House, to ignore the definitions nor the words of the laws that have been voted on in this body, passed by the Senate, and signed into law by the President.

I am asking this body to vote "no" on this motion to recommit, vote "yes" to uphold the laws of this land, vote "yes" for your constituents on final passage, and have a good weekend.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 89, and adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 112.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 237, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—170

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

NOES—237

Abraham Collins (NY) Gibson
 Aderholt Comstock Gohmert
 Allen Conaway Goodlatte
 Amash Cook Gowdy
 Babin Costello (PA) Granger
 Barr Cramer Graves (GA)
 Barton Crawford Graves (LA)
 Benishek Crenshaw Graves (MO)
 Bilirakis Culberson Griffith
 Bishop (MI) Curbelo (FL) Grothman
 Bishop (UT) Davidson Guinta
 Black Davis, Rodney Guthrie
 Blackburn Denham Hanna
 Blum Dent Harper
 Bost DeSantis Harris
 Boustany DesJarlais Hartzler
 Brady (TX) Diaz-Balart Heck (NV)
 Brat Dold Hensarling
 Bridenstine Donovan Hice, Jody B.
 Brooks (AL) Duncan (SC) Hill
 Brooks (IN) Duncan (TN) Holding
 Buchanan Ellmers (NC) Hudson
 Buck Emmer (MN) Huelskamp
 Buechson Farenthold Huizenga (MI)
 Burgess Fitzpatrick Hultgren
 Byrne Fleischmann Hunter
 Calvert Fleming Hurd (TX)
 Carter (GA) Flores Hurt (VA)
 Carter (TX) Forbes Issa
 Chabot Fortenberry Jenkins (KS)
 Chaffetz Fox Jenkens (WV)
 Clawson (FL) Franks (AZ) Johnson (OH)
 Coffman Frelinghuysen Johnson, Sam
 Cole Garrett Jolly
 Collins (GA) Gibbs Jones

Jordan Newhouse Shimkus
 Joyce Noem Shuster
 Katko Nugent Simpson
 Kelly (MS) Nunes Smith (MO)
 Kelly (PA) Olson Smith (NE)
 King (IA) Palazzo Smith (NJ)
 King (NY) Palmer Smith (TX)
 Kinzinger (IL) Paulsen Stefaniak
 Kline Pearce Stewart
 Knight Perry Stivers
 Labrador Labrador Stutzman
 LaHood Pitts Thornsberry
 LaMalfa Poe (TX) Thompson (PA)
 Lamborn Poliquin Thornberry
 Lance Pompeo Tiberi
 Latta Posey Tipton
 LoBiondo Price, Tom Trott
 Long Ratcliffe Turner
 Loudermilk Reed Upton
 Love Reichert Valadao
 Lucas Renacci Wagner
 Lummis Ribble Walberg
 MacArthur Rice (SC) Walden
 Marchant Rigell Walker
 Marino Roby Walorski
 Massie Roe (TN) Walters, Mimi
 McCarthy Rogers (AL) Weber (TX)
 McCaul Rogers (KY) Fleischmann
 McClintock Rohrabacher Flores
 McHenry Rokita Forbes
 McKinley Rooney (FL) Fortenberry
 McMorris Ros-Lehtinen Westmoreland
 Rodgers Roskam Whitfield
 McSally Ross Williams
 Meadows Rothfus Wilson (SC)
 Meehan Rouzer Wittman
 Messer Royce Womack
 Mica Russell Woodall
 Miller (FL) Salmon Yoder
 Moolenaar Sanford Yoho
 Mooney (WV) Scalise Young (AK)
 Mullin Schweikert Young (IA)
 Mulvaney Scott, Austin Young (IN)
 Murphy (PA) Sensenbrenner Zeldin
 Neugebauer Sessions Zinke

NOT VOTING—27

Adams Fincher Luettkemeyer
 Amodei Fudge Meeks
 Barletta Gosar Miller (MI)
 Cohen Hardy Napolitano
 Davis, Danny Herrera Beutler Neal
 Duffy Hinojosa Payne
 Engel Jackson Lee Sires
 Farr Lee Waters, Maxine
 Fattah Lieu, Ted Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1237

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 293.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 175, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

YEAS—233

Abraham Bishop (MI) Buck
 Aderholt Bishop (UT) Buechson
 Aguilar Black Burgess
 Black Blackburn Byrne
 Ashford Bost Calvert
 Babin Boustany Carter (GA)
 Barr Brady (TX) Carter (TX)
 Barton Brat Chabot
 Bridenstine Chaffetz
 Brooks (IN) Brooks (IN) Clawson (FL)
 Buchanan Buchanan Coffman

Cole Johnson, Sam Ribble
 Collins (GA) Jolly Rice (SC)
 Collins (NY) Jordan Rigell
 Comstock Joyce Roby
 Conaway Katko Roe (TN)
 Cook Kelly (MS) Rogers (AL)
 Cooper Kelly (PA) Rogers (KY)
 Costa King (NY) Rohrabacher
 Costello (PA) Kinzinger (IL) Rokita
 Cramer Kline Rooney (FL)
 Crawford Knight Ros-Lehtinen
 Crenshaw Labrador Roskam
 Cuellar LaHood Ross
 Culberson LaMalfa Rothfus
 Curbelo (FL) Lamborn Rouzer
 Davis, Rodney Lance Royce
 Denham Latta Ruiz
 Dent LoBiondo Russell
 DesJarlais Long Salmon
 Diaz-Balart Loudermilk Sanford
 Dold Love Scalise
 Donovan Lucas Schweikert
 Duncan (SC) Lummis Scott, Austin
 Duncan (TN) MacArthur Sensenbrenner
 Emmer (MN) Marchant Sessions
 Farenthold Marino Shimkus
 Fitzpatrick McCarthy Shuster
 Fleischmann McCaul Simpson
 Flores McHenry Sinema
 Forbes McKinley Smith (MO)
 Fortenberry McMorris Smith (NE)
 Foxx Rodgers Smith (NJ)
 Franks (AZ) McSally Smith (TX)
 Frelinghuysen Meadows Stefanik
 Garrett Meehan Stewart
 Gibbs Messer Stivers
 Gibson Mica Stutzman
 Gohmert Miller (FL) Thompson (PA)
 Goodlatte Moolenaar Thornberry
 Gowdy Mooney (WV) Tiberi
 Mullin Tipton
 Trott
 Mulvaney Graves (LA) Turner
 Murphy (PA) Graves (MO) Neugebauer
 Upton
 Upton Valadao
 Griffith Newhouse
 Grothman Wagner
 Guthrie Nugent
 Hanna Nunes
 Harper Olson
 Harris Palazzo
 Hartzler Palmer
 Heck (NV) Paulsen
 Hensarling Pearce
 Hice, Jody B. Perry
 Hill Peters
 Peterson Peterson
 Pittenger Pittenger
 Pitts Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren Hultgren
 Hunter Hunter
 Hurd (TX) Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA) Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV) Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)

NAYS—175

Amash Cleaver Gabbard
 Bass Clyburn Gallego
 Beatty Connolly Garamendi
 Becerra Conyers Graham
 Beyer Courtney Grayson
 Bishop (GA) Crowley Green, Al
 Blum Cummings Green, Gene
 Blumenauer Davidson Grijalva
 Bonamici Davis (CA) Guinta
 Boyle, Brendan DeFazio Gutiérrez
 F. DeGette Hahn
 Brady (PA) Delaney Hastings
 Brooks (AL) DeLauro Heck (WA)
 Brown (FL) DelBene Higgins
 Brownley (CA) DeSantis Himes
 Buechson DeSaulnier Honda
 Butterfield Deutch Hoyer
 Capps Dingell Huffman
 Capuano Doggett Israel
 Cárdenas Doyle, Michael Jeffries
 Carney F. Johnson (GA)
 Carson (IN) Duckworth Johnson, E. B.
 Cartwright Edwards Jones
 Castro (FL) Ellison Kaptur
 Castro (TX) Ellmers (NC) Keating
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL) Kennedy
 Cicilline Esty Kennedy
 Clark (MA) Fleming Kildee
 Clarke (NY) Foster Kilmer
 Clay Frankel (FL) Kind

144, answered "present" 2, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—253

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

NAYS—144

Bass Bonamici Bustos
Beatty Boyle, Brendan Butterfield
Becerra F. Capps
Beyer Brady (PA) Capuano
Blumenauer Brown (FL) Cárdenas

Carney Himes Perlmutter
Carson (IN) Honda Peters
Cartwright Hoyer Pingree
Castor (FL) Huffman Pocan
Chu, Judy Israel Polis
Cicilline Jeffries Price (NC)
Clark (MA) Johnson (GA) Quigley
Clarke (NY) Johnson, E. B. Rangel
Clay Kaptur Rice (NY)
Cleaver Keating Ruppertsberger
Connolly Kelly (IL) Rush
Conyers Kennedy Ryan (OH)
Cooper Kildee Sanchez, Loretta
Costa Kilmer Sarbanes
Courtney Kind Langevin
Crowley Cummings Larsen (WA)
Davis (CA) Larson (CT) Schiff
DeGette Lawrence Schradler
Delaney Levin Scott (VA)
DeLauro Lewis Scott, David
DelBene Lipinski Serrano
DeSaulnier Loeb sack Sewell (AL)
Deutsch Lofgren Sherman
Dingell Lowenthal Slaughter
Doggett Lowey Smith (WA)
Doyle, Michael Lynch Speier
F. Maloney, Swallowell (CA)
Edwards Carolyn Takai
Ellison Matsui Takano
Eshoo McCollum Thompson (CA)
Esty McDermott Titus
Foster McGovern Tonko
Frankel (FL) McNerney Torres
Gabbard Meng Tsongas
Gallego Moore Van Hollen
Garamendi Moulton Vargas
Grayson Nadler Velázquez
Grijalva Napolitano Visclosky
Gutiérrez Nolan Walz
Hahn Norcross Wasserman
Hanna O'Rourke Schultz
Hastings Pallone Watson Coleman
Heck (WA) Pascrell Welch
Higgins Pelosi Wilson (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Castro (TX) DeFazio

NOT VOTING—35

Adams Fattah Meeks
Amodei Fincher Miller (MI)
Barletta Fudge Murphy (PA)
Blackburn Gosar Neal
Clawson (FL) Hardy Payne
Clyburn Herrera Beutler Roybal-Allard
Cohen Hinojosa Sánchez, Linda
Davis, Danny Hurt (VA) T.
Duffy Jackson Lee Sires
Ellmers (NC) Lee Stivers
Engel Lieu, Ted Waters, Maxine
Farr Luetkemeyer Yarmuth

□ 1258

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 296 on H. Con. Res. 112. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 289—I would have voted "no." On rollcall No. 290—I would have voted "yes." On rollcall No. 291—I would have voted "no." On rollcall No. 292—I would have voted "yes." On rollcall No. 293—I would have voted "no." On rollcall No. 294—I would have voted "no." On rollcall No. 295—I would have voted "yes." On rollcall No. 296—I would have voted "yes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule of the week to come.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that later votes than normal are possible on Thursday and to keep their travel plans flexible.

No votes are expected in the House on Friday.

□ 1300

Madam Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

The House will consider H.R. 5053, the Preventing the IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act, sponsored by Representative ROSKAM. This common-sense bill prohibits the IRS from collecting donor information, which has been used by the IRS to improperly target tax-exempt organizations.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 5293, the FY17 Defense appropriations bill, sponsored by Representative RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN. We expect a large number of amendments to be considered on this bill. So, again, Members are reminded to keep their travel schedules flexible at the end of next week.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Today, we considered a third appropriations bill. It was a structured rule, which is not uncommon on both sides of the aisle to have a structured rule.

But next week, the gentleman has announced the Defense appropriations bill, and I am wondering whether or not that will be an open rule so that amendments will be able to be offered by Members without constraint of being limited?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, to answer the gentleman's question, yes, that will come under a structured rule. So Members will be able to offer amendments but before the Rules Committee and then have the debate on the floor prior to passage of the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, does the gentleman mean by "structured rule" that we will simply require amendments to be filed as of a certain time, but that there will be no restriction on amendments that will be in order?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, it will be a structured rule exactly the same as we have used a structured rule before. Amendments will be presented to the Rules Committee, be debated, and then brought to the floor for a vote.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, to further clarify, my understanding, therefore, is that the majority leader expects the Rules Committee to choose which amendments will be made in order on the bill. Is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, yes, it will be a very fair, wide open process in the Rules Committee looking at amendments—those that have not been able to be offered already in committee, where these bills have gone through subcommittee and full committee with amendments being offered, and then they will be brought to the floor so we can get the work done and move the bill forward.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I understand what the gentleman is saying.

And it appears to me that it is an abandonment of the Speaker and others' representations that when appropriations bills are brought to the floor that they will be brought to the floor with an open rule or a rule that will allow any and all amendments that seek to be offered by Members on both sides of the aisle to be offered.

From the gentleman's explanation, I believe that is not the case and a deviation from the announced policy at the beginning of the year. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that it is a pragmatic judgment that some amendments are making it difficult on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

As someone who has been here for some period of time, that has been my experience when we were in the majority that the gentleman's side, under open rules, offered a lot of very difficult amendments that we had to confront. The Maloney amendment obviously was a difficult amendment for Members to confront on the gentleman's side and led to the defeat of apparently one of the bills, the Energy and Water bill, which failed on this floor.

Would I not be correct in saying that this is a policy that is now being pursued that is different from that which was represented at the beginning of the year where the floor would be open to any and all amendments and would be considered by the House on their merits?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has sat in this position that I have today as majority leader in the past, and the gentleman knows the history of bills he brought to the floor and the manner in which they did.

But if I could be frank with my friend, I am a little disappointed. This is not a place to play politics. This is not about one amendment. We have a

process for amendments for Members that are serious about making a passionate argument for a bill, not to kill a bill and not to have an amendment pass and then an entire side of the aisle vote against it.

What we are bringing forth is a process that the American people want to see. They want to see ideas get brought here, debated, and moved forward. If we look at the appropriations process in the Senate, they have amendments that go through. If the gentleman wants to go back and recite a history of the number of bills that were open here under his leadership, I more than welcome him to do that.

But we should be honest with one another. If Members want to offer an amendment and want to debate the amendment and want to make the bill, in their view, better, I would suspect that, if they win an amendment, they would vote for the bill. The gentleman has a long history here, and that is really probably the history that he remembers as well.

I want to see the work get done. So any ideas that get brought forth in committee, they are debated, they are offered, and they are voted on. Ideas will get brought forth further as the bill comes forward. If it is an amendment and someone wants to move it to the floor, so be it. But we are not going to sit back with the idea of people who want to play politics on the outside and play politics on the inside. I just expect more.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Of course, 130 of his Members voted against that bill; 130 of his Members rejected that bill. I am hard pressed to think that the majority leader believes that our "no" votes were political and his "no" votes were principled. That defies logic from my standpoint. The fact of the matter is that bill lost because the gentleman's Members didn't support it. The gentleman has 247 Members.

I do remember being majority leader. Very frankly, I remember getting 218 Democrats for almost every bill we brought to the floor. So we passed them with our votes.

If 130 of the gentleman's Members had not voted against their own bill, it would have passed. And there should be no, Madam Speaker, misrepresentation or misinformation about how seriously Mr. MALONEY cared about his amendment. There should be none whatsoever. In point of fact, it enjoyed ultimately the majority of support here on this floor.

I will tell the gentleman, I have been here for sometime. He is correct on that, and I do offer amendments from time to time to improve bills that, even as improved, I don't like. So, in the final analysis, although I have improved them and been successful in adopting an amendment, I still do not think the bills are appropriate to pass and go into law.

This conversation started with the fact that we need to be able to offer

ideas. Very frankly, I understand the gentleman's position.

Today, we just voted on two bills that aren't going anywhere, a sense of Congress that you are not going to bring to the floor. They have no chance of passage. What did you want to do? You wanted to play politics. I don't mean you personally, Madam Speaker, but it was a political effort solely to bring two bills to the floor to express some sense of Congress, both of which I voted against because I thought they were playing politics.

So the accusation somehow that we are playing politics because we offer amendments that we care deeply about, that we want to see no discrimination allowed in our bills and that we want to defeat those constraints on an executive order that says to people who do business with the Federal Government, you can't discriminate against people, I will tell my friend, yes, we are going to continue to try to do that. Now, of course, on this last bill, we were not allowed to do that. We were shut down and shut up and precluded from voting on that particular piece of legislation.

So, when I tell my friend that this session started with a pledge for open rules on appropriations bills, I understand the gentleman's problem. Frankly, we had structured rules when we were in charge as well. We had not made any great representation about open rules; therefore, we, too, wanted to get the business of the House done.

Yes, I remember well 2007 when we were confronted with a filibuster by amendment. At some point in time, after 10 bills had been very difficult to pass, on the last two bills, we did have structured rules.

I tell my friend that I hope that he will accord to Mr. MALONEY or others the sincerity of their objectives, notwithstanding the fact that their amendment is adopted and articulates what I think is proper policy for our country, that is, not to discriminate. Everybody in our country apparently doesn't believe that, but Mr. MALONEY does. And I want to make it very clear that he was very sincere in that amendment. Those of us who voted for it were very sincere in that amendment. It was not politics; it was values.

Moving on, I want to congratulate the majority leader on his work on Puerto Rico. That was a difficult issue for us both, a difficult issue for our caucuses, a difficult issue for the executive department. We worked together. We got a bill done that certainly was not our favorite.

The bill included a lot of stuff in there that we didn't like, but I will tell the gentleman that we didn't play politics on that. We only lost 24 votes on a bill that was largely constructed by the gentleman's side of the aisle in terms of some of the issues unrelated, per se, to restructuring of the debt, which was the intent of the bill.

So I want the majority leader to know—he and I have a good relationship. I have great respect for him—we

are going to intend to try to work together on issues like that that are difficult but are necessary for the American people.

Toward that end, can the gentleman tell me what the status of the Zika issue is with reference to getting resources as quickly as possible to confront this challenge to our country's health?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work on the Puerto Rico crisis. It is something that we worked on together very early from all leaders' sides, making sure that we protected the taxpayers from a bailout, and I think we met all the criteria for helping Puerto Rico move forward and protecting the taxpayer.

The gentleman is correct on Zika. We want to make sure the funding is there. As the gentleman knows, there is currently funding, and, as the gentleman knows, we have passed a bill on Zika and we have named our conferees. It is my understanding that the Senate is just now naming their conferees, so I am very hopeful that we can get that conference done very quickly and a bill brought back to the floor.

As of now, I had met with the Director of the CDC the week when we departed before the district work period. There are enough resources currently, but we need to get our work done as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Obviously, this is an emergency confronting our country. Dr. Frieden of the CDC, Dr. Fauci of the NIH, and so many others have raised this as a critically important issue for us to confront and confront now.

So I would join the majority leader in whatever efforts are necessary to accelerate this process and give to the administration and our health officials the resources they need to protect the American people.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I rise to say that we have lost a great American, perhaps one of the most famous Americans in the world in Muhammad Ali.

Muhammad Ali was, for a portion of his life, reviled for the decisions he took. But through his life, he reflected a commitment to principle that all of us could well follow, an example of even in the light of extraordinary opprobrium from his fellow citizens who said, This is what I believe, this is where I stand, and I am prepared to take the consequences.

Many of us believe he was probably the greatest fighter that ever lived. As he fought so successfully in the ring, he fought successfully for his principles and his convictions.

□ 1315

I know that the American people and the House of Representatives would reflect the respect and affection for a great athlete and a great human being

and a great American. If my friend wanted to make a comment, I will yield to him.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank him for recognizing the life of Muhammad Ali. He touched so many of those who met him and those who did not, and there are so many stories out there of what he was able to do even privately on helping change people's lives and actually stand up for what he believed. I think so many times when you look at his life from where he rose and where he stayed rooted in his belief in this country, his belief in the courage to fight for what he believed in.

There was a quote he made. I just read it today. It was put up by Forbes as the quote of the week, but Muhammad Ali once said: "He who is not courageous enough to take risks will accomplish nothing in life."

I know they are going to honor his life today. He was one who took risks and had the courage to stand up when others didn't believe the same as he did.

One great foundation of this country provides the individuals the right to do that, to challenge others and to live a life that is very full. He lived his life to the fullest and reached many. In the athletic world, he reached the heights, and in reaching others, he did the same in his personal life as well.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 2016, TO MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, June 13, 2016, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ENDING THE INSANITY OF THE OBAMA-CLINTON-KERRY IRAN POLICY

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

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, sadly, insanity is the only word that I can use to describe the foolishness of the Obama-Clinton-Kerry engagement with the Islamic Republic of Iran.

In January, the Obama administration cut a \$1.7 billion check to the Government of Iran. On May 18, Iran's Guardian Council voted to send all of this money to Iran's military. Secretary of State Kerry was asked in January whether this money would be used to fund terrorism. He responded:

I think that some of it will wind up in the hands of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps or other entities, some of which are labeled terrorists.

This week, we can sadly confirm that this has indeed come to pass, that the entire \$1.7 billion from the U.S. taxpayers will now be used to fund Iran's military and terrorism apparatus. This is the same Iran that routinely chants "Death to America," threatens to wipe Israel off of the map, captures and humiliates our U.S. sailors, and brazenly fires missiles in close proximity to America's naval vessels, and is responsible for the killing of hundreds of American troops.

Madam Speaker, this is utter foolishness, and these policies must end.

ISRAEL'S EFFORTS IN CYBERSECURITY

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, last month I had the opportunity to join my colleague on the Committee on Homeland Security, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), on a trip to Israel to learn about their efforts in cybersecurity.

As we all know, the security threats Israel faces are enormous, and they extend well into the cyber domain. Israel's response to attacks on her networks has been truly extraordinary, as Israel is now the second largest exporter of cybersecurity products and services, second only behind the United States. The development of this industry, led in large part by the Prime Minister, has been catalyzed by public-private partnerships such as the CyberSpark initiative, which brings together public servants, academic innovators, and business leaders in Be'er Sheva in the Negev Desert, their version of the Silicon Valley.

The United States and Israel already collaborate very closely on so many issues, and I strongly believe that the United States and Israel can learn from each other in this emerging field, both in terms of cutting-edge technologies and novel policy approaches. I look forward to working to develop these partnerships. I thank the Prime Minister and the government for a wonderful learning experience.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SERVICE ACADEMY STUDENT NOMINEES

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to extend heartfelt congratulations to Benjamin Wiggins of El Dorado, Kimberly Monterosso of Camden, Parker Ross of Hot Springs, Nicholas Amerson of Percy, and Krisanna Reynolds of Smackover. These star students from the Fourth District of

Arkansas will have the honor of attending the service academies this fall. Benjamin, Kimberly, and Parker will be headed to West Point; Nicholas and Krisanna to the Air Force Academy.

Arkansas has a history of academy alumni. These include General Douglas MacArthur, Supreme Allied Commander in the Pacific during World War II, and Brigadier General William O. Darby, leader of what would later become the Army Rangers. Their example is one of courage and excellence under any circumstances. With this rich tradition before them and through their own accomplishments, there is no doubt these students will do their very best, bringing honor to themselves, their families, and their State.

I wish them well in their service careers and success in whatever they pursue.

PLAYING GAMES WITH WOMEN'S HEALTH

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, at what point do we stop playing games with women's health?

Zika is becoming an epidemic, and American women across the country are helplessly watching as Congress refuses to act. Every day this disease spreads faster and impacts more men, women, and especially newborn babies.

It is unbelievable that so far the best response to stop the spread of this dangerous infection is to tell American women: Don't get pregnant.

That is unacceptable. We can do better.

Have Republicans learned nothing from the response of the Flint water crisis, where they focused on the price tag instead of on protecting Michigan's children from getting lead poisoning?

We cannot wait one more minute for Congress to act. We must do something now to prevent further spreading of the Zika virus. I am outraged we do not have a solution to something that can hurt an entire generation of our children.

Because of Zika's serious debilitating impacts, Americans are afraid to travel, Americans are afraid to go outside, and Americans are now terrified to grow their families.

I urge leadership to schedule a vote on H.R. 3299. This bill incentivizes the development of a vaccine to protect us from this disease.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DARLA SIDLES

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Darla Sidles, superintendent of Saguaro National Park, on her recent appointment to

oversee the Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, and I thank her for her 7 years of service to the people of Arizona.

Under Darla's leadership, Saguaro National Park set record highs for attendance, attracting over 750,000 people last year. Her tenure saw the complete refurbishment of the Rincon Mountain Visitor Center and successful application of key resilient landscapes grants. She also spearheaded efforts to connect the park with local young and urban populations, helping expose them to the many treasures the park offers.

In addition to her role as director of one of southern Arizona's largest parks, she is a valued leader in our community who served for 4 years on the January 8 Memorial Foundation board.

I had the privilege to hike Saguaro National Park with Darla, pictured here, to talk about its value. We continue to work together on efforts to protect and improve this Tucson gem. We will be sad to lose her in August, and no doubt Darla's standout leadership of our park contributed to her appointment to oversee the third-most-visited national park in the country. I thank her for her service, and I wish her well in Colorado.

ILLEGAL ALIEN PROVISION IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my fierce opposition to the "illegal alien" provision that has been inserted into the legislative branch appropriations bill.

This partisan language will force the Library of Congress to keep using the term "illegal alien" even though the Library of Congress decided to remove that derogatory and totally inaccurate term from the Library's subject heading system.

"Illegal alien" is a form of dehumanizing rhetoric. The term has been used to justify continued discrimination against vulnerable migrants and minority communities.

The provision is politicizing what is supposed to be a bipartisan budget bill. This unprecedented interference by Congress will have huge ramifications. The Library of Congress sets the standard for subject headings used across America and internationally.

"Illegal alien" is inaccurate. The Library of Congress contains our most important records, and they should be accurate and reflect reality.

ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. This month is set aside as a time for us to raise awareness of what Alzheimer's disease is, the devastating impact that this disease has on millions of people throughout our Nation, and what we can do to help fight this condition.

In Michigan alone, over 180,000 of our seniors are currently facing Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's is the sixth leading cause of death in the State. These numbers are only expected to go up over the coming years. As a doctor from northern Michigan, I have seen firsthand the struggle that those living with Alzheimer's face.

Here in Congress, I have supported numerous efforts to increase Federal funding for Alzheimer's research as well as plans to offer a higher quality of care for Alzheimer's patients.

While we have made great progress in the research and treatment of Alzheimer's disease, it is my hope that we will all continue to work together toward ending this plight.

21ST CENTURY STEM FOR GIRLS AND UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITIES ACT

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of STEM education and the critical role science, technology, engineering, and mathematics play in our Nation's economic prosperity.

As our economy shifts toward STEM-oriented careers, we must ensure students have the opportunity to learn and succeed in these fields. That is why I introduced the 21st Century STEM For Girls and Underrepresented Minorities Act, H.R. 2773. I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this bill.

This legislation would help create programs and curriculum for girls and underrepresented minorities to pursue STEM careers. Just last week, I was reminded of the importance of STEM education while delivering the commencement address at Metro Early College High School, a STEM-focused high school in my Third Congressional District of Ohio.

I salute the graduates of the Metro Early College High School who achieved a 100 percent acceptance rate to college, and I commend their parents as well as the dedicated teachers and staff, including Principal Anthony Alston.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the names of the 106 graduates of the Metro Early College High School graduating class.

METRO EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 2016, JUNE 10, 2016

Sundari Vudatala, Camryn Walker, Christopher Warren, Christian Wiget, Silas Young, Banan Zangana, Sophia Brown,

Simone Burden, Nicholas Burgett, De'Ciana Burnette, Seth Cabalquinto, Sydney Carroll, Anna Chin, Joseph Chiu, Spencer Churchill, Griffin Patterson, JaNai Rakes, Kennedy Reissland-Woods, Gus Roussi.

Michael Ruland, Mario Segovia, Sefora Seyoum, Riley Shaw, Wyatt Sheline, Adam Gill, Sarah Golding, Raquan Goss, Alexander Granato, Montgomery Gray, Connor Guarino, Kailyn Gullatt, McKenzie Hartman, Kelly Haubert, Jonah McKind, Eduardo Medina, Jen Miller, Jared Moehrman, Khalid Mohamed, Qiukui Moutvic, Yulia Mulugeta, Aida Ndiaye, Lan Nguyen.

Jennifer Kentner, Nathaniel Kolli, Renee Krajinak, Maria Krantz, Ethan Laver, Caleb Lehman, Rebecca Lipster, Samantha Loeffler, Karsten Look, Justin Loring, Matthew Lowe, Anna Lowery, Miles Marchese, Hannah Martin, Sara McClaskey, Maya McGeachy, Madison McGraw, Lila Henninger, Elaff Hounsee, Grant Hughes, Nathaniel Huller, Christopher Hulse, Ally Hutchison.

Hamdan Ismail, Cherie Johnson, Cierre Johnson, Aaron Joseph, Meghan O'Bryan, Robert O'Shaughnessy, Armando Olvera, Igbinoso Oriakhi, Muwahib Osman, Xzavier Pace, Teja Parasa, Grant Parks, Autumn Patterson, Emma Clark, Tamara Cole, Amina Cusmaan, Angela Dang, Timothy Davis, Rebecca Dye, Nimco Essa, Nahom Eyassu, Charles Gauthier, Aarti Singhal.

David Sipes, Curtis Snead, Pauline Sohn, Sally Squires, Kate Swigert, Abigail Thompson, Devon Tinker, Alicia Tong, Jolene Tran, Hafsa Abdullahi, Mohamed Abdullahi, Zahra Abu-Rayyan, Saido Ahmed, Maxim Antonyuk, Gary Augustin, Keevyn Baden-Winterwood, Kaila Berry, Silas Birdsell.

□ 1330

SAVANNAH PURPLE HEART VETERAN GETS HUMANITARIAN AWARD

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very special constituent of mine, Tech Sergeant Enos Garvin.

On May 2, at a Chatham County Veterans Council meeting, Sergeant Garvin received a long overdue Humanitarian Service Medal for his service in Rwanda.

In 1994, Reverend Garvin, turned tech sergeant, volunteered with the Georgia Air National Guard and worked on flying missions to help Rwandan refugees, called Operation Support Hope. In these missions, Reverend Garvin flew supplies and food to many refugees in Rwanda who were staying in makeshift tent villages during one of the worst conflicts in Africa's history.

Sergeant Garvin's service to our Nation and for a better world do not end with his involvement in Rwanda. He is also a Purple Heart recipient because of his courageous service in Vietnam. He was shot three times in the leg while Viet Cong troops killed his guards in the middle of the night and launched a surprise attack on his unit.

I want to thank Tech Sergeant Garvin for his service and the United States Department of Defense for recognizing the remarkable service of Ser-

geant Garvin and the 156th Airlift Wing.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back on the House floor to pick up on an issue that concerns most every American that has gone to college, who is now in school, or beyond.

I remember a day 3 weeks ago at the Calaveras County Fair. The security guard at the gate greeted me.

He said: Congressman.

I said: Yes.

He said: I need your help.

I said: What can I do for you?

He said: Well, I had to go back to school to get the license and the education for this job. I now run the security program here. I will be over 70 years of age before I am able to pay off my student loan.

He was probably in his early fifties at that time.

I said: How can that be?

He said: The interest rate is killing me.

And, indeed, not only killing him, but all across this Nation, the issue of student debt is harming families, holding back the formation of families—not getting married because you have to pay off the debt, and who would want to marry that person with all that debt? I don't think so—buying houses, getting a car, carrying on in your life.

Student debt is an incredible burden on the American public. And not just the students but, in many cases, the parents of students.

Here is what has happened with student debt:

It is now over \$2.2 trillion. Probably today it is much larger than the debt on credit cards. The growth has been almost exponential. And we are continuing to see this rise. It is not over. Continuing the debt is part of America's reality.

Here are some astonishing facts about student debt:

Not only is it \$1.2 trillion, but it is continuing to increase at \$2,726.27 every second. So we are going to see this go way beyond \$1.2 trillion to, and probably approaching, nearly \$1.5 trillion by the end of this decade.

The number of borrowers and the average balance of their debt has grown by 70 percent between 2004 and 2012. That is more than 7 percent per year.

And finally, down here, we can say that the average student loan debt for graduate students is now over \$35,000 per student. This is an extraordinary burden.

Now, tell me, what family in America has not refinanced their home? I think we all have. Certainly, Patti and I have refinanced our home. And I suspect

most Americans, if they haven't yet refinanced, are watching the interest rates and looking for that moment when they, too, will refinance their home.

So the question for us today is: Why not refinance student loans just the same as we refinance our homes?

Well, the loans are owned by the Federal Government. So this is a question for us in Congress to say: Yes, let's do something to give the American economy a boost. Let's give something to those families, those young students that are out of school and those that are still in school—an opportunity to refinance their loans and to recalculate the interest on loans that they will be taking out in the months and years ahead.

Take a look at this. Undergraduate loans from the Federal Government are now 4.29 percent. If you are in the other programs, it may be 5 percent. And if you are in the graduate program, it is 6.84 percent.

The Federal Government can borrow money somewhere less than 2 percent, or right around 2 percent for 10 years. If you add another percent for administrative costs, we could refinance all that \$1.2 trillion of student loans down to 3.23 percent.

What a break that would give to students in school and out of school and those that are going to be borrowing money for the next school year, 3.2 percent versus 4.29 percent. Or, if you are a graduate student, 3.2 percent versus 6.84 percent—less than half the interest rate.

We can do it. We can do this. And when we do it, we can help those students that are now carrying that incredible burden of having to pay these extraordinary interest rates to the Federal Government, which is actually making a \$138 billion profit on the backs of students.

So I go back to that gentleman there at the Calaveras County Fair who now has a business, but also has a student loan that he took out to get the education he needed to start that business. I would go back to him and say: I will tell you what. Instead of a 6 percent or 7 percent loan, we can refinance your loan down to 3.23 percent.

And what does it mean to the individual student? It means a great deal.

So we have introduced H.R. 5274, the Student Loan Refinancing and Recalculation Act. It will do the following. It would set all student loan interest rates at 3.25 percent—new ones that come up, existing ones, graduate loans, low-income family loans, and the like.

If you happen to be a low-income family, and many of these students are—in fact, the great majority of low-income student are, in fact, taking out loans. For those borrowers, it will be thousands of dollars of interest saved, because we also calculate that the interest will not begin to accrue until after graduation.

Also, we know that the average savings for students will be over \$2,000 on their loans.

It also eliminates the origination fee. Why is the Federal Government charging an origination fee when a student actually goes to the financial office at the university and the paperwork is done by the university? Yet the Federal Government—your Federal Government—is sticking it one more way to the students by charging an origination fee.

So the new piece of legislation, H.R. 5274, the Student Loan Refinancing and Recalculation Act, is an enormous advantage to the American economy by allowing these students to hang on to a little bit more of their money and to engage in the economy: get married, get a car, buy a house.

I had an interesting conversation with the bankers that came into my office a while back. They said: The interest rate is not the only problem.

I said: Really? What is the rest of it?

They said: These students are carrying these loans on their assets or their liabilities, and when we look at their asset-liability, we see this enormous debt, and we cannot even offer them a loan.

He said: If you are able to reduce that—the interest rate and, therefore, the payments that are required—we will be better able to offer them a loan for a car or a house.

So let's do it. The Federal Government ought not be making \$138 billion profit on the backs of students. We can borrow money at less than 2 percent or right around 2 percent for 10 years. Let's refinance all of those \$1.2 trillion of loans down to 3.2 percent. And for the new loans that the students are going to be taking up this coming year, let's give them a break. Instead of 4, 5, or 6 percent, let's do 3.2 percent. It is just 1 percent more than the Federal Government can borrow money.

So keep in mind H.R. 5274, the Student Loan Refinancing and Recalculation Act. My colleagues, let's do it. Let's do it for the students—both new and existing students—and families that have taken out loans so that their children can get ahead, so that those students that have taken out that loan can have the burden reduced. Refinance your house, refinance your student loan.

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

GUANTANAMO BAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is an issue we have been talking about on the Republican side for quite a bit, and I think some of my Democratic friends realize how serious an issue this is because they care about our military members.

The President of the United States promised, ill-advisedly, before he was

ever elected, that he was going to close the Guantanamo Bay facility that housed the worst of the worst terrorists wanting to kill Americans and destroy our way of life. Well, he found out right after he took office that you just can't do that because it is going to put American lives at risk. There is a reason they are being held there. And it violates no rules of law when it comes to war, because war is a little different.

Since civilized society came along in the history of mankind, things improved for prisoners of war. Before there was a civilized society, when one group warred against another, they would either kill them or make them slaves. What occurred was pretty gruesome.

In civilized history, when one group says, "We are at war with this other group," then the other group either responds by defending themselves or they are overtaken by the evildoers—in this case, radical Islamists.

Since the history of more civilized warfare—if we can call it such, because war is truly hell—noble nations played by rules that said, if you capture someone who is part of the group at war with you, then you hold them as prisoners in a humane fashion until such time as the group of which they are a part agrees that they are no longer at war. If the war drags on 15, 20, 30, 50 years, it is not the fault of the country that captures people at war with them, because that country did not start the war.

In this case, the radical Islamists have had this small part of Islam since its beginning and felt like the way to be truly religiously Islamic is to kill anybody that stands in your way of having an international caliphate and forcing everyone in the world to bow before Allah and Islam, in the name of Islam.

□ 1345

It is not our fault if they will not say we are no longer at war with you, because once that happens, then you release those prisoners who were part of the group that was at war with you. And if some of them can be proven to be guilty of actual war crimes against humanity, then you take them to trial, and you try to convict them. And if you do, as we saw after World War II, if they are convicted and sentenced to death, that occurs. If they are sentenced to prison, that is on top of the years that we waited while their group continued to be at war with us. That is under the civilized rules of warfare.

Guantanamo Bay, I can say, having been there more than once, and also having toured many State and Federal prisons, has provided the most humane treatment I have ever seen a group of prisoners get.

For example, in a Texas prison, if you throw urine or feces on a guard, you will suffer consequences for that decision. I found out on one of my trips to Guantanamo Bay prison that when,

as often happens, an inmate figures out a way to throw urine or feces on one of our military member guards, that because we don't want to be perceived as having some mean-spirited prison, we take away a couple of their movie-watching hours during some day to teach them a lesson.

And there have been instances where, when they didn't like the movies being presented, perhaps they hadn't been screened properly enough, maybe some woman exposed a bare arm and that offended somebody, well, there was uproar, problems. But if somebody committed a really egregious crime of assaulting one of our guards, then they might actually lose some of their time outside for a day or two.

It bothered me greatly to find out that the guards were not allowed to even say anything when someone threw urine or feces on them who was an inmate at Guantanamo Bay; because one such United States military member, I think they said he was a minority member of our United States military, had feces thrown on him, and he angrily said a name, and he received an article 15 non-judicial punishment, and he was punished for simply saying something back after he had feces thrown on him.

Well, that ought to be the least of the problems. And I couldn't believe one of our military members who had been assaulted in such a despicable manner was the one punished for saying something back to the inmate that threw feces on him.

But the President is determined to follow through with this same kind of policy idea that he has had since the beginning, when he had his apology tour going throughout the Middle East, apologizing in Egypt, apologizing around the world for America, who has been the only country that I can find in history that has shed so much precious American blood, so much blood of our Americans for other people's freedom. We didn't owe anybody an apology, not for that.

And there is this mentality among some liberals like our President that the world will be so much safer and a so much better place to live if America were brought down and were not a superpower and you let other countries be superpowers, like, for example, Iran.

Let's give Iran \$100 billion, \$150 billion access to that, and let's let them become a superpower, and we will negotiate a deal that, hopefully, will prevent them from getting a nuclear weapon while President Obama is in office. And then who cares what happens after that; right?

But the deal that was negotiated pretty well assures that Iran will have nuclear weapons. It is just a matter of when. And now we know that Iran has repeatedly broken their agreement and we know that this administration, as we found out, this administration actually manipulated video to try to cover up just how bad the deal was that this State Department was negotiating.

I didn't really need to see the story to know this kind of stuff was going on. When I saw that Wendy Sherman was maybe chief negotiator, working with the Secretary of State, who was also part of the glorious deal that the Clinton administration, along with Madeleine Albright, negotiated with North Korea, basically—and this is my translation of the deal—but, okay.

We are going to make sure that you have nuclear power, and we will make sure you have got nuclear fuel, you have got everything you need to make a nuclear weapon so long as you will sign an agreement saying that you are not going to use it to create a nuclear weapon.

You can't help but think of all the snickering that went on in North Korea, especially by Kim Jong-il: Wow, all they want is my signature and they will give us what we need to make a nuclear weapon? Sure. Where do I sign?

I mean, it really reminded me of the story Jeff Foxworthy told about, before he made money as a comedian, he was down on his luck.

A guy shows up at the door, says, "I'm here to repossess your car."

"Oh, please don't take my car. If you take my car, I can't make it to any of my gigs. I can't make money, and then I have no chance of paying for the car. So please, don't take my car."

"I'm sorry, Mr. Foxworthy. I'm here, and I'm supposed to either leave with your car or with cash payment or with a check."

And Foxworthy basically said, "A check? You'll take a check? I didn't know you'd take a check."

"Yeah, how much do you want me to make it out for?"

"I'm glad to write you a check. Sure, you just tell me." And then he signs and gives the check and he keeps his car.

That had to be the kind of mentality.

You mean, you will give us everything we need in North Korea to have nuclear weapons, and all we have to do is sign and you're good with that? Wow. Okay. Let us sign.

So they signed. We make sure they have what they need for nuclear weapons in the name of giving them nuclear power, and sure enough—very expectedly by some of us because it was such a stupid thing to do, the Clinton administration, with Wendy Sherman right there in the negotiations—we gave them the ability to create nuclear weapons, which they have done.

The same way with Iran. Their leaders must have been laughing behind our backs, because we know what they were saying publicly while they were still continuing to say "death to America," still calling us the "Great Satan," still saying they weren't going to abide by any agreement, that the United States would never get them to do what we wanted them to.

Oh, so while we are telling the public we are not going to go along with any deal we sign, you are still willing to accept our signature on a deal? For sure,

we will sign, because even Allah allows us to sign something that is a lie if, in the end, it furthers his kingdom, in their way of thinking.

So if we had strong enough leadership in the United States Senate, what would happen would be there would be a call for a vote on the Iran treaty, which it is. It modifies other treaty provisions and, therefore, you can't do that unless it is a treaty, so it is a treaty. The Constitution says that requires two-thirds of the Senate to vote for the treaty in order for it to be ratified.

The Senate took up this Corker bill, that turned the Constitution upside down, and said, no, we are going to say it takes two-thirds to vote against a deal; otherwise, it goes forward. BOB CORKER is a really nice guy, but, my word, the damage that was done to the Middle East and to the world by the Senate taking an approach to the Iran treaty as if it wasn't really a treaty.

There is still time. Take the vote in the Senate. I know that 60 votes are required for cloture; but when HARRY REID felt like getting very liberal judges into Federal courts was more important than the cloture rule, he had 51 Democrats vote to set aside the cloture rule, and they put in the liberal judges they wanted over the Republican objection.

This Iran treaty is going to eventually bring so much death and destruction to not only the Middle East, but, as Netanyahu has warned us, they are not preparing those intercontinental ballistic missiles for Israel. Those are for us. They can already hit Israel. They are for us.

So what do we see in the news now, other than the fact that Iran—well, this article says: "Iran Spends \$1.7 Billion in U.S. Taxpayer Funds to Boost Its Military." And it says in this June 9 article from Free Beacon, by Adam Kredon:

"The State Department is staying silent after Iranian officials disclosed that the Islamic Republic spent a recent payment by the United States of \$1.7 billion in taxpayer funds to expand and build-up its military, according to comments provided to the Washington Free Beacon.

"The Obama administration earlier this year paid Iran \$1.7 billion from a U.S. taxpayer-funded account in order to settle decades-old legal disputes with the Islamic Republic."

Never mind that our American citizens that were taken hostage have never been allowed to collect properly on the damages done by this regime in Iran. Yes, it was Ayatollah Khomeini instead of Khamenei, but these same hoodlums that are running Iran, same type of thinking, were the ones this administration provided \$1.7 billion. Instead of taking care of the American citizens that this radical Islamist regime in Iran, after they attacked our Embassy, took our hostages, held them for over a year, and we pay them?

It is consistent, I understand, with the apology mentality that leaders in

this country have. Maybe the world will be so much better if we are not a superpower, we cut our military to pre-World War II levels, which is happening, and then we give Iran, that hates us, says very clearly they are going to destroy us and our way of life and our freedoms, we give them \$1.7 billion to build up their military while we are breaking down ours.

I keep going back to the comment by a gentleman, African, named Ebenezer from Togo, when I was over there with the Mercy Ship, provided incredible health care to the people of Togo, Lome, there in West Africa. And at the end of my week there, he and other Africans—these were not African Americans. These were Africans. But they also happened to be fellow Christians.

After a lovely meeting with them, Ebenezer spoke, and he said: Look. Basically, he said: We were so excited when you elected your first African American—or "Black President," I believe he said—but since then, we have seen America get weaker and weaker. And the reason we all wanted to meet with you is because, you know, we're Christians. We know where we're going when we die. But our only hope in this life for a peaceful life is if America is strong, because as America gets weaker, we suffer more.

We have seen that around the world. I have been to Nigeria and wept with mothers whose children were kidnapped by radical Islamists. They know that, as America has not responded to the radical Islam in Nigeria and helped them as we could, they have suffered mightily.

□ 1400

Yet, this administration, from what has come out of Nigeria, has said: Look, we will help you a little more. We will really be able to help you with Boko Haram, but you have to start paying for abortions, and you have to start having same-sex marriage. We don't care if it violates your religious convictions because that is what we want you to do.

They are suffering there. They are suffering in all parts of Africa, many parts of Africa, because this administration has not been the force for good; it has been a force for weakness.

Now this story from The Washington Post, Adam Goldman and Missy Ryan, June 8: "At least 12 released Guantanamo detainees implicated in attacks on Americans."

The article says: "The Obama administration believes that at least 12 detainees"—and this is the Obama administration themselves. This isn't LOUIE GOHMERT. This is "the Obama administration believes that at least 12 detainees released from the prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, have launched attacks against U.S. or allied forces in Afghanistan, killing about a half-dozen Americans, according to current and former U.S. officials."

It goes on to explain how these former Guantanamo Bay detainees

have been killing Americans in Afghanistan. This is no surprise to some of us who have been saying—when these people were involved in plotting and killing Americans before they were detained, and they have even made statements in detention that they can't wait to get out so they can kill more Americans, at some point even if they say, Okay, I will sign where you want me to, just let me go, who is surprised when they go back on their word like North Korea, go back on their word like the radical Islamist leaders in Iran as distinguished with so many Iranians who want to be rid of the radical Islamist leaders? But who can be surprised that they would actually go back to killing Americans?

That is why so many of us have been saying—a majority in this House—we are not going to let you close Guantanamo. We have made it against the law for him to release people unless certain things were done. And he violated that—the President did—when he made the deal for what is apparently a United States Army deserter, it certainly appears, and he let five of the worst murderers go without following the law that was set out for the President. Now it has been substantiated. We know people that have been released from Guantanamo have been killing Americans.

So one thing we know also is when a nation's enemies see that that nation's strongest ally is pulling away from that enemy, it is provocative. They act against that nation. So when that nation is Israel, and the appearance to the world is that the United States is pulling back from our close alliance and friendship with Israel, is it any wonder that Israel's biggest and most hateful enemies would be moving against Israel?

Terrorists have, once again, been inspired to go on killing sprees in Israel despite the Israelis doing everything they can to stop the carnage. As Prime Minister Netanyahu has said, I believe he even said it in this Chamber as he stood here facing Moses, our greatest known lawgiver of all time, standing, by the way—and I mentioned this to Prime Minister Netanyahu as he came down the aisle in May of 2011: Don't forget, while you are standing, speaking to us, our national motto will be right above your head.

He started to look up, and then he didn't even have to look up because he obviously knew what was up there. He looked me in the eye and said: I had already thought about that.

So as he stood here, In God We Trust above his head, looking at the greatest lawgiver in the history of mankind, Moses—most of us think he had 10 good commandments. I think our Supreme Court would probably say maybe five or six. But he warned us what was happening in the realm of radical Islam, what would be happening to Israel, and what would be happening to what they call the Great Satan, America. People in this administration did not listen.

Americans have spoken out loudly during the primary season about this idea of refugees who cannot be properly vetted, because we don't know really who they are and where they are coming from. As FBI Director Comey testified in front of our Judiciary Committee:

We will vet them, but we have got nothing to vet with. At least in Iraq, we had Iraq's records on who had criminal convictions, who had arrests, and who had things in their record. We got no records from Syria and some of these other places. We don't know who they are. We don't know how criminal they are. We don't know how radical Islamist they are.

So many have been warning, and the American people have been warning through the primary season, and this article substantiates, from June 10, "Refugees Angry Over Skimpy Ramadan Meals Set Shelter on Fire, Police Say."

This is from FOX News. It says: "A pair of North African refugees reportedly set a German shelter on fire Tuesday because they were angry the special Ramadan meals there weren't up to snuff.

"Investigators told the BBC that the men—who were not fasting at the shelter in Dusseldorf—had complained their lunch portions were too small."

Since they weren't observing the fast, they wanted more food.

"The fire burned the facility to the ground, causing \$11 million in damages."

The 26-year-old North African told reporters:

We had to do it. We had to burn it down so things would change.

So the question remains as more and more refugees are brought into this country against the will of the majority of the American people: How many facilities are going to be burned in America? How many more Americans are going to be killed on our own soil because the State Department and the Homeland Security Department are not properly vetting?

Our friend—and, in my mind, hero—Phil Haney, who worked for the Department of Homeland Security, had thousands of entries that Janet Napolitano said: We tried to connect the dots.

They deleted thousands of those dots. Why? Because this administration apparently doesn't want the public to know or the next administration to find out that many of the people they consult with and consort with have ties to terrorists. They deleted so many thousands of the dots in our system.

We are at risk, and the FBI director—I respect him—James Comey, said Tuesday: "The Islamic State group is currently the main threat facing the United States, both in its efforts to recruit fighters to join its members overseas and to have others carry out violence in America."

He said: "The Islamic State group poses a third potential threat: a 'terrorist diaspora' that he said will eventually flow out of Syria and Iraq and

end up in Western Europe, where members will have easy access to the United States.

"There's three prongs to this ISIL threat,' Comey said. 'The recruitment to travel, the recruitment to violence in place, and then what you saw a preview of in Brussels and in Paris—hardened fighters coming out, looking to kill people.'

"He said officials are 'laser-focused on that.'"

We know some officials like him are focused on that, but we also know there are others in the administration who are meeting with people that the Justice Department under President Bush made very clear in their pleadings were coconspirators in support for terrorism. That included the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR.

Then we hear about our friends at the Council on American-Islamic Relations when we see the article that just this week CAIR is joking around about medicating Americans against Islamophobia.

So that article from Virginia Hale, 9 June, Breitbart, talks about the jokes by the "Muslim Brotherhood-linked Council on American-Islamic Relations advises that anyone who harbors 'intolerance' towards Muslims, or who believes large numbers of the religion's adherents could pose a danger to the U.S., to take anti-Islamophobia medication for their 'unthinking bigotry.'"

Is it really bigotry when you are not prejudiced against Muslims, you have many Muslim friends, but you know there is a part of Islamists and there is a part of Muslims who are radical Islamists who want to kill you, destroy your country, destroy Christianity, and destroy Jews—kill all of them?

Is it really bigotry to say that we would really like to stop them before they destroy America, kill all Americans, kill all Christians in the world, and kill all Jews in the world, that we would really like to stop that? Is that really bigotry?

Because I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that what that is—if you are an American—is love of country. We have had Americans—and I hope and pray still—well, no. I know we have Americans who still have what Jesus, who laid down His life for us, said is the greatest love anyone could ever have, that someone would lay down their life for others. He knew what that was. He did it. We have had so many Americans do that.

But because of the lunacy that is occurring now in the administration, in the State Department, in homeland security, and in our military, Americans are being killed and are going to be killed.

If that is not enough, this article from TownHall, Matt Vespa, June 3: "Syrian Refugees Pushed Sweden's Welfare State to the Brink of Collapse."

Very interesting. Osama bin Laden had an interesting statement at one time about how very cheaply they were

able to kill 3,000 Americans on 9/11, but that the best part even beyond killing 3,000 Americans was that they cost us billions and maybe trillions of dollars with a very, very small investment to killing Americans on 9/11, and that if they will keep having projects like that, they can break us financially.

It appears that with decisions in this administration, they are on their way to doing that.

If that is not enough, this administration had the VA announce that the Department of Veterans Affairs has now proposed covering transition-related surgeries for transgender veterans in the near future under a proposed rule change. I know that the people making this decision don't want more veterans killing themselves. But as Dr. Paul McHugh, the former head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins, now retired, was still working with them—but one transgender gentleman that had had the sex change in his forties had told me Dr. McHugh knows more about transgender than anybody.

Dr. McHugh has not made that claim. He is a very humble gentleman. He is a brilliant man. He cites in his article printed in *The Wall Street Journal* about a 2011 study at the Karolinska Institutet in Sweden produced the most illuminating results yet regarding the transgendered evidence that should give advocates pause. He is talking about advocates for transgender agenda that is even being pushed here in Congress.

□ 1415

And he says: “The long-term study—up to 30 years—followed 324 people who had sex-reassignment surgery. The study revealed that beginning about 10 years after having the surgery, the transgendered began to experience increasing mental difficulties. Most shockingly, their suicide mortality rose almost 20-fold above the comparable nontransgender population. This disturbing result has as yet no explanation but probably reflects the growing sense of isolation reported by the aging transgendered after surgery. The high suicide rate certainly challenges the surgery prescription.”

So for those in the VA who think a sex change operation is a good idea, Mr. Speaker, I hope they will look at the number of veterans that are killing themselves—higher rates than any time in previous eras of American history—and they will look at how many veterans are dying without the treatment they need, the veterans that are in long timelines to get the treatment they need to stay alive, and those who are dying waiting for the treatment they need.

Do you really want to have 20 times more veterans killing themselves? Is that where you want the VA money being spent, so that we can have 20 times the suicide rate that we currently have?

“Forbid it, Almighty God,” as Patrick Henry once said.

And now the administration wants to take away parents' choices of decisions for their kids, wants to take our choices away that the First Amendment assures us that we have the right to freedom of religion. There is no right to freedom from religion, but there is a right of freedom of religion; and those rights are being taken away, even as they were from the Little Sisters of the Poor.

Do we want to allow these rights to continue to be taken at the cost of American lives, as we have seen resulting from people released at Guantanamo Bay, resulting from the ridiculous rules that are given to our military members? They are told they can't fire on people unless they are fired at and they can be assured no civilian will get hit.

The rules of engagement are ridiculous under this administration. So many rules are costing American lives. It is time to bring it all home and to understand the words of Ebenezer in Africa that, when America gets weaker, people around the world suffer. They understand that around the world. Freedom-loving people understand around the world when America gets weaker, they suffer.

America has been a gift to the world. Mr. Speaker, you know it, I know it, and I hope and pray more in the administration will realize it before it is too late.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DUFFY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today through June 14 on account of the birth of his child.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 13, 2016, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Pete Aguilar, Rick W. Allen, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Brad Ashford, Brian Babin, Lou Barletta, Andy Barr, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Gus M. Bilirakis, Mike Bishop, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Rod Blum, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner*, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike Bost, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Brendan F. Boyle, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Corrine Brown,

Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Ken Buck, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cárdenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Earl L. “Buddy” Carter, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins.

Doug Collins, Barbara Comstock, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Ryan A. Costello, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. “Rick” Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Carlos Curbelo, Warren Davidson, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Mark DeSaulnier, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Daniel M. Donovan, Jr., Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Tom Emmer, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. “Chuck” Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry.

Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Ruben Gallego, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Gwen Graham, Kay Granger, Garret Graves, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Glenn Grothman, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Richard L. Hanna, Cresent Hardy, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Jody B. Hice, Brian Higgins, J. French Hill, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Will Hurd, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Evan H. Jenkins, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, John Katko, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Trent Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Adam Kinzinger.

Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Stephen Knight, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Darin LaHood, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Robert E. Latta, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Barry Loudermilk, Mia B. Love, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Thomas MacArthur, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Thomas Massie, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty

McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Martha McSally, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Candice S. Miller, Jeff Miller, John R. Moolenaar, Alexander X. Mooney, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Dan Newhouse.

Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee*, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Gary J. Palmer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Bruce Poliquin, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Amata Coleman Radewagen, Charles B. Rangel, John Ratcliffe, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Kathleen M. Rice, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, David Rouzer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Steve Russell, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff.

Aaron Schock*, Kurt Schrader, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason Smith, Lamar Smith, Jackie Speier, Elise M. Stefanik, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, David A. Trott, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Mark Walker, Jackie Walorski, Mimi Walters, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Bruce Westerman, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, David Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young, Lee M. Zeldin, Ryan K. Zinke.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5658. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps

for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants — Cross-Border Application of the Margin Requirements (RIN: 3038-AC97) received June 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5659. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Risk-Based Capital (RIN: 3133-AD77) received June 8, 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.

5660. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 16-015, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); and 22 U.S.C. 2776(d)(1); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(d) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (90 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5661. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Country Reports on Terrorism 2015", pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656f; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5662. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period ending March 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5663. A letter from the Chairman, Capitol Police Board, transmitting the Board's 2015 Year in Review which provides a synopsis of the Board's many short- and long-term initiatives and highlights the achievements of the Board, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1901 note; Public Law 108-7, Sec. 1014(d)(1); (117 Stat. 361); to the Committee on House Administration.

5664. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB — Cosentino v. Commissioner [T.C. Memo. 2014-186] received June 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5665. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Certain Transfers of Property to Regulated Investment Companies [RICs] and Real Estate Investment Trusts [REITs] [TD 9770] (RIN: 1545-BN39) received June 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3636. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow labor organizations and management organizations to receive the results of visa petitions about which such organizations have submitted advisory opinions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 114-614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5169. A bill to strengthen

welfare research and evaluation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-615, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5170. A bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON. Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5050. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-617, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4612. A bill to ensure economic stability, accountability, and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on midnight rules during a President's final days in office, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-618, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4612 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5169 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 5445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the rules with respect to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 5446. A bill to require the Attorney General to review foreign forms of identification, including consular identification cards and foreign passports without a valid visa, to establish a valid and secure form of identification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5447. A bill to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 5448. A bill to expand the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program to include members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty and the families of such members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 5449. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to create a commission to provide adequate representation to defendants

in Federal criminal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 5450. A bill to establish an American Savings Account Fund and create a retirement savings plan available to all employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 5451. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to exempt certain recipients of Department of Agriculture conservation assistance from certain reporting requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 5453. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish an advisory opinion process for the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 5454. A bill to provide for automatic acquisition of United States citizenship for certain internationally adopted individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 5455. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to separate the market monitoring functions of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection from the Bureau's supervisory functions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mrs. ROBY):

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed Coastal Climate Resilience Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BRAT, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H. Res. 776. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of November as "U.S. Navy Aircraft Carrier Month", in celebration of the accomplishments and contributions of United States Navy aircraft carriers in defending the freedom of the United States, protecting the security of the Nation and its allies, responding to crisis and spurring technological innovation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—power to lay and collect taxes

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 5446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—Business/Labor Regulation—The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 5448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 5449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5450.

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 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 office thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 5451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 5452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 5455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Con-

gress shall have power to regulate the regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 228: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 239: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 335: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 379: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 499: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 670: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 704: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 759: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 836: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 842: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 923: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 953: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 1062: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 1192: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 1211: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 1221: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 1391: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SPEIER, and Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 1603: Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 1608: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 1784: Mr. BLUM.
 H.R. 1877: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 1958: Mr. KILMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1959: Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 1988: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 2016: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 2058: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2090: Mr. KIND and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 2114: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2205: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 2254: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 2290: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 2327: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 2450: Mr. TONKO and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 2726: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2799: Ms. ESTY and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 2804: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2867: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 2911: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 2980: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2992: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. ROBY.
 H.R. 3065: Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 3094: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 3099: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 3159: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 3185: Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 3229: Mr. TIPTON and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

- H.R. 3308: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Ms. KUSTER.
- H.R. 3323: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 3384: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 3471: Mr. BUCSHON.
- H.R. 3643: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 3666: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 3683: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
- H.R. 3684: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 3706: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 3742: Mr. MARINO and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 3765: Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 3884: Mr. ISSA and Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 3885: Mr. ISSA and Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 3929: Mr. HANNA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 3964: Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 3965: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 4006: Mr. BLUM.
- H.R. 4007: Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 4087: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 4150: Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 4184: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
- H.R. 4247: Mr. REED, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. TIBERI.
- H.R. 4257: Mr. ROTHFUS.
- H.R. 4352: Mr. FORBES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
- H.R. 4365: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 4452: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
- H.R. 4514: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. RENACCI.
- H.R. 4538: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 4542: Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 4592: Mr. COLE and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
- H.R. 4616: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 4625: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. KATKO.
- H.R. 4632: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 4640: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
- H.R. 4681: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 4715: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 4731: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 4764: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
- H.R. 4773: Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 4816: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. CARTER of Texas.
- H.R. 4817: Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 4829: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 4887: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
- H.R. 4956: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 5025: Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 5044: Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
- H.R. 5047: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. BLUM.
- H.R. 5082: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 5091: Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 5137: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 5143: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. HILL, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. POLIQUIN.
- H.R. 5165: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 5166: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DENT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. ZINKE.
- H.R. 5168: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 5172: Mr. MCHENRY.
- H.R. 5182: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. POLIQUIN.
- H.R. 5183: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 5210: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 5230: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
- H.R. 5254: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 5259: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
- H.R. 5275: Mr. GRIFFITH.
- H.R. 5276: Mr. POSEY and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
- H.R. 5283: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 5292: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 5312: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 5334: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 5364: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 5386: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 5408: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 5423: Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 5425: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 5426: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.J. Res. 48: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. WILLIAMS.
- H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. GROTHMAN.
- H. Res. 14: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. ESHOO.
- H. Res. 220: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. COFFMAN.
- H. Res. 494: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H. Res. 549: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
- H. Res. 591: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H. Res. 642: Mr. HARPER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H. Res. 729: Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BOST, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
- H. Res. 740: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. GIBBS.
- H. Res. 750: Mr. JOYCE and Mrs. LOWEY.
- H. Res. 754: Mr. POCAN.
- H. Res. 766: Mr. FARR, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H. Res. 769: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. DEUTCH.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 2016

No. 92

Senate

The Senate met at 8:15 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we rejoice in Your strength, for You continue to withhold no good thing from those who do what is right. You are our God; be merciful to our Nation and world.

Lord, teach our lawmakers Your ways so that they may live according to Your truth with a purity of heart that honors You. Guide them with Your unfailing love, fortifying them for every challenge. May they never be put to shame, as they strive to live worthy of Your amazing grace. Listen closely to their prayers and provide them with answers to the questions that befuddle them.

And Lord, we thank You for the faithful service of our 2016 spring page class. We are grateful for the creativity, competence, and commitment of these outstanding young people. In all of their tomorrows, do for them more than they can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2016.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ISAKSON thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, the Senate will take another important step toward passing sweeping defense legislation that will support our troops and our national security. It will help drive defense innovation and research. It will authorize pay raises for our servicemembers and modernize retirement benefits. It will help prepare our country to deal with the threats of today and the challenges of tomorrow, and it will help prepare the force that the next Commander in Chief will lead to do so as well.

It is a responsible and important bill. Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED of Rhode Island have worked relentlessly to manage this bill, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for cloture this morning.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the hard work of Senator REED and of course of Senator MCCAIN. They have worked very hard on this bill, but it is not a good bill. I am going to vote against cloture for a lot of reasons. The White House has announced they have scores of reasons to veto the bill, and they will.

I also am concerned about the so-called robust amendment process we were supposed to have under the new Senate leadership. We have Senator GILLIBRAND, who has worked for years. All she wants is a vote, and she hasn't been given that opportunity. We have many other Senators. I know every Senator who has an amendment can't offer it, but, gee whiz, we have had a handful of amendments. I think we have been very outgoing and doing what we can to make sure these managers' packages are approved, but it has been unfair, the whole process. So for that, and many other reasons, I will vote no on cloture.

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 senior assistant 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:

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3787

McCain amendment No. 4607, to amend the provision on share-in-savings contracts.

Reid (for Reid) amendment No. 4603 (to amendment No. 4607), to change the enactment date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I came to the floor yesterday to talk about a truly shameful change that is buried away in this bill. It is a change that would put us on a path to go back on a promise that we made to our servicemembers just 6 months ago and a change, if left unfixed, that will pull the rug out for men and women in the Armed Forces who are prepared to make the highest sacrifice for the country they love.

In case any of my colleagues are unaware, a single line in this massive Defense bill on page 1,455, buried in the funding chart, would zero out a new program that is intended to help men and women in our military realize their dream of having a family even if they go on to suffer catastrophic injuries when they are fighting on our behalf. I don't know how this line got in there, I don't know who thought it was a good idea, and I don't know why, but what I do know is this: It is wrong and it has to be fixed.

I just want to tell my colleagues that 6 months ago the Pentagon announced a pilot program that would offer servicemembers who are getting ready to deploy an opportunity at cryopreservation—in other words, freezing their eggs or sperm. This new program gave our deploying servicemembers not just the ability to have reproductive options in the event they are grievously injured but some deserved peace of mind. It took us a step forward in the promise we have made to our servicemembers to support them when they sacrifice so much for us, and it meant they wouldn't have to worry about choosing between defending their country or a chance of having a family some day.

This new program was met with widespread praise and relief. Men and women who were getting ready to deploy—many of whom were thinking about exploring cryopreservation, using their own money if they could afford it—were assured that their country had their back.

While the pilot program was not groundbreaking, these services have long been available in the private sector, and, in fact, fertility preservation techniques have been used by the British Armed Forces for years. It reflected a basic level of respect for servicemembers who are willing to risk suffering catastrophic injuries on our behalf, and it sent a clear message that no matter what happens to them on the battlefield, we will be ready to stand with them with whatever they need.

I was hoping this new program was a step we could build on, a move in the right direction, an important part of our larger work to help our warriors who sustained grievous injuries achieve

their dream of starting a family, which is why I was so upset when I learned this bill would move us the other way. It would take this promise we just made to our warriors and toss it in the trash. It would be a slap in the face to the men and women who serve us proudly and heroically. And honestly, it is the wrong thing to do.

Many people here in the Senate are quick to honor our military with their words, but for the men and women who signed up to fight on our behalf and are looking ahead to potentially massive sacrifices, we owe them so much more than that. We owe them action, respect, and a shot at their dream of having a family. We need to fix this bill. We owe them that much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to offer Murray amendment No. 4490 relating to fertility treatments and that the Senate vote in relation to this amendment with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I reluctantly have to object, and that is because there is an objection on this side, which I have to honor.

I thank Senator MURRAY for her advocacy for the people who are serving in our military in uniform, and this is at least an important aspect of military life, and I thank the Senator for that.

I also thank Senator GILLIBRAND, who will speak in a moment on an issue that has been of great importance to her for several years now. She has been an advocate of this very compelling issue of sexual assault in the military.

Unfortunately, we have an objection to all the amendments, and that, in my view, is a great disservice to this body, to the men and women serving in the military, and to the American public. It shouldn't matter whether I happen to agree or disagree with Senator GILLIBRAND or Senator MURRAY; they deserve debate and votes, and they are not getting them because of these objections.

I wish to also point out that we are working on amendments by Senator MORAN, Senator CORKER, Senator GILLIBRAND, and Senator SHAHEEN.

I might point out gratuitously that one of the things I have seen in recent years is involvement on issues that bring new perspectives from people like Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator MURRAY, Senator AYOTTE, Senator MCCASKILL, Senator FISCHER, and Senator ERNST. They have brought perspectives to our committee and to this body that have been very helpful.

All I can say is this: Senator MURRAY, I will continue to fight to get a vote on your amendment.

Mr. President, I reluctantly object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for his remarks, and I thank the leaders.

I urge my colleagues to allow a vote on my amendment No. 4310.

We now know far more about the extent of the military sexual assault problem than we did last year. We have more data, we have reviewed more case files, we heard from more survivors, and it is clear that very little has changed despite the Department of Defense's persistent claims that things are getting better and that they are making progress.

When the Department of Defense estimates that 20,000 servicemembers were sexually assaulted this year—the same number as in 2010—that is not progress. When an estimate of 8 out of 10 military sexual assault survivors don't report the crime, that is not progress. When more than half of all retaliation cases—58 percent of them—are perpetrated by someone in the chain of command of the accuser, that is not progress. When the percentage of survivors willing to report openly has declined for the past 5 years, that is not progress. When 62 percent of survivors have experienced retaliation since 2012 and there has not been one prosecution of this enumerated crime, that is not progress. When it is confirmed by the Associated Press that the Pentagon blatantly misled the Senate in order to skew our debate, this is perhaps the ultimate time that they are not making progress.

Our military justice system is broken. It is failing our men and women who so bravely serve. No matter how many small reforms we make, as long as commanders with no legal experience are continuing to make these important decisions about violent sexual crimes, we are not going to solve this problem. Our commanders are great at winning wars and training troops. They are not prosecutors. They are not even lawyers. They are warfighters, and their job is to keep our country safe, not make legal judgments about whether to prosecute a rape.

Once and for all, let's take this decision to prosecute these crimes and instead give it to trained military prosecutors. Let's give our servicemembers a justice system that is worthy of their service. This is our chance, and I urge everyone to vote yes if we have a vote.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked for S. 2943, notwithstanding rule XXII, that Gillibrand amendment No. 4310, the Military Justice Improvement Act, be considered in order postcloture, and that it be in order to offer amendment No. 4310, and the Senate vote in relation to that amendment with a 60 affirmative vote threshold, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, again, it is the same comment I made to Senator MURRAY. It is with profound reluctance because it is not the way we are supposed to conduct business here in the U.S. Senate.

I have reached such a level of frustration that I would even consider changing the rules of the Senate that one individual out of 100 can't bring everything to a screeching halt, and that is what is taking place here over an issue.

One of the amendments that is being held up is literally putting the lives of our interpreters in Afghanistan at risk. That is the view of General Petraeus, Ambassador Crocker, General Nicholson, and others. If we don't allow these people to come to this country, they are going to die. It is that serious. Senator GILLIBRAND's and Senator MURRAY's amendments are important, and I do not in any way diminish them, but we are talking about human lives of people who assisted us in carrying out our mission in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that is what is at stake here.

I reluctantly object, and I want to assure Senator GILLIBRAND that I will do everything in my power—which is not a lot right now when you look at the rules of the Senate—to get a vote. I may have some differences with Senator GILLIBRAND, but no one has been more dedicated to addressing this issue of a very difficult and frankly embarrassing side of the military today, and that is the incidence of sexual assaults.

I reluctantly object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been to a few of these rodeos, and I think the only way we are going to get some fairness here is that we do not invoke cloture.

As I said, I have been through this a number of times. I think if that happens, people will understand. We have to have a few votes—not a lot of votes but a few votes.

I was on the floor yesterday when Senator MCCAIN made this emphatic statement that, frankly, only he could make. He was talking about how people's lives are in jeopardy here, especially with the Shaheen amendment.

We don't have to change the rules of the Senate, but I suggest that we do not invoke cloture, give us some time to work out a few amendments, and I think that can happen.

We have two experienced legislators. The chairman of the committee and ranking member of the committee, Senator MCCAIN and Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, are two of the best we have here in the Senate, and we should move forward in a way that is expeditious yet productive.

Earlier this morning I said that a robust amendment process has not taken place here. There hasn't been an amendment process. You can blame a lot of people, but it hasn't happened.

I think this is an important piece of legislation. Senator MCCAIN and I have worked on this issue for years, and we have been at odds on occasion. He was upset that I didn't bring the bill forward quickly enough, but I do remember that we always brought it to the floor. I can remember on one occasion

when he and Senator Levin, who has since retired, finished this bill in 2 days, and we had a good bill that came out of here. There were no vetoes, no threats of veto, and we worked out the problems. So I would hope that we can move forward and get some fairness in this bill.

It is a huge bill. I have some differences in the bill, but it is not fair that we don't have a better process than what we have had so far. So I would suggest that others vote no on cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I simply want to underscore the importance of these amendments that Senator MURRAY and Senator GILLIBRAND are putting forward. There can be disagreement on the substance, but the merits, the importance, and the criticality should be obvious to all of us. I would hope to find a way to have votes on these amendments.

The same logic applies to Senator SHAHEEN and Senator MORAN. They have amendments that they have worked tirelessly on for days. They are being frustrated, not by the majority of the Senate but by a few individuals.

I think we have reached the point now where we have very little time left. If we could come together at least on a good-faith package of consents to deal with all of these or a majority of these and then continue to work forward for votes on all of them, I think that would be the appropriate thing to do.

So, again, I just want to underscore the fact that the issues that Senator MURRAY and Senator GILLIBRAND have raised are deserving of a vote, and we should have a vote on these issues.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on 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.

John McCain, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Tom Cotton, Kelly Ayotte, Deb Fischer, Mike Rounds, Lindsey Graham, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Joni Ernst, Thom Tillis, Daniel Coats, Chuck Grassley, John Thune, Steve Daines, Mitch McConnell.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on 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, as amended, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH).

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 97 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Ayotte	Gardner	Perdue
Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Risch
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Roberts
Blunt	Heller	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Schatt
Cassidy	Johnson	Schetz
Coats	Kaine	Sessions
Cochran	King	Shelby
Collins	Kirk	Stabenow
Corker	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McCaskill	Toomey
Donnelly	McConnell	Udall
Enzi	Moran	Vitter
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—23

Booker	Franken	Paul
Brown	Gillibrand	Reed
Cantwell	Hirono	Reid
Cardin	Lee	Schumer
Carper	Markey	Shaheen
Casey	Menendez	Warren
Cruz	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	

NOT VOTING—9

Boxer	Hatch	Sanders
Coons	Leahy	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 23.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE "JAMES H. MEREDITH MARCH AGAINST FEAR"

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 488, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 488) recognizing the historical significance and the 50th anniversary of the "James H. Meredith March Against Fear," a 220-mile walk down Highway 51 from Memphis, Tennessee, to Jackson, Mississippi.

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

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 488) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I think this is a very appropriate time to recognize the Meredith March Against Fear. On June 5, 1966, 4 years after becoming the first African-American student to enroll at the University of Mississippi, James Meredith began his historic Meredith March Against Fear. The march began at the Peabody Hotel in downtown Memphis and would conclude some 3 weeks later at the Mississippi State Capitol in Jackson.

On June 6, Mr. Meredith and his small band of supporters encountered gunshots about 1 mile south of Hernando, MS. James Meredith was shot three times on that day and was taken to a hospital. Although he would recover, Meredith was unable to complete his March Against Fear, and the leadership was taken over by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Floyd McKissick, and Stokely Carmichael. By the time the march reached the city limits of Canton, the number of marchers had doubled to 250. By the time it concluded in Jackson, there were 15,000 people in attendance. This overwhelming turnout made it the largest civil rights demonstration in the history of the State of Mississippi. More than 4,000 African Americans were registered to vote from rallies and drives during the march along U.S. Highway 51.

Mr. Meredith still lives in Jackson, where he is frequently seen wearing his Ole Miss cap and attending Ole Miss

athletic events in Oxford. He will turn 83 1 day before the 50th anniversary of the march's conclusion.

Today, the Senate recognizes the courageous leadership of James Meredith. I think it is appropriate that this resolution is sponsored by the three current Members of the Senate who are graduates of the University of Mississippi—Senator COCHRAN, Senator SHAHEEN, and this Senator.

I commend the Senate on its recognition of this important individual and this significant milestone in the history of the civil rights movement.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, as we move forward with cloture, I wish to make a clarification for the record.

There has been a lot of conversation about this issue of the role of women as far as Selective Service is concerned. At the time the amendments were filed, there was no amendment, except one, from the Senator from Utah, who is on the floor.

As soon as we began consideration of the bill, I said to the Senator from Utah: When do you want to do your amendment on women in the Selective Service?

His response was that he wanted to do another amendment first.

I said: Look, the way things work, you may have great difficulty getting that up. Nor has the Senator from Utah or anyone else raised the amendment for a vote.

So I am sorry to say that out there, there seems to be some conversation that Senator MCCAIN was blocking a vote on women in the Selective Service. I am not. Right now, if it were germane—and I don't know if it is germane or not—I have repeatedly said that if that amendment is up for consideration, I would be glad to have that amendment considered and to have it voted on.

So I want to clarify that for the record. I did not block any amendment concerning women being eligible for Selective Service. I want the record to be very clear.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS GALYON

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, today I recognize Thomas Galyon of Rogers, AR, as this week's Arkansan of the Week for his advocacy work with the Arkansas chapter of the national ALS Association.

Tom was diagnosed with ALS in 2014 and has been a tireless advocate ever since. Tom isn't one to let ALS hold him back. In fact, after spending 33 successful years in the tourism industry, Tom decided retirement wasn't for him and went back to work as the property manager for the Center for Nonprofits at St. Mary's in northwest Arkansas. As luck would have it, the ALS Association is headquartered in the very building Tom manages, making his commitment to their organization that much stronger.

Recently I had the opportunity to meet with Tom when he came to Washington to advocate on behalf of the ALS Association. We had a long discussion, where I learned about Tom's story and the struggle of nearly 20,000 other Americans who are currently living with ALS. During our meeting, Tom asked me to address the problem that persons with ALS face when seeking disability insurance.

I was proud to work with my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE to become the lead Republican sponsor of the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act, a bill that would waive the 5-month waiting period to receive disability insurance program benefits for those living with ALS. While the waiting period may be prudent in many cases, for ALS it consumes a lot of the remaining life expectancy once you get a diagnosis of ALS.

We now have nine sponsors. As we gain more support, I am hopeful this bill will move forward and eventually become law.

In a testimony about his journey with ALS, Tom writes: "Until there is a treatment or a cure for ALS I will continue to be an avid advocate for change in government policies and procedures that affect all ALS patients in a negative way."

I encourage all Arkansans to take a lesson from Tom's words: Advocacy works. If there is a bill or regulatory matter that impacts your life, I want to hear about it. To become an advocate, contact my office and tell me your story. It is part of my job to represent you in the Senate.

Tom's journey is a remarkable one. He has not let the unexpected discourage him. In fact, he has used his diagnosis to teach others about ALS and

bring us closer to a cure. As Tom himself always says, "Blue skies always." I think that is a mantra everyone in the Senate and Arkansas could adopt, too. It is my honor to recognize Thomas Galyon as this week's Arkansan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act, a bill upon which we have fortunately invoked cloture today and which I hope will allow us to proceed to finish this vitally important legislation.

I wish to commend both Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED for their leadership as they worked together. Their bill puts us on a path toward addressing the myriad threats we face today. In fact, in my years in the Senate, it is difficult to think of a time in which we have faced more threats from more different adversaries around the world. These national security challenges include the challenges posed by ISIS, as it continues to control territory and key cities in Syria and Iraq and spreads to other countries, such as Libya and Nigeria; Al Qaeda and other Islamic extremist terrorist groups determined to attack our country and our allies; Russia's aggressive operations in Ukraine, the Baltics, and Syria; and China's aggressive military activities in the South China Sea.

This bill funds programs that ensure our Nation's continued presence and deterrence missions, including \$271 million to help complete the construction of two DDG-1000 Destroyers. These ships provide capabilities including stealth technology, electric propulsion, and a smaller crew size. The Navy recently accepted delivery of the first DDG-1000, the Zumwalt—a major milestone for this revolutionary program. Given the ship's cutting-edge technology, unique hull, and advanced combat systems, the shipbuilders at Bath Iron Works in my State should be commended for their exceptional work and dedication in building the largest naval destroyer and the most advanced naval destroyer in history.

The bill before us also includes \$3.2 billion for the procurement of two Arleigh Burke-Class Destroyers as part of a multiyear procurement contract, as well as incremental funding for a third fiscal year 2016 Flight Three Destroyer. This much needed additional destroyer, which ranks No. 2 on the

Navy's unfunded priorities list, will be built at Bath Iron Works. As the workhorses of the Navy, these destroyers help ensure that our Navy's capabilities remain unrivaled in delivering power and presence across the globe. From freedom of navigation missions in the South China Sea to addressing Iranian aggression in the Strait of Hormuz, these ships signal to enemies and allies alike that the U.S. Navy is ready to respond wherever and whenever it is needed.

After years of advocacy, I am pleased this legislation also includes an important provision that requires the Department of Defense to finally comply with the Berry amendment by outfitting new recruits with high-quality athletic shoes made in America by skilled American workers. This amendment, sponsored by my colleague Senator KING, is based upon stand-alone legislation that I introduced with my colleague from Maine. It is good not only for our troops but also for American manufacturing. It is time to stop relying on goods manufactured in foreign countries to outfit those who wear the uniform of our Nation. It is past time for the Department's circumvention of the Berry amendment to be ended when it comes to athletic footwear.

This bill also provides for investments in our public shipyards, which are strategic assets for our national security. For Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME, almost \$75 million is authorized for necessary upgrades, including \$18 million for unaccompanied housing, \$30 million for utility improvements for nuclear platforms, and \$27 million to construct a replacement for a medical and dental unit that is in a building that is 100 years old and does not meet current safety standards.

As the senior member of the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I am pleased these authorizations match the funding included in our Military Construction and VA spending bill that passed the Senate overwhelmingly a few weeks ago. These investments at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard will result in the high-quality facilities that shipyard personnel deserve as they maintain, repair, and modernize our nuclear submarine fleet.

The bill also provides the resources necessary to help our allies and partners around the world. I am pleased it would authorize \$50 million for the U.S.-Israel Anti-Tunneling Cooperation Program. The terrorist organization Hamas continues to construct tunnels from Gaza to Israel, which have been used by terrorists to sneak across the border and carry out attacks on Israeli citizens.

Meanwhile, we have the problem of Iran, which has continued to defy a U.N. Security Council resolution on its ballistic missile program by conducting flight testing of missiles that

are inherently capable of delivering nuclear weapons that could someday reach the United States. They already are capable of reaching Israel, which is why this bill's continued support for the U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs is so important.

I am pleased to note that the National Defense Authorization Act contains several measures supporting our servicemembers, who perform the important missions we assign them. These provisions include a 1.6-percent pay raise and reauthorization of bonuses and special pay to help encourage retention. I know this has been a real problem, for example, for the Air Force in retaining the pilots it needs, who oftentimes can make so much more money and have far easier missions and hours in the private sector.

I filed an amendment, as I did last year, to strike a provision in this bill that would unfairly discriminate against women servicemembers. The provision mandates that if two or more servicemembers live in the same house, the amount of the basic allowance for housing payable to each member would be divided by the total number of members in the house. That means, in cases where a servicemember resides with his or her Active-Duty spouse or if a member resides with military roommates, each would proportionately lose his or her stipend for housing under this bill. This disproportionately affects female servicemembers because 20 percent of them are married to another servicemember. In contrast, less than 4 percent of Active-Duty men are married to Active-Duty women servicemembers. I hope we can change this provision.

Other provisions of this bill would provide additional protections for survivors of sexual assault to move closer to the goal of translating the military's stated policy of zero tolerance into reality. Specifically, the bill would create a new punitive article in the Uniform Code of Military Justice that criminalizes acts of retaliation. The article would hold servicemembers accountable if they threaten or take adverse personnel action against those who report or plan to report retaliation.

Finally, this bill would direct the Pentagon to rein in unnecessary and wasteful spending by reducing the number of general and flag officers by 25 percent. This is an issue that I have been working on with Chairman MCCAIN since 2012, and I am pleased to see the continued focus on ending the practice of rank inflation.

I should mention that I have the greatest respect for the high-ranking officials as well as for all who serve in our military. But this is an issue that we do need to deal with, and I believe this bill strikes the appropriate balance. We owe it to taxpayers to assess every efficiency and use every cost-saving measure while also ensuring the security of our Nation.

I thank the Presiding Officer for her patience. I know the Senate is soon to

adjourn. I urge support of this important bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION AND FEMALE VETERAN SUICIDE PREVENTION BILLS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it was encouraging to see the Senate vote to advance the National Defense Authorization Act this morning. It reflects a recognition by this body of the importance of the bill and the moment. The defense authorization act will promote defense innovation and research, it will modernize retirement benefits for our men and women in uniform, and authorize the pay raises they deserve. It will help prepare our country for the threats of today and the challenges of tomorrow, and it will better enable the next Commander in Chief, regardless of party, to deal with them as well. That is critical given that the next President is about to inherit an array of threats and troubling instability in the Middle East.

Yesterday Senators laid out many ways in which President Obama's foreign policy has fallen short. One was lack of strategic vision. Take for instance his unnecessary threat to veto this very bill. He doesn't like bipartisan prohibitions on transferring hardcore terrorists from Guantanamo's secure facilities to American communities or unstable countries. We include similar bipartisan provisions year after year after year. He makes similar threats year after year after year, but he signs the bill year after year, so it is time to quit that.

This bill just advanced in the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 68 to 23. The funding levels this bill authorizes is exactly the same as what President Obama requested in his budget, and unless the President is actually more concerned about a campaign slogan from back in 2008 than he is about grave threats we face in 2016, he will sign it.

I thank colleagues on both sides for their hard work on this legislation, particularly Chairman MCCAIN. He is always on guard for our men and women in uniform, and he is always standing up for our national security. This bill is a reflection of his commitment. It is an important step for the American people, but it is not the only one we took this past week.

It has been reported that we lose over 20 veterans each day to suicide, and one study has revealed that suicide rates among female veterans grew by 40 percent between 2000 and 2010. This is heartbreaking, and it underlines the

importance of the Female Veterans Suicide Prevention Act that the Senate passed earlier this week. This legislation will require the VA to take a closer look at this issue and assess which mental health care and veteran suicide prevention programs are most successful for our female veterans. It builds upon the progress of the Clay Hunt Act, an important law we passed last year that provides more of the suicide prevention and mental health support our veterans deserve.

As Senator ERNST recently reminded us, our servicemembers have selflessly sacrificed in defense of our freedoms, and we should help ensure that they are prepared to transition back to civilian life, which includes access to quality and timely mental health care they deserve. Senator ERNST knows what it means to serve. I thank her for her continued leadership for Iowa and for her work on this bill with Senators BOXER, BLUMENTHAL, and BROWN.

This veterans mental health legislation is another example of what we can accomplish when we work together to find solutions for the American people, and it is another example of a Senate that is back to work.

SOCIAL IMPACT PARTNERSHIP BILL

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes, known as the Social Impact Partnership Act, SIPA. This legislation would facilitate the creation of public-private partnerships that have the goal of improving the outcomes from our Nation's social services spending in order to benefit both the people intended to be helped by those programs and the U.S. taxpayer. It would do so by creating the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships, which would recommend to the Treasury Secretary that the Federal Government enter into agreements with State and local governments and private investors to pay for successful social improvement programs funded by private investors out of savings those programs create for the Federal Government.

The bill appropriates \$300 million for this purpose and aims to ensure that the savings to the Federal Government from the projects selected will exceed that \$300 million. If a social services program is not successful, the Federal Government will not pay for it. In this way, SIPA helps to reorient Federal social spending towards measurable improvements in the lives of those served.

While I am supportive of the bill, I do want to note for the record that this bill could benefit from further assurances at a committee markup that the funded projects will result in governmental savings.

The appropriations for the legislation should be offset with spending reduc-

tions in other areas, as has been done in the companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

There should be a specified role in the legislation for CBO and OMB to certify for taxpayers that the Federal performance payments authorized in the bill for successful projects do not exceed actual programmatic savings and that this bill provides better social outcomes for equal or less total money spent.

Finally, the bill should ensure that there is no way for any program stakeholder, government official, or member of the Federal Interagency Council on Social Impact Partnerships to unduly influence the measured outcome of these funded projects, which is required to receive federal payments. As part of these protections, there should be strict conflict of interest rules in place to prohibit those involved in selecting and measuring the projects from having a financial interest in their outcome.

The purpose of the Social Impact Partnership Act is to establish funding for innovative social service projects that work and ending funding for those that do not. If there is any evidence that such innovation is not occurring and SIPA is becoming yet another wasteful and politically influenced government program, I will work to end it.

I thank Senators HATCH and BENNET for their great work on this bill, and I look forward to its markup in the Finance Committee and passage in the full Senate.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BILLY COX

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to Baxter County Sheriff's Deputy Billy Cox, the American Legion Department of Arkansas Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award recipient.

Deputy Cox has dedicated 13 years to law enforcement and currently serves as the Norfolk school resource officer. He provides a law enforcement presence, but also uses his skills and experiences to help students learn and grow in a safe environment through D.A.R.E. and other youth safety programs. Having worked as a paramedic for two decades, he also teaches CPR to high school students.

Known as Officer Billy to the students and educators around the Norfolk School District, Deputy Cox is a positive role model for the students. Students rely on him to listen to their problems, and he is always patient and willing to listen. Norfolk High School Principal Bobby Hulse says Deputy Cox means a lot to the students and staff.

His dedication to law enforcement has earned Deputy Cox certifications in drug abuse education and gang resistance education. He is a State-certified drug recognition expert.

The American Legion Department of Arkansas Law Enforcement Officer of

the Year Award recognizes law enforcement officers who exceed their responsibilities in uniform and show a commitment to community service. Deputy Cox was nominated for this award by his supervisor, Lt. Ralph Bird, because of the huge impact he has had on students and citizens in the county.

Deputy Cox is well-deserving of this recognition. His dedication, devotion, and commitment to Baxter County and the Norfolk School District are apparent every day.

I offer my congratulations to Deputy Billy Cox for receiving this honor and wish him continued success in his law enforcement career.●

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3826. An act 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.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-5706. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "D-glucurono-6-deoxy-L-manno-D-glucan, acetate, calcium magnesium potassium sodium salt (diutan gum); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9946-48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5707. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alpha-2,4,6-Tris[1-(phenyl)ethyl]-Omega-hydroxypoly(oxyethylene) poly(oxypropylene) copolymer; Tolerance Exemption; Technical Correction" (FRL No. 9946-43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5708. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alcohols, C>14, ethoxylated; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9946-16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5709. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedure; Adjusting Civil Money Penalties for Inflation" (RIN3052-AD16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5710. A communication from the Board Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance

Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedure; Adjusting Civil Money Penalties for Inflation" (RIN3055-AA11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5711. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants—Cross-Border Application of the Margin Requirements" (RIN3038-AC97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5712. 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 "Implementation of the February 2015 Australia Group (AG) Interseasonal Decisions and the June 2015 AG Plenary Understandings" (RIN0694-AG88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5713. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps" ((RIN1904-AB94) (Docket No. EERE-2009-BT-TP-0004)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5714. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf - Technical Corrections" (RIN1014-AA15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-5715. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units" ((RIN2060-AS11) (FRL No. 9945-72-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5716. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Secondary Aluminum Production" ((RIN2060-AS94) (FRL No. 9947-30-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5717. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Chemical Reporting: Community Right-to-Know; Revisions to Hazard Categories and Minor Corrections" ((RIN2050-AG85) (FRL No. 9945-07-OLEM)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5718. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Completeness Findings for 110(a)(2)(C) State Implementation Plan Pertaining to the Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) NAAQS; California; El Dorado County Air Quality Management District and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9947-35-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5719. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; California Mobile Source Regulations" (FRL No. 9947-59-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5720. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Sulfur Dioxide" (FRL No. 9947-48-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5721. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Removal of Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements" (FRL No. 9947-39-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5722. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; NAAQS Updates" (FRL No. 9946-80-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5723. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Unified Listing Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Zuni Bluehead Sucker" (RIN1018-AZ23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5724. A communication from the Chief of the Wildlife Trade and Conservation Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revisions of the Section 4(d) Rule for the African Elephant (*Loxodonta africana*)" (RIN1018-AX84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5725. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Unified Listing Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination That Designation of Critical Habitat is Not Prudent For The Northern Long-Eared Bat" (RIN1018-AZ62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5726. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Unified Listing Team, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Oregon Spotted Frog" (RIN1018-AZ56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5727. 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 "Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates" (Notice 2016-33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5728. 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 "Cosentino v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo 2014-186" (AOD 124337-15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5729. 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 "Applying for Certification as a Certified Professional Employer Organization" (Rev. Proc. 2016-33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5730. 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 "Certain Transfers of Property to Regulated Investment Companies [RICs] and Real Estate Investment Trusts" ((RIN1545-BN39) (TD 9770)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5731. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, section 701: Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Improvements Act of 2015" (RIN0960-AH99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5732. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System" (RIN0970-AB90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5733. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of waiver authority for Belarus; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5734. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of waiver authority for Turkmenistan; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5735. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the International Labor Organization Recommendations concerning the Transition from the Informal to

the Formal Economy (No. 204), adopted by the 104th session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5736. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Traffic in Arms: Revisions to Definition of Export and Related Definitions" (RIN1400-AD70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5737. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5738. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustment of Civil Penalties" (RIN1212-AB33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5739. A communication from the Deputy 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 Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Chromium Propionate" (Docket No. FDA-2014-F-0232) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5740. A communication from the Inspector General of the General Services Administration, 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-5741. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transportation'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-5742. A joint communication from the Chairman and the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5743. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a Management Report for the period from October 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5744. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-292, "Sense of the Council in Support of a 'Statehood or Else' Signature Campaign Resolution of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5745. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Education'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-5746. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Rewrite of GSAR Part 515, Contracting by Negotiation" (RIN3090-AI76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5747. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Rewrite of GSAR Part 517, Special Contracting Methods" (RIN3090-AI51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5748. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Purchasing by Non-Federal Entities" (RIN3090-AJ43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5749. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Grants Management, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Government Contracting and National Defense Authorization Act of 2013 Amendments" (RIN3245-AG58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2016; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-5750. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning; Metropolitan Transportation Planning" (RIN2125-AF52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5751. A communication from the Paralegal, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning; Metropolitan Transportation Planning" (RIN2132-AB10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5752. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Categorical Exclusions" (RIN2125-AF69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5753. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commercial Zones at International Border with Mexico" (RIN2126-AB86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 3048. A bill to withdraw certain Federal land located in Malheur County, Oregon, from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws, location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and operation under the mineral leasing laws, to provide for the conduct of certain economic activities in Malheur County, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 3049. A bill to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3050. A bill to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements in which the United States is a party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND
SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 488. A resolution recognizing the historical significance and the 50th anniversary of the "James H. Meredith March Against Fear", a 220-mile walk down Highway 51 from Memphis, Tennessee, to Jackson, Mississippi; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 489. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of Muhammad Ali; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 490. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BURR, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. Res. 491. A resolution designating June 12, 2016, as a national day of racial amity and reconciliation; considered and agreed to.

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

S. Res. 492. A resolution designating the week of June 6 through June 12, 2016, as "Hemp History Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 386

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

S. 1089

At the request of Mr. CORKER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors 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. 1239

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

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) 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. 1779

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1779, a bill to prevent conflicts of interest that stem from executive Government employees receiving bonuses or other compensation arrangements from nongovernment sources, from the revolving door that raises concerns about the independence of financial services regulators, and from the revolving door that casts aspersions over the awarding of Government contracts and other financial benefits.

S. 2031

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2031, a bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2216

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 2904

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2904, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to elimi-

nate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 2924

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2924, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to former United States Senator Max Cleland.

S. 2968

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2968, a bill to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 483

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) 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.

S. RES. 486

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 486, a resolution commemorating "Cruise Travel Professional Month" in October 2016.

AMENDMENT NO. 4383

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4383 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. 4417

At the request of Mr. KAIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4417 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. 4458

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4458 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. 4490

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4490 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. 4550

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4550 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. 4629

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4629 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. 4641

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4641 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 3048. A bill to withdraw certain Federal land located in Malheur County, Oregon, from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws, location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and operation under the mineral leasing laws, to provide for the conduct of certain economic activities in Malheur County, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Southeastern Or-

egon Mineral Withdrawal and Economic Preservation and Development Act to provide a boost to the rural Oregon economy and to protect the world-renowned Southeastern Oregon landscape. I am pleased to introduce this bill with my colleague from Oregon, Senator JEFF MERKLEY.

In Southeastern Oregon, the high desert landscape is home to hundreds of millions of acres of public lands that have hosted cattle ranching and visitors and locals for generations. These lands are supported by Oregonians who grew up there and who rely on them as a long-time linchpin for their local economies. The equation is simple: Healthy public lands mean healthy economies in this part of Oregon. And outside threats to those lands place local economies in peril.

I understand that companies, including foreign companies, want to come into Southeastern Oregon to explore for minerals, including uranium. This is deeply troubling because these mining operations are dangerous—to the existing local economies as well as to the environment, over all. By potentially hamstringing the creation of jobs in agriculture and recreation, and stunting the growth of small businesses, blocking mining in these areas protects this local potential.

Senator MERKLEY and I are introducing this bill because the risks posed by mineral exploration to the communities and their way of life are far too great to roll the dice.

Not only does our bill protect more than 2 million acres from mineral exploration and extraction, it creates and expands programs to support Southeastern Oregon communities so they can grow their economies and build on their strengths. These programs include grants to develop modern and efficient water storage systems to keep livestock out of rivers and streams and reduce the need to transport water. They also include infrastructure grants to improve roads for farmers and agriculture-related businesses, as well as job training for veterans and young people get started in agriculture. Finally, our bill would address broader economic issues by establishing an Agriculture Center of Excellence to expand local agriculture research, providing additional assistance to local and rural firefighters, improving water and wastewater systems, and deploying broadband service and cellphone towers.

With these investments in Southeastern Oregon, communities can create jobs, train a new generation of workers, and modernize their economies. All those gains can be achieved while protecting Malheur County's natural landscape and ensuring that the historic uses of the land can continue without interruption from harmful mining operations.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 488—RECOGNIZING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE "JAMES H. MEREDITH MARCH AGAINST FEAR", A 220-MILE WALK DOWN HIGHWAY 51 FROM MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE, TO JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 488

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), ruled that separating children in public schools on the basis of race violates the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas in the years following *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), some Southern States, including the State of Mississippi, continued to uphold racial segregation;

Whereas, in 1962, the first African-American integrated the University of Mississippi (referred to in this preamble as "Ole Miss");

Whereas, in 1965, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), which passed Congress with bipartisan support and was signed by President Lyndon Johnson, prohibited racial discrimination in voting;

Whereas, in 1966, 4 years after integration, the first African-American student at Ole Miss planned a 220-mile march from Memphis, Tennessee, to Jackson, Mississippi (referred to in this preamble as the "Meredith March Against Fear")—

(1) to challenge the fear that dominated the day-to-day lives of African-Americans in the Southern United States, specifically in the State of Mississippi; and

(2) to encourage the 450,000 unregistered African-Americans in the State of Mississippi to register to vote and to go to the polls;

Whereas, on June 5, 1966, the historic Meredith March Against Fear began at the Peabody Hotel in downtown Memphis, Tennessee;

Whereas the self-reliant and determined leader of the Meredith March Against Fear carried no food, clothing, or sleeping bag, and was joined only by a small number of African-American supporters and Whites from the North;

Whereas on reaching the border between the States of Tennessee and Mississippi, the marchers were greeted with hostility;

Whereas, on June 6, 1966, the Meredith March Against Fear continued south along United States Highway 51 through DeSoto County toward the town of Hernando, Mississippi;

Whereas 150 African-American men and women greeted the marchers at the town square in Hernando, Mississippi;

Whereas the visit of the marchers to Hernando, Mississippi, embodied the purpose of the Meredith March Against Fear, "to explain [to African Americans] that the old order was passing, that they should stand up as men with nothing to fear";

Whereas, on June 6, 1966, about 1 mile south of Hernando, Mississippi, the leader of the Meredith March Against Fear was shot 3 times by an attempted assassin;

Whereas, on June 7, 1966, national civil rights leaders, including Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Floyd McKissick, and Stokely Carmichael, resumed the Meredith March

Against Fear while their leader recovered from the attempted assassination;

Whereas, over the next 3 weeks, the marchers weathered violence and tear gas, but accomplished what the Meredith March Against Fear set out to accomplish;

Whereas voter rallies and drives along United States Highway 51 resulted in more than 4,000 African-Americans registering to vote;

Whereas the Meredith March Against Fear featured many African-Americans defying the intimidation of hostile Whites;

Whereas, on June 25, 1966, the leader of the Meredith March Against Fear, along with 125 allies, resumed the march from the Canton, Mississippi, courthouse, located 15 miles north of Jackson, Mississippi;

Whereas the number of marchers doubled to approximately 250 by the time the Meredith March Against Fear reached the city limits of Canton, Mississippi;

Whereas 1 mile north of Tougaloo College, the marchers were met by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and hundreds of additional followers;

Whereas hundreds of supporters were led through the iron-rod gate at the main entrance to the Tougaloo campus in Jackson, Mississippi;

Whereas, on June 26, 1966, the Meredith March Against Fear concluded with a walk from Tougaloo College to the Mississippi State Capitol building in Jackson, Mississippi;

Whereas approximately 15,000 individuals attended the climactic conclusion of the Meredith March Against Fear, making it the largest civil rights demonstration in the history of the State of Mississippi; and

Whereas the self-sufficiency and resolve that motivated the Meredith March Against Fear made its leader a revolutionary and a powerful figure in the history of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 50th anniversary of the “James H. Meredith March Against Fear”;

(2) recognizes the discipline and focus required to complete the James H. Meredith March Against Fear during the most contentious decade in the Civil Rights Movement to encourage African-Americans to defy intimidation and register voters; and

(3) acknowledges the significance of the James H. Meredith March Against Fear.

SENATE RESOLUTION 489—HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF MUHAMMAD ALI

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 489

Whereas Muhammad Ali was an Olympic gold medalist;

Whereas the athletic legacy of Muhammad Ali is cemented by a 21-year professional career amid a golden age of boxing, in which he amassed a record of 56-5 with 37 knockouts;

Whereas Muhammad Ali was the first individual ever to capture the World Heavyweight Title 3 times;

Whereas Muhammad Ali memorably recaptured the world title in the “Rumble in the Jungle” on October 30, 1974, when he knocked out then-undefeated World Heavyweight Champion George Foreman;

Whereas Muhammad Ali successfully defended his title 10 times, perhaps most famously during the “Thrilla in Manila” on October 1, 1975;

Whereas Muhammad Ali showed, beyond his impressive fighting prowess in the boxing

ring, even greater courage and tenacity as an advocate outside the ring;

Whereas Muhammad Ali was a great philanthropist and a widely recognized advocate of peace, equality, and freedom;

Whereas Muhammad Ali remains an icon of freedom of conscience;

Whereas Muhammad Ali was a prominent African American of the Muslim faith, and was and continues to be a role model to the citizens of the United States of all races, ethnicities, and religions;

Whereas Muhammad Ali used his fame to advocate for humanitarian causes in audiences with world leaders, such as Pope John Paul II, the Dalai Lama, and multiple presidents of the United States; and

Whereas Muhammad Ali inspired people around the globe in displaying the same vibrant and larger-than-life character and dedication in spite of his physical ailments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the life of Muhammad Ali and his achievements as an athlete, philanthropist, and humanitarian.

SENATE RESOLUTION 490—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT AMBUSH MARKETING ADVERSELY AFFECTS THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC TEAMS

Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 490

Whereas the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games will occur on August 5, 2016, through August 21, 2016, and September 7, 2016, through September 18, 2016, respectively, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil;

Whereas more than 10,500 athletes from 206 nations will compete in 28 Olympic sports and 4,350 Paralympic athletes from 176 nations will compete in 23 Paralympic sports;

Whereas American athletes have spent countless days, months, and years training to earn a spot on the United States Olympic or Paralympic teams;

Whereas the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act (36 U.S.C. 220501 et seq.)—

(1) established the United States Olympic Committee as the coordinating body for all Olympic and Paralympic athletic activity in the United States;

(2) gave the United States Olympic Committee the exclusive right in the United States to use the words “Olympic”, “Olympiad”, “Paralympic”, and “Paralympiad”, the emblem of the United States Olympic Committee, and the symbols of the International Olympic Committee and the International Paralympic Committee; and

(3) empowered the United States Olympic Committee to authorize sponsors that contribute to the United States Olympic or Paralympic teams to use any trademark, symbol, insignia, or emblem of the International Olympic Committee, the International Paralympic Committee, the Pan-American Sports Organization, or the United States Olympic Committee;

Whereas Team USA is significantly funded by 36 sponsors who ensure that the United States has the best Olympic and Paralympic teams possible;

Whereas in recent years, a number of entities in the United States have engaged in marketing strategies that appear to affiliate themselves with the Olympic and Paralympic Games without becoming official sponsors of Team USA;

Whereas any ambush marketing in violation of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) undermines sponsorship activities and creates consumer confusion around official Olympic and Paralympic sponsors; and

Whereas ambush marketing impedes the goals of the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act (36 U.S.C. 220501 et seq.) to fund the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams through official sponsorships: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) official sponsor support is critical to the success of Team USA at all international competitions; and

(2) ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams and their ability to attract and retain corporate sponsorships.

SENATE RESOLUTION 491—DESIGNATING JUNE 12, 2016, AS A NATIONAL DAY OF RACIAL AMITY AND RECONCILIATION

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BURR, and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 491

Whereas the greatest asset of the United States is the people of the United States;

Whereas the motto on the Great Seal of the United States is E Pluribus Unum, “out of many, one”;

Whereas the United States is comprised of multicultural, multiethnic, and multiracial people;

Whereas friendship, collegiality, civility, respect, and kindness are commonly shared ideals of the people of the United States; and

Whereas organizations and communities across the United States, motivated by the ideals behind the motto of E Pluribus Unum, have joined together in introspection and reflection on how the diversity of the people of the United States has been indispensable in creating the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 12, 2016, as a national day of racial amity and reconciliation;

(2) supports all people of the United States who join in activities in support of the goals and ideals of racial amity; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 492—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JUNE 6 THROUGH JUNE 12, 2016, AS “HEMP HISTORY WEEK”

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 492

Whereas Hemp History Week will be held from June 6 through June 12, 2016;

Whereas the goals of Hemp History Week are to commemorate the historical relevance of industrial hemp in the United States and to promote the full growth potential of the industrial hemp industry;

Whereas industrial hemp is an agricultural commodity that has been used for centuries to produce many innovative industrial and consumer products, including soap, fabric, textiles, construction materials, clothing, paper, cosmetics, food, and beverages;

Whereas the global market for hemp is estimated to consist of more than 25,000 products;

Whereas the value of hemp imported into the United States for use in the production of other retail products is estimated at approximately \$76,000,000 annually;

Whereas the United States hemp industry estimates that the annual market value of hemp retail sales in the United States is more than \$570,000,000;

Whereas despite the legitimate uses of hemp, many agricultural producers of the United States are prohibited under current law from growing hemp;

Whereas because most hemp cannot be grown legally in the United States, raw hemp material and hemp products are imported for sale in the United States;

Whereas the United States is the largest consumer of hemp products in the world, but the United States is the only major industrialized country that restricts hemp farming; and

Whereas industrial hemp holds great potential to bolster the agricultural economy of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of June 6 through June 12, 2016, as “Hemp History Week”;

(2) recognizes the historical relevance of industrial hemp; and

(3) recognizes the growing economic potential of industrial hemp.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4670. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4607 submitted by Mr. MCCAIN 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.

SA 4671. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4672. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4253 submitted by Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. VITTER) and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4673. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4609 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4674. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4608 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4675. Mr. BENNETT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4676. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4253 submitted by Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. VITTER) and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2943, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4677. 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 4678. Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER) 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 4670. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4607 submitted by Mr. MCCAIN 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 1, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 829B. COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT AND PHASE OUT OF ROCKET ENGINES FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN THE EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM FOR SPACE LAUNCH OF NATIONAL SECURITY SATELLITES.

(a) **INEFFECTIVENESS OF SUPERSEDED REQUIREMENTS.**—Sections 1036 and 1037 shall have no force or effect, and the amendments proposed to be made by section 1037 shall not be made.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Any competition for a contract for the provision of launch services for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program shall be open for award to all certified providers of evolved expendable launch vehicle-class systems.

(c) **AWARD OF CONTRACTS.**—In awarding a contract under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense—

(1) subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (d), and notwithstanding any other provision of law, may, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2022, award the contract to a provider of launch services that intends to use any certified launch vehicle in its inventory without regard to the country of origin of the rocket engine that will be used on that launch vehicle; and

(2) may only award contracts utilizing an engine designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation for phase 1(a) and phase 2 evolved expendable launch vehicle procurements.

(d) **LIMITATION.**—The total number of rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation and used on launch vehicles for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program shall not exceed 18.

SA 4671. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) 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:

Strike sections 1036 and 1037 and insert the following:

SEC. 1036. COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT AND PHASE OUT OF ROCKET ENGINES FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN THE EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM FOR SPACE LAUNCH OF NATIONAL SECURITY SATELLITES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any competition for a contract for the provision of launch services

for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program shall be open for award to all certified providers of evolved expendable launch vehicle-class systems.

(b) **AWARD OF CONTRACTS.**—In awarding a contract under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense—

(1) subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (c), and notwithstanding any other provision of law, may, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2022, award the contract to a provider of launch services that intends to use any certified launch vehicle in its inventory without regard to the country of origin of the rocket engine that will be used on that launch vehicle; and

(2) may only award contracts utilizing an engine designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation for phase 1(a) and phase 2 evolved expendable launch vehicle procurements.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—The total number of rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation and used on launch vehicles for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program shall not exceed 18.

SA 4672. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4253 submitted by Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. VITTER) and intended to be proposed 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:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

DIVISION F—SBIR AND STTR REAUTHORIZATION AND IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 6001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “SBIR and STTR Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2016”.

TITLE LXI—REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 6101. PERMANENCY OF SBIR PROGRAM AND STTR PROGRAM.

(a) **SBIR.**—Section 9(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(m)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “TERMINATION” and inserting “SBIR PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION”; and

(2) by striking “terminate on September 30, 2017” and inserting “be in effect for each fiscal year”.

(b) **STTR.**—Section 9(n)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “through fiscal year 2017”.

TITLE LXII—ENHANCED SMALL BUSINESS ACCESS TO FEDERAL INNOVATION INVESTMENTS

SEC. 6201. ALLOCATION INCREASES AND TRANSPARENCY IN BASE CALCULATION.

(a) **SBIR.**—Section 9(f) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “expend” and inserting “obligate for expenditure”; and

(B) in subparagraph (H), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (I), by striking “in fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter,” and inserting “in each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

“(J) for a Federal agency other than the Department of Defense, the National Science Foundation, or the Department of Health and Human Services—

“(i) not less than 3.4 percent of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the Federal agency in fiscal year 2022;

“(ii) not less than 3.6 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2023;

“(iii) not less than 3.8 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2024;

“(iv) not less than 4 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2025;

“(v) not less than 4.2 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2026;

“(vi) not less than 4.4 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2027; and

“(vii) not less than 4.54 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2028 and each fiscal year thereafter;

“(K) for the Department of Defense—

“(i) not less than 2.6 percent of the budget for research, development, test, and evaluation of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2022;

“(ii) not less than 2.7 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2023;

“(iii) not less than 2.8 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2024;

“(iv) not less than 2.9 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2025;

“(v) not less than 3 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2026;

“(vi) not less than 3.1 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2027;

“(vii) not less than 3.2 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2028;

“(viii) not less than 3.3 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2029;

“(ix) not less than 3.4 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2030; and

“(x) not less than 3.5 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2031 and each fiscal year thereafter; and

“(L) for the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health and Human Services, for fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, the lesser of—

“(i) the percentage of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, equal to the sum of—

“(I) the percentage in effect under this paragraph for the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, for the previous fiscal year; and

“(II)(aa) 0.04 percent; or

“(bb) if the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, for the fiscal year is not less than 103 percent of such extramural budget for the previous fiscal year, 0.2 percent; or

“(ii) 4.5 percent of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting “(or for the Department of Defense, an amount of the budget for basic research of the Department of Defense)” after “research”; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by inserting “(or for the Department of Defense an amount of the budget for research, development, test, and evaluation of the Department of Defense)” after “of the agency”.

(b) STTR.—Section 9(n)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “expend” and inserting “obligate for expenditure”; and

(B) by striking “not less than the percentage of that extramural budget specified in subparagraph (B)” and inserting “for a Federal agency other than the Department of Defense, the National Science Foundation, or the Department of Health and Human Services, not less than the percentage of that extramural budget specified in subparagraph (B), for the Department of Defense, not less than the percentage of the budget for research, development, test, and evaluation of the Department of Defense specified in subparagraph (B), and for the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health and Human Services, not less than the percentage of that extramural budget specified in subparagraph (C)”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “OTHER THAN FOR NSF AND HHS” after “AMOUNTS”;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “the extramural budget required to be expended by an agency” and inserting “the extramural budget, for a Federal agency other than the Department of Defense, the National Science Foundation, or the Department of Health and Human Services, and of the budget for research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Department of Defense, required to be obligated for expenditure with small business concerns”;

(C) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) in clause (v), by striking “fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) 0.5 percent for fiscal year 2022;

“(vii) 0.55 percent for fiscal year 2023;

“(viii) 0.6 percent for fiscal year 2024;

“(ix) 0.65 percent for fiscal year 2025;

“(x) 0.7 percent for fiscal year 2026;

“(xi) 0.75 percent for fiscal year 2027;

“(xii) 0.8 percent for fiscal year 2028;

“(xiii) 0.85 percent for fiscal year 2029;

“(xiv) 0.9 percent for fiscal year 2030; and

“(xv) 0.95 percent for fiscal year 2031 and each fiscal year thereafter.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXPENDITURE AMOUNTS FOR NSF AND HHS.—The percentage of the extramural budget required to be expended by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health and Human Services in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall be—

“(i) for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, 0.45 percent; and

“(ii) for fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, the lesser of—

“(I) the percentage of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, equal to the sum of—

“(aa) the percentage in effect under this paragraph for the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, for the previous fiscal year; and

“(bb)(AA) 0 percent; or

“(BB) if the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, for the fiscal year is not less than 103 percent of such extramural budget for the previous fiscal year, 0.05 percent; or

“(II) 0.95 percent of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively.”.

SEC. 6202. REGULAR OVERSIGHT OF AWARD AMOUNTS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF AUTOMATIC INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 9(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(D), by inserting “through fiscal year 2016” after “every year”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) 2016 MODIFICATIONS FOR DOLLAR VALUE OF AWARDS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the SBIR and STTR Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2016, the Administrator shall modify the policy directives issued under this subsection to—

“(A) eliminate the annual adjustments for inflation of the dollar value of awards described in paragraph (2)(D); and

“(B) clarify that Congress intends to review the dollar value of awards every 3 fiscal years.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REGULAR REVIEW OF THE AWARD SIZES.—It is the sense of Congress that for fiscal year 2019, and every third fiscal year thereafter, Congress should evaluate whether the maximum award sizes under the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) should be adjusted and, if so, take appropriate action to direct that such adjustments be made under the policy directives issued under subsection (j) of such section.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF SEQUENTIAL PHASE II AWARDS.—Section 9(ff) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(ff)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) CLARIFICATION OF SEQUENTIAL PHASE II AWARDS.—The head of a Federal agency shall ensure that any sequential Phase II award is made in accordance with the limitations on award sizes under subsection (aa).

“(4) CROSS-AGENCY SEQUENTIAL PHASE II AWARDS.—A small business concern that receives a sequential Phase II SBIR or Phase II STTR award for a project from a Federal agency is eligible to receive an additional sequential Phase II award that continues work on that project from another Federal agency.”.

TITLE LXII—COMMERCIALIZATION IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 6301. PERMANENCY OF THE COMMERCIALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM FOR CIVILIAN AGENCIES.

Section 9(gg) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(gg)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “PILOT PROGRAM” and inserting “COMMERCIALIZATION DEVELOPMENT AWARDS”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (2), (7), and (8);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), respectively;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘commercialization development program’ means a program established by a covered Federal agency under paragraph (1); and

“(B) the term ‘covered Federal agency’—

“(i) means a Federal agency participating in the SBIR program or the STTR program; and

“(ii) does not include the Department of Defense.”; and

(5) by striking “pilot program” each place it appears and inserting “commercialization development program”.

SEC. 6302. ENFORCEMENT OF NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS GOAL FOR FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 9(h) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(h)) is amended to read as follows:

“(h) NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS GOAL FOR FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in consultation with Federal agencies, shall establish a Governmentwide goal for each fiscal year, which shall be not less than 10 percent, for the percentage of the amounts made available for research or research and development that shall be obligated for funding agreements—

“(A) with small business concerns; or

“(B) that will facilitate the development of research and development small business concerns.

“(2) AGENCY GOALS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency which has a budget for research or research and development in excess of \$20,000,000, in consultation with the Administrator, shall establish a goal for the Federal agency for each fiscal year that is appropriate to the mission of the Federal agency for the percentage of such budget that shall be obligated for funding agreements—

“(i) with small business concerns; or

“(ii) that will facilitate the development of research and development small business concerns.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The head of a Federal agency may not establish a percentage goal under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year that is less than the percentage goal that was established under subparagraph (A) for the Federal agency for the previous fiscal year.”.

SEC. 6303. TRACKING RAPID INNOVATION FUND AWARDS IN ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL REPORT.

Section 9(b)(7) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by adding “and” at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) information regarding awards under the Rapid Innovation Program under section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4366; 10 U.S.C. 2359 note), including—

“(i) the number and dollar amount of awards made under the Rapid Innovation Program to business concerns receiving an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program;

“(ii) the proportion of awards under the Rapid Innovation Program made to business concerns receiving an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program;

“(iii) the proportion of awards under the Rapid Innovation Program made to small business concerns; and

“(iv) a projection of the effect on the number of awards under the Rapid Innovation Program if amounts to carry out the program were made available as a fixed allocation of the amount appropriated to the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation, excluding amounts appropriated for the defense universities;”.

SEC. 6304. PROTECTING INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(tt) PROTECTING INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.—

“(1) COST-REIMBURSEMENT CONTRACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B)(ii), the cost of seeking protection for intellectual property, including a trademark, copyright, or patent, that was created through work performed under an STTR award that uses a cost-reimbursement contract or an SBIR award that uses a cost-reimbursement contract is allowable as an indirect cost under that award.

“(B) CLARIFICATION OF PATENT COSTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A Federal agency shall not directly or indirectly inhibit, through the policies, directives, or practices of the Federal agency, an otherwise eligible small business concern performing under an award described in subparagraph (A) from recovering patent costs incurred as requirements under that award, including—

“(I) the costs of preparing—

“(aa) invention disclosures;

“(bb) reports; and

“(cc) other documents;

“(II) the costs for searching the art to the extent necessary to make the invention disclosures;

“(III) other costs in connection with the filing and prosecution of a United States patent application where title or royalty-free license is to be conveyed to the Federal Government; and

“(IV) general counseling services relating to patent matters, including advice on patent laws, regulations, clauses, and employee agreements.

“(ii) RECOVERY LIMITATIONS.—The patent costs described in clause (i) shall be allowable for technology developed under a—

“(I) Phase I award, as indirect costs in an amount not greater than \$5,000;

“(II) Phase II award, as indirect costs in an amount not greater than \$15,000; and

“(III) Phase III award in which the Federal Government has government purpose rights (as defined in section 227.7103-5 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations).

“(2) FIRM FIXED-PRICE CONTRACTS.—An otherwise eligible small business concern performing under an STTR award that uses a firm fixed-price contract or an SBIR award that uses a firm fixed-price contract may recover fair and reasonable costs arising from seeking protection for intellectual property, including a trademark, copyright, or patent, that was created through work performed under that award.”.

SEC. 6305. ANNUAL GAO AUDIT OF COMPLIANCE WITH COMMERCIALIZATION GOALS.

Section 9(nn) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(nn)) is amended to read as follows:

“(nn) ANNUAL GAO REPORT ON GOVERNMENT COMPLIANCE WITH GOALS, INCENTIVES, AND PHASE III PREFERENCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the SBIR and STTR Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2016, and every year thereafter until the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of the SBIR and STTR Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report that—

“(1) discusses the status of the compliance of Federal agencies with the requirements or authorities established under—

“(A) subsection (h), relating to the establishment by certain Federal agencies of a goal for funding agreements for research and research and development with small business concerns;

“(B) subsection (y)(5)(A), relating to the requirement for the Department of Defense to establish goals for the transition of Phase III technologies in subcontracting plans;

“(C) subsection (y)(5)(B), relating to the requirement for the Department of Defense to establish procedures for a prime contractor to report the number and dollar amount of contracts with small business concerns for Phase III SBIR projects or STTR projects of the prime contractor; and

“(D) subsection (y)(6), relating to the requirement for the Department of Defense to set a goal to increase the number of Phase II SBIR and STTR contracts that transition into programs of record or fielded systems;

“(2) includes, for a Federal agency that is in compliance with a requirement described under paragraph (1), a description of how the Federal agency achieved compliance; and

“(3) includes a list, organized by Federal agency, of small business concerns that have asserted that—

“(A) the Government or prime contractor—

“(i) did not protect the intellectual property of the small business concern in accordance with data rights under the SBIR or STTR award; or

“(ii) issued a Phase III SBIR or STTR award conditional on relinquishing data rights;

“(B) the Federal agency solicited bids for a contract, or provided funding to an entity other than the small business concern receiving the SBIR or STTR award, that was for work that derived from, extended, or completed efforts made under prior funding agreements under the SBIR program or STTR program;

“(C) the Government or prime contractor did not comply with the SBIR and STTR policy directives and the small business concern filed a comment or complaint to the Office of the National Ombudsman or appealed to the Administrator for intervention; or

“(D) the Federal agency did not comply with subsection (g)(12) or (o)(16) requiring timely notice to the Administrator of any case or controversy before any Federal judicial or administrative tribunal concerning the SBIR program or the STTR program of the Federal agency.”.

SEC. 6306. CLARIFYING THE PHASE III PREFERENCE.

Section 9(r) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(r)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4), and transferring such paragraph to after paragraph (3); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) PHASE III AWARD DIRECTION FOR AGENCIES AND PRIME CONTRACTORS.—To the greatest extent practicable, Federal agencies and Federal prime contractors shall issue Phase III awards relating to technology, including sole source awards and awards under the Defense Research and Development Rapid Innovation Program under section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4366; 10 U.S.C. 2359 note), to the SBIR and STTR award recipients that developed the technology.”.

SEC. 6307. IMPROVEMENTS TO TECHNICAL AND BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.

Section 9(q) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(q)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND BUSINESS” after “TECHNICAL”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “a vendor selected under paragraph (2)” and inserting “1 or more vendors selected under paragraph (2)(A)”;

(ii) by inserting “and business” before “assistance services”; and

(iii) by inserting “assistance with product sales, intellectual property protections, market research, market validation, and development of regulatory plans and manufacturing plans,” after “technologies,”; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “, including intellectual property protections” before the period at the end;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “Each agency may select a vendor to assist small business concerns to meet” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each agency may select 1 or more vendors from which small business concerns may obtain assistance in meeting”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) SELECTION BY SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—A small business concern may, by contract or otherwise, select 1 or more vendors to assist the small business concern in meeting the goals listed in paragraph (1).”; and

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting “(A)” after “paragraph (2)” each place it appears;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$5,000 per year” each place it appears and inserting “\$6,500 per project”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$5,000 per year” each place it appears and inserting “\$35,000 per project”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “which shall be in addition to the amount of the recipient’s award” and inserting “which may, as determined appropriate by the head of the Federal agency, be included as part of the recipient’s award or be in addition to the amount of the recipient’s award”;

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting “or business” after “technical”;

(ii) by striking “the vendor” and inserting “a vendor”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: “Business-related services aimed at improving the commercialization success of a small business concern may be obtained from an entity, such as a public or private organization or an agency of or other entity established or funded by a State that facilitates or accelerates the commercialization of technologies or assists in the creation and growth of private enterprises that are commercializing technology.”;

(E) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting “or business” after “technical” each place it appears; and

(ii) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “the vendor” and inserting “1 or more vendors”; and

(II) by striking “provides” and inserting “provide”; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) MULTIPLE AWARD RECIPIENTS.—The Administrator shall establish a limit on the amount of technical and business assistance services that may be received or purchased under subparagraph (B) by small business concerns with respect to multiple Phase II SBIR or STTR awards for a fiscal year.”

SEC. 6308. EXTENSION OF PHASE 0 PROOF OF CONCEPT PARTNERSHIP PILOT.

Section 9(jj) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(jj)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6) by striking “The Director” and inserting “Not later than February 1, 2019, the Director”; and

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

TITLE LXIV—PROGRAM DIVERSIFICATION INITIATIVES

SEC. 6401. REGIONAL SBIR STATE COLLABORATIVE INITIATIVE PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (mm)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2017” and inserting “2021”;

(ii) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(K) funding for improvements that increase commonality across data systems, re-

duce redundancy, and improve data oversight and accuracy.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS; FAST PROGRAM.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered Federal agency’ means a Federal agency that—

“(i) is required to conduct an SBIR program; and

“(ii) elects to use the funds allocated to the SBIR program of the Federal agency for the purposes described in paragraph (1).

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—Each covered Federal agency shall transfer an amount equal to 15 percent of the funds that are used for the purposes described in paragraph (1) to the Administration—

“(i) for the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program established under subsection (uu);

“(ii) for the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program established under section 34; and

“(iii) to support the Office of the Administration that administers the SBIR program and the STTR program, subject to agreement from other agencies about how the funds will be used, in carrying out those programs and the programs described in clauses (i) and (ii).

“(8) PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Of amounts provided to the Administration under paragraph (7), not less than \$5,000,000 shall be used to provide awards under the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program established under subsection (uu) for each fiscal year in which the program is in effect.

“(B) DISBURSEMENT FLEXIBILITY.—The Administration may use any unused funds made available under subparagraph (A) as of April 1 of each fiscal year for awards to carry out clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (7)(B) after providing written notice to—

“(i) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(ii) the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”; and

(2) by adding after subsection (tt), as added by section 6304 of this Act, the following:

“(uu) REGIONAL SBIR STATE COLLABORATIVE INITIATIVE PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(i) a research institution; and

“(ii) a small business concern;

“(B) the term ‘eligible State’ means—

“(i) a State that the Administrator determines is in the bottom half of States, based on the average number of annual SBIR program awards made to companies in the State for the preceding 3 years for which the Administration has applicable data; and

“(ii) an EPSCoR State that—

“(I) is a State described in clause (i); or

“(II) is—

“(aa) not a State described in clause (i); and

“(bb) invited to participate in a regional collaborative; and

“(C) the term ‘EPSCoR State’ means a State that participates in the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research of the National Science Foundation, as established under section 113 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1862g);

“(D) the term ‘FAST program’ means the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program established under section 34;

“(E) the term ‘pilot program’ means the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program established under paragraph (2);

“(F) the term ‘regional collaborative’ means a collaborative consisting of eligible entities that are located in not less than 3 eligible States; and

“(G) the term ‘State’ means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall establish a pilot program, to be known as the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program, under which the Administrator shall provide awards to regional collaboratives to address the needs of small business concerns in order to be more competitive in the proposal and selection process for awards under the SBIR program and the STTR program and to increase technology transfer and commercialization.

“(3) GOALS.—The goals of the pilot program are—

“(A) to create regional collaboratives that allow eligible entities to work cooperatively to leverage resources to address the needs of small business concerns;

“(B) to grow SBIR program and STTR program cooperative research and development and commercialization through increased awards under those programs;

“(C) to increase the participation of States that have historically received a lower level of awards under the SBIR program and the STTR program;

“(D) to utilize the strengths and advantages of regional collaboratives to better leverage resources, best practices, and economies of scale in a region for the purpose of increasing awards and increasing the commercialization of the SBIR program and STTR projects;

“(E) to increase the competitiveness of the SBIR program and the STTR program;

“(F) to identify sources of outside funding for applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program, including venture capitalists, angel investor groups, private industry, crowd funding, and special loan programs; and

“(G) to offer increased one-on-one engagements with companies and entrepreneurs for SBIR program and STTR program education, assistance, and successful outcomes.

“(4) APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A regional collaborative that desires to participate in the pilot program shall submit to the Administrator an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Administrator may require.

“(B) INCLUSION OF LEAD ELIGIBLE ENTITIES AND COORDINATOR.—A regional collaborative shall include in an application submitted under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the name of each lead eligible entity from each eligible State in the regional collaborative, as designated under paragraph (5)(A); and

“(ii) the name of the coordinator for the regional collaborative, as designated under paragraph (6).

“(C) AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATION.—A regional collaborative shall include in an application submitted under subparagraph (A) an explanation as to how the activities of the regional collaborative under the pilot program would differ from other State and Federal outreach activities in each eligible State in the regional collaborative.

“(5) LEAD ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible State in a regional collaborative shall designate 1 eligible entity located in the eligible State to serve as the lead eligible entity for the eligible State.

“(B) AUTHORIZATION BY GOVERNOR.—Each lead eligible entity designated under subparagraph (A) shall be authorized to act as

the lead eligible entity by the Governor of the applicable eligible State.

“(C) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each lead eligible entity designated under subparagraph (A) shall be responsible for administering the activities and program initiatives described in paragraph (7) in the applicable eligible State.

“(6) REGIONAL COLLABORATIVE COORDINATOR.—Each regional collaborative shall designate a coordinator from amongst the eligible entities located in the eligible States in the regional collaborative, who shall serve as the interface between the regional collaborative and the Administration with respect to measuring cross-State collaboration and program effectiveness and documenting best practices.

“(7) USE OF FUNDS.—Each regional collaborative that is provided an award under the pilot program may, in each eligible State in which an eligible entity of the regional collaborative is located—

“(A) establish an initiative under which first-time applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program are reviewed by experienced, national experts in the United States, as determined by the lead eligible entity designated under paragraph (5)(A);

“(B) engage national mentors on a frequent basis to work directly with applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program, particularly during Phase II, to assist with the process of preparing and submitting a proposal;

“(C) create and make available an online mechanism to serve as a resource for applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program to identify and connect with Federal labs, prime government contractor companies, other industry partners, and regional industry cluster organizations;

“(D) conduct focused and concentrated outreach efforts to increase participation in the SBIR program and the STTR program by small business concerns owned and controlled by women, small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (as defined in section 8(d)(3)(C)), and historically black colleges and universities;

“(E) administer a structured program of training and technical assistance—

“(i) to prepare applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program—

“(I) to compete more effectively for Phase I and Phase II awards; and

“(II) to develop and implement a successful commercialization plan;

“(ii) to assist eligible States focusing on transition and commercialization to win Phase III awards from public and private partners;

“(iii) to create more competitive proposals to increase awards from all Federal sources, with a focus on awards under the SBIR program and the STTR program; and

“(iv) to assist first-time applicants by providing small grants for proof of concept research; and

“(F) assist applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program to identify sources of outside funding, including venture capitalists, angel investor groups, private industry, crowd funding, and special loan programs.

“(8) AWARD AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall provide an award to each eligible State in which an eligible entity of a regional collaborative is located in an amount that is not more than \$300,000 to carry out the activities described in paragraph (7).

“(B) LIMITATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An eligible State may not receive an award under both the FAST program and the pilot program for the same year.

“(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to prevent an eligible State from applying for an award under the FAST program and the pilot program for the same year.

“(9) DURATION OF AWARD.—An award provided under the pilot program shall be for a period of not more than 1 year, and may be renewed by the Administrator for 1 additional year.

“(10) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on September 30, 2021.

“(11) REPORT.—Not later than February 1, 2021, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program, which shall include—

“(A) an assessment of the pilot program and the effectiveness of the pilot program in meeting the goals described in paragraph (3);

“(B) an assessment of the best practices, including an analysis of how the pilot program compares to the FAST program and a single-State approach; and

“(C) recommendations as to whether any aspect of the pilot program should be extended or made permanent.”.

SEC. 6402. FEDERAL AND STATE TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 34 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2001 through 2005” and inserting “2017 through 2021”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “fiscal years 2001 through 2005” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

(2) in subsection (i), by striking “September 30, 2005” and inserting “September 30, 2021”.

TITLE LXV—OVERSIGHT AND SIMPLIFICATION INITIATIVES

SEC. 6501. DATA REALIGNMENT AND MODERNIZATION.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding after subsection (uu), as added by section 6401 of this Act, the following:

“(vv) SBIR AND STTR INTERAGENCY POLICY COMMITTEE.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘Committee’ means the SBIR and STTR Interagency Policy Committee established under paragraph (2);

“(B) the term ‘participating Federal agency’ means a Federal agency with an SBIR program or an STTR program; and

“(C) the term ‘phase’ means Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an interagency committee to be known as the ‘SBIR and STTR Interagency Policy Committee’.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall include—

“(A) 4 representatives from each participating Federal agency, of which—

“(i) 1 shall have expertise with respect to the SBIR program and STTR program of the Federal agency;

“(ii) 1 shall have expertise with respect to the broader research and development missions and programs of the Federal agency;

“(iii) 1 shall have expertise with respect to marketplace commercialization or to the transition of technologies to support the missions of the Federal agency; and

“(iv) 1 shall have expertise with respect to the information technology systems of the Federal agency; and

“(B) 2 representatives from the Administration, of which—

“(i) 1 shall serve as chairperson of the Committee; and

“(ii) 1 shall be from the Information Technology Development Team of the Office of Investment and Innovation of the Administration.

“(4) WORKING GROUPS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall establish working groups as necessary to ensure consistency and clarity between the participating Federal agencies.

“(B) DATA REALIGNMENT AND MODERNIZATION WORKING GROUP.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall establish a data alignment and modernization working group, which shall review the recommendations made in the report to Congress by the Office of Science and Technology of the Administration entitled ‘SBIR/STTR TechNet Public & Government Databases’, dated September 15, 2014, and the practices of participating Federal agencies to—

“(I) determine how to collect data on achievements by small business concerns in each phase of the SBIR program and the STTR program and ensure collection and dissemination of such data in a timely, efficient, and uniform manner;

“(II) establish a uniform baseline for metrics that support improving the solicitation, contracting, funding, and execution of program management in the SBIR program and the STTR program;

“(III) normalize formatting and database usage across participating Federal agencies; and

“(IV) determine the feasibility of developing a common system across all participating Federal agencies and the paperwork requirements under such a common system.

“(ii) MEMBERSHIP.—Each member of the Committee shall serve as a member of the data alignment and modernization working group.

“(5) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than September 31, 2018, the Committee shall brief the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on the solutions identified by the working group under paragraph (4) and resources needed to execute the solutions.”.

SEC. 6502. IMPLEMENTATION OF OUTSTANDING REAUTHORIZATION PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9(mm) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)), as amended by section 6401(1) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (3) and (9)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) SUSPENSION OF FUNDING.—

“(A) FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal years 2018 and 2019, any Federal agency that has not implemented each provision of law described in clause (ii)—

“(I) shall continue to provide amounts to the Administration in accordance with paragraph (7)(B); and

“(II) may not use any additional amounts as described in paragraph (1) until 30 days after the date on which the Federal agency submits to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives documentation demonstrating that the Federal agency has implemented and is in compliance with each provision of law described in clause (ii).

“(ii) PROVISIONS.—The provisions of law described in this subparagraph are the following:

“(I) Subsection (r)(4), relating to Phase III preferences.

“(II) Paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (y), relating to insertion goals.

“(III) Subsection (g)(4)(B), relating to shortening the decision time for SBIR awards.

“(IV) Subsection (o)(4)(B), relating to shortening the decision time for STTR awards.

“(V) Subsection (v), relating to reducing paperwork and compliance burdens.

“(B) FOR ADMINISTRATION.—For fiscal years 2018 and 2019, if the Administration is not in compliance with subsection (b)(7), relating to annual reports to Congress, the Administration may not use amounts received under paragraph (7)(B) of this subsection for a purpose described in clause (iii) of such paragraph (7)(B).”

(b) CLARIFICATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 9(b)(7) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)(7)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “not less than annually” and inserting “not later than December 31 of each year”.

SEC. 6503. STRENGTHENING OF THE REQUIREMENT TO SHORTEN THE APPLICATION REVIEW AND DECISION TIME.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(4), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) make a final decision on each proposal submitted under the SBIR program—

“(i) for the Department of Health and Human Services, not later than 1 year after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes, with a goal to reduce the review and decision time to less than 10 months by September 30, 2019;

“(ii) for the Department of Agriculture and the National Science Foundation, not later than 6 months after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes; or

“(iii) for any other Federal agency—

“(I) not later than 90 days after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes; or

“(II) if the Administrator authorizes an extension with respect to a solicitation, not later than 90 days after the date that would otherwise be applicable to the Federal agency under subclause (I);”;

(2) in subsection (o)(4), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) make a final decision on each proposal submitted under the STTR program—

“(i) for the Department of Health and Human Services, not later than 1 year after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes, with a goal to reduce the review and decision time to less than 10 months by September 30, 2019;

“(ii) for the Department of Agriculture and the National Science Foundation, not later than 6 months after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes; or

“(iii) for any other Federal agency—

“(I) not later than 90 days after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes; or

“(II) if the Administrator authorizes an extension with respect to a solicitation, not later than 90 days after the date that would otherwise be applicable to the Federal agency under subclause (I);”.

SEC. 6504. CONTINUED GAO OVERSIGHT OF ALLOCATION COMPLIANCE AND ACCURACY IN FUNDING BASE CALCULATIONS.

Section 5136(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (15 U.S.C. 638 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “until the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and insert “until the date on which the Comptroller General of the United States submits the report relating to fiscal year 2019”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) assess whether the change in the base funding for the Department of Defense as required by subparagraphs (J) and (K) of section 9(f)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(f)(1))—

“(i) improves transparency for determining whether the Department is complying with the allocation requirements;

“(ii) reduces the burden of calculating the allocations; and

“(iii) improves the compliance of the Department with the allocation requirements; and”;

(3) in paragraph (2) by striking “under subparagraph (B)” and inserting “under subparagraphs (B) and (C)”.

SEC. 6505. COORDINATION BETWEEN AGENCIES ON COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (j), as amended by section 6202(a) of this Act, by adding at the end the following:

“(5) COORDINATION OF COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directive issued pursuant to this subsection to clarify that a small business concern receiving training through the Innovation Corps program with administrative funds made available under subsection (mm) shall not receive discretionary business assistance funds for the same or similar activities as allowed under subsection (q).”;

(2) in subsection (p), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) COORDINATION OF COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directive issued pursuant to this subsection to clarify that a small business concern receiving training through the Innovation Corps program with administrative funds made available under subsection (mm) shall not receive discretionary business assistance funds for the same or similar activities as allowed under subsection (q).”.

TITLE LXVI—PARTICIPATION BY WOMEN AND MINORITIES

SEC. 6601. SBA COORDINATION ON INCREASING OUTREACH FOR WOMEN AND MINORITY-OWNED BUSINESSES.

Section 9(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) to coordinate with participating agencies on efforts to increase outreach and awards under each of the SBIR and STTR programs to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4).”.

SEC. 6602. FEDERAL AGENCY OUTREACH REQUIREMENTS FOR WOMEN AND MINORITY-OWNED BUSINESSES.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (11), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) implement an outreach program to small business concerns for the purpose of enhancing its SBIR program, under which the Federal agency shall—

“(A) provide outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women

and socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4); and

“(B) establish goals for outreach by the Federal agency to the small business concerns described in subparagraph (A).”;

(2) in subsection (o)(14), by striking “SBIR program;” and inserting “SBIR program, under which the Federal agency shall—

“(A) provide outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4); and

“(B) establish goals for outreach by the Federal agency to the small business concerns described in subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 6603. STTR POLICY DIRECTIVE MODIFICATION.

Section 9(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(p)), as amended by section 6505 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directive issued pursuant to this subsection to provide for enhanced outreach efforts to increase the participation of small business concerns owned and controlled by women and socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4), in technological innovation and in STTR programs.”.

SEC. 6604. INTERAGENCY SBIR/STTR POLICY COMMITTEE.

Section 5124 of the SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1837) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee shall meet not less than twice per year to carry out the duties under subsection (c).

“(2) OUTREACH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES.—If the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee meets to discuss outreach and technical assistance activities to increase the participation of small business concerns that are underrepresented in the SBIR and STTR programs, the Committee shall invite to the meeting—

“(A) a representative of the Minority Business Development Agency; and

“(B) relevant stakeholders that work to advance the interests of—

“(i) small business concerns owned and controlled by women, as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and

“(ii) socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(4)).”.

SEC. 6605. DIVERSITY AND STEM WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

(2) the term “covered STEM intern” means a student at, or recent graduate from, an institution of higher education serving as an intern—

(A) whose course of study studied is focused on the STEM fields; and

(B) who is a woman or a person from an underrepresented population in the STEM fields;

(3) the term “eligible entity” means a small business concern that—

(A) is receiving amounts under an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program of a Federal agency on the date on which the Federal agency awards a grant to the small business concern under subsection (b); and

(B) provides internships for covered STEM interns;

(4) the terms “Federal agency”, “SBIR”, and “STTR” have the meanings given those terms under section 9(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e));

(5) the term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given the term under section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a));

(6) the term “person from an underrepresented population in the STEM fields” means a person from a group that is underrepresented in the population of STEM students, as determined by the Administrator;

(7) the term “pilot program” means the Diversity and STEM Workforce Development Pilot Program established under subsection (b);

(8) the term “recent graduate”, relating to a woman or a person from an underrepresented population in the STEM fields, means that the woman or person from an underrepresented population in the STEM fields earned an associate degree, baccalaureate degree, or postbaccalaureate from an institution of higher education during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the internship;

(9) the term “small business concern” has the meaning given the term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and

(10) the term “STEM fields” means the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM FOR INTERNSHIPS FOR WOMEN AND PEOPLE FROM UNDERREPRESENTED POPULATIONS.—The Administrator shall establish a Diversity and STEM Workforce Development Pilot Program to encourage the business community to provide workforce development opportunities for covered STEM interns, under which a Federal agency participating in the SBIR program or STTR program may make a grant to 1 or more eligible entities for the costs of internships for covered STEM interns.

(c) AMOUNT AND USE OF GRANTS.—

(1) AMOUNT.—A grant under subsection (b)—

(A) may not be in an amount of more than \$15,000 per fiscal year; and

(B) shall be in addition to the amount of the award to the recipient under the SBIR program or the STTR program.

(2) USE.—Not less than 90 percent of the amount of a grant under subsection (b) shall be used by the eligible entity to provide stipends or other similar payments to interns.

(d) EVALUATION.—Not later than January 31 of the first calendar year after the third fiscal year during which the Administrator carries out the pilot program, the Administrator shall submit to Congress—

(1) data on the results of the pilot program, such as the number and demographics of the covered STEM interns participating in an internship funded under the pilot program and the amount spent on such internships; and

(2) an assessment of whether the pilot program helped the SBIR program and STTR program achieve the congressional objective of fostering and encouraging the participation of women and persons from underrepresented populations in the STEM fields.

(e) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate after the end of the fourth fiscal year during which the Administrator carries out the pilot program.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the pilot program.

TITLE LXVII—TECHNICAL CHANGES

SEC. 6701. UNIFORM REFERENCE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (cc), by striking “National Institutes of Health” and inserting “Department of Health and Human Services”; and

(2) in subsection (dd)(1)(A), by striking “Director of the National Institutes of Health” and inserting “Secretary of Health and Human Services”.

SEC. 6702. FLEXIBILITY FOR PHASE II AWARD INVITATIONS.

Section 9(e)(4)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)(4)(B)) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(1) by striking “, which shall not include any invitation, pre-screening, or pre-selection process for eligibility for Phase II.”; and

(2) by inserting “in which eligibility for an award shall not be based only on an invitation, pre-screening, or pre-selection process and” before “in which awards”.

SA 4673. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4609 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER and intended to be proposed 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:

Strike page 1 line 2 through page 15 line 2 and insert:

SEC. 578. BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR EMPLOYEES OF AGENCIES AND SCHOOLS PROVIDING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS.

(a) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Commencing not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, each covered local educational agency and each Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code, shall have in effect policies and procedures that—

(1) require that a criminal background check be conducted for each school employee of the agency or school, respectively, that includes—

(A) a search of the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the school employee resides;

(B) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the school employee resides;

(C) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

(D) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 119 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919);

(2) prohibit the employment of a school employee as a school employee at the agency or school, respectively, if such employee—

(A) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under paragraph (1);

(B) makes a false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

(C) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

(i) murder;

(ii) child abuse or neglect;

(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

(iv) spousal abuse;

(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

(vi) kidnapping;

(vii) arson; or

(viii) physical assault, battery, or a drug-related offense, committed on or after the date that is five years before the date of such employee’s criminal background check under paragraph (1); or

(D) has been convicted of any other crime that is a violent or sexual crime against a minor;

(3) require that each criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) be periodically repeated or updated in accordance with policies established by the covered local educational agency or the Department of Defense (in the case of a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code);

(4) upon request, provide each school employee who has had a criminal background check under paragraph (1) with a copy of the results of the criminal background check;

(5) provide for a timely process, by which a school employee of the school or agency may appeal, but which does not permit the employee to be employed as a school employee during such appeal, the results of a criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) which prohibit the employee from being employed as a school employee under paragraph (2) to—

(A) challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information produced by such criminal background check; and

(B) establish or reestablish eligibility to be hired or reinstated as a school employee by demonstrating that the information is materially inaccurate or incomplete, and has been corrected; and

(6) allow the covered local educational agency or school, as the case may be, to share the results of a school employee’s criminal background check recently conducted under paragraph (1) with another local educational agency that is considering such school employee for employment as a school employee.

(b) FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Attorney General, attorney general of a State, or other State law enforcement official may charge reasonable fees for conducting a criminal background check under subsection (a)(1), but such fees shall not exceed the actual costs for the processing and administration of the criminal background check.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ‘covered local educational agency’ means a local educational agency that receives funds—

(A) under subsection (b) or (d) of section 8003, or section 8007, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703, 7707), as such sections are in effect before the effective date for title VII of the Every Student Succeeds Act (Public Law 114-95); or

(B) under subsection (b) or (d) of section 7003, or section 7007, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703, 7707), beginning on the effective date of such title VII.

(2) SCHOOL EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘school employee’ means—

(A) a person who—

(i) is an employee of, or is seeking employment with—

(I) a covered local educational agency; or

(II) a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10,

United States Code, such elementary and secondary school; and

(ii) as a result of such employment, has (or will have) a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students; or

(B)(i) any person, or an employee of any person, who has a contract or agreement to provide services to a covered local educational agency or a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code; and

(ii) such person or employee, as a result of such contract or agreement, has a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students.

SEC. 578A. PROHIBITION ON AIDING AND ABETTING SEXUAL ABUSE.

SA 4674. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4608 submitted by Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) and intended to be proposed 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:

Strike page 1 line 2 through page 6 line 15 and insert:

SEC. 578. BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR EMPLOYEES OF AGENCIES AND SCHOOLS PROVIDING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS.

(a) **BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—Commencing not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, each covered local educational agency and each Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code, shall have in effect policies and procedures that—

(1) require that a criminal background check be conducted for each school employee of the agency or school, respectively, that includes—

(A) a search of the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the school employee resides;

(B) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the school employee resides;

(C) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

(D) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 119 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919);

(2) prohibit the employment of a school employee as a school employee at the agency or school, respectively, if such employee—

(A) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under paragraph (1);

(B) makes a false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

(C) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

(i) murder;

(ii) child abuse or neglect;

(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

(iv) spousal abuse;

(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

(vi) kidnapping;

(vii) arson; or

(viii) physical assault, battery, or a drug-related offense, committed on or after the date that is five years before the date of such employee's criminal background check under paragraph (1); or

(D) has been convicted of any other crime that is a violent or sexual crime against a minor;

(3) require that each criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) be periodically repeated or updated in accordance with policies established by the covered local educational agency or the Department of Defense (in the case of a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code);

(4) upon request, provide each school employee who has had a criminal background check under paragraph (1) with a copy of the results of the criminal background check;

(5) provide for a timely process, by which a school employee of the school or agency may appeal, but which does not permit the employee to be employed as a school employee during such appeal, the results of a criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) which prohibit the employee from being employed as a school employee under paragraph (2) to—

(A) challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information produced by such criminal background check; and

(B) establish or reestablish eligibility to be hired or reinstated as a school employee by demonstrating that the information is materially inaccurate or incomplete, and has been corrected; and

(6) allow the covered local educational agency or school, as the case may be, to share the results of a school employee's criminal background check recently conducted under paragraph (1) with another local educational agency that is considering such school employee for employment as a school employee.

(b) **FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—The Attorney General, attorney general of a State, or other State law enforcement official may charge reasonable fees for conducting a criminal background check under subsection (a)(1), but such fees shall not exceed the actual costs for the processing and administration of the criminal background check.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.**—The term “covered local educational agency” means a local educational agency that receives funds—

(A) under subsection (b) or (d) of section 8003, or section 8007, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703, 7707), as such sections are in effect before the effective date for title VII of the Every Student Succeeds Act (Public Law 114-95); or

(B) under subsection (b) or (d) of section 7003, or section 7007, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703, 7707), beginning on the effective date of such title VII.

(2) **SCHOOL EMPLOYEE.**—The term “school employee” means—

(A) a person who—

(i) is an employee of, or is seeking employment with—

(I) a covered local educational agency; or

(II) a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code, such elementary and secondary school; and

(ii) as a result of such employment, has (or will have) a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students; or

(B)(i) any person, or an employee of any person, who has a contract or agreement to provide services to a covered local educational agency or a Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary school established pursuant to section 2164 of title 10, United States Code; and

(ii) such person or employee, as a result of such contract or agreement, has a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students.

SA 4675. Mr. BENNET 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 XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1667. INCREASED FUNDING FOR CERTAIN MISSILE DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

(a) **PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense by section 101 is hereby increased by \$290,000,000, with the amount of increase to be available for procurement, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4101 and available for procurement for the following:

(1) Iron Dome, \$20,000,000.

(2) David's Sling Weapon System, \$150,000,000.

(3) Arrow 3 Upper Tier, \$120,000,000.

(b) **RDT&E, DEFENSE-WIDE.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense by section 201 is hereby increased by \$29,900,000, with the amount of increase to be available for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4201 and available for research, development, test, and evaluation for the following:

(1) David's Sling Weapon System, \$19,300,000.

(2) Arrow 3 Upper Tier, \$4,100,000.

(3) Base Arrow, \$6,500,000.

(c) **CONSTRUCTION OF INCREASE.**—Amounts available under subsection (a) for procurement for items specified in subsection (a), and amounts available under subsection (b) for research, development, test, and evaluation for items specified in subsection (b), are in addition to any other amounts available for such purposes for such items in this Act.

(d) **OFFSET.**—

(1) **O&M, NAVY.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense by section 301 is hereby decreased by \$24,900,000, with the amount of decrease to be applied against amounts available for Operation and Maintenance, Navy, for Enterprise Information as specified in the funding table in section 4301.

(2) **O&M, DEFENSE-WIDE.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense by section 301 is hereby decreased by \$295,000,000, with the amount of decrease to be applied against savings otherwise available for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4301 for purposes, and in amounts, as follows:

(A) Foreign currency savings, \$200,000,000.

(B) Bulk fuel overestimation, \$95,000,000.

SA 4676. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4253 submitted by Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. VITTER) and intended to be proposed 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:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

**DIVISION F—SBIR AND STTR
REAUTHORIZATION AND IMPROVEMENTS
SEC. 6001. SHORT TITLE.**

This division may be cited as the “SBIR and STTR Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2016”.

**TITLE LXI—REAUTHORIZATION OF
PROGRAMS**

**SEC. 6101. PERMANENCY OF SBIR PROGRAM AND
STTR PROGRAM.**

(a) SBIR.—Section 9(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(m)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “TERMINATION” and inserting “SBIR PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION”; and

(2) by striking “terminate on September 30, 2017” and inserting “be in effect for each fiscal year”.

(b) STTR.—Section 9(n)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “through fiscal year 2017”.

**TITLE LXII—ENHANCED SMALL BUSINESS
ACCESS TO FEDERAL INNOVATION IN-
VESTMENTS**

**SEC. 6201. ALLOCATION INCREASES AND TRANS-
PARENCY IN BASE CALCULATION.**

(a) SBIR.—Section 9(f) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “expend” and inserting “obligate for expenditure”; and

(B) in subparagraph (H), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (I), by striking “in fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter,” and inserting “in each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

“(J) for a Federal agency other than the Department of Defense, the National Science Foundation, or the Department of Health and Human Services—

“(i) not less than 3.4 percent of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the Federal agency in fiscal year 2022;

“(ii) not less than 3.6 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2023;

“(iii) not less than 3.8 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2024;

“(iv) not less than 4 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2025;

“(v) not less than 4.2 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2026;

“(vi) not less than 4.4 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2027; and

“(vii) not less than 4.54 percent of such extramural budget in fiscal year 2028 and each fiscal year thereafter;

“(K) for the Department of Defense—

“(i) not less than 2.6 percent of the budget for research, development, test, and evaluation of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2022;

“(ii) not less than 2.7 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2023;

“(iii) not less than 2.8 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2024;

“(iv) not less than 2.9 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2025;

“(v) not less than 3 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2026;

“(vi) not less than 3.1 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2027;

“(vii) not less than 3.2 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2028;

“(viii) not less than 3.3 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2029;

“(ix) not less than 3.4 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2030; and

“(x) not less than 3.5 percent of such budget in fiscal year 2031 and each fiscal year thereafter; and

“(L) for the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health and Human Services, for fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, the lesser of—

“(i) the percentage of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, equal to the sum of—

“(I) the percentage in effect under this paragraph for the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, for the previous fiscal year; and

“(II)(aa) 0.04 percent; or

“(bb) if the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, for the fiscal year is not less than 103 percent of such extramural budget for the previous fiscal year, 0.2 percent; or

“(ii) 4.5 percent of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting “(or for the Department of Defense, an amount of the budget for basic research of the Department of Defense)” after “research”; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by inserting “(or for the Department of Defense an amount of the budget for research, development, test, and evaluation of the Department of Defense)” after “of the agency”.

(b) STTR.—Section 9(n)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “expend” and inserting “obligate for expenditure”; and

(B) by striking “not less than the percentage of that extramural budget specified in subparagraph (B)” and inserting “for a Federal agency other than the Department of Defense, the National Science Foundation, or the Department of Health and Human Services, not less than the percentage of that extramural budget specified in subparagraph (B), for the Department of Defense, not less than the percentage of the budget for research, development, test, and evaluation of the Department of Defense specified in subparagraph (B), and for the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health and Human Services, not less than the percentage of that extramural budget specified in subparagraph (C)”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “OTHER THAN FOR NSF AND HHS” after “AMOUNTS”;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “the extramural budget required to be expended by an agency” and inserting “the extramural budget, for a Federal agency other than the Department of Defense, the National Science Foundation, or the Department of Health and Human Services, and of the budget for research, development,

test, and evaluation, for the Department of Defense, required to be obligated for expenditure with small business concerns”;

(C) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) in clause (v), by striking “fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) 0.5 percent for fiscal year 2022;

“(vii) 0.55 percent for fiscal year 2023;

“(viii) 0.6 percent for fiscal year 2024;

“(ix) 0.65 percent for fiscal year 2025;

“(x) 0.7 percent for fiscal year 2026;

“(xi) 0.75 percent for fiscal year 2027;

“(xii) 0.8 percent for fiscal year 2028;

“(xiii) 0.85 percent for fiscal year 2029;

“(xiv) 0.9 percent for fiscal year 2030; and

“(xv) 0.95 percent for fiscal year 2031 and each fiscal year thereafter.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXPENDITURE AMOUNTS FOR NSF AND

HHS.—The percentage of the extramural budget required to be expended by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health and Human Services in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall be—

“(i) for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, 0.45 percent; and

“(ii) for fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, the lesser of—

“(I) the percentage of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, equal to the sum of—

“(aa) the percentage in effect under this paragraph for the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, for the previous fiscal year; and

“(bb)(AA) 0 percent; or

“(BB) if the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively, for the fiscal year is not less than 103 percent of such extramural budget for the previous fiscal year, 0.05 percent; or

“(II) 0.95 percent of the extramural budget for research or research and development of the National Science Foundation or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively.”.

**SEC. 6202. REGULAR OVERSIGHT OF AWARD
AMOUNTS.**

(a) ELIMINATION OF AUTOMATIC INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 9(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(D), by inserting “through fiscal year 2016” after “every year”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) 2016 MODIFICATIONS FOR DOLLAR VALUE OF AWARDS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the SBIR and STTR Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2016, the Administrator shall modify the policy directives issued under this subsection to—

“(A) eliminate the annual adjustments for inflation of the dollar value of awards described in paragraph (2)(D); and

“(B) clarify that Congress intends to review the dollar value of awards every 3 fiscal years.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REGULAR REVIEW OF THE AWARD SIZES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that for fiscal year 2019, and every third fiscal year thereafter, Congress should evaluate whether the maximum award sizes under the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) should be adjusted and, if so, take appropriate action

to direct that such adjustments be made under the policy directives issued under subsection (j) of such section.

(2) **POLICY CONSIDERATIONS.**—In reviewing adjustments to the maximum award sizes, Congress should take into consideration the balance of number of awards to size of awards, the missions of Federal agencies, and the technology needed to support national goals.

(c) **CLARIFICATION OF SEQUENTIAL PHASE II AWARDS.**—Section 9(ff) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(ff)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **CLARIFICATION OF SEQUENTIAL PHASE II AWARDS.**—The head of a Federal agency shall ensure that any sequential Phase II award is made in accordance with the limitations on award sizes under subsection (aa).

“(4) **CROSS-AGENCY SEQUENTIAL PHASE II AWARDS.**—A small business concern that receives a sequential Phase II SBIR or Phase II STTR award for a project from a Federal agency is eligible to receive an additional sequential Phase II award that continues work on that project from another Federal agency.”.

TITLE LXIII—COMMERCIALIZATION IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 6301. PERMANENCY OF THE COMMERCIALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM FOR CIVILIAN AGENCIES.

Section 9(gg) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(gg)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “PILOT PROGRAM” and inserting “COMMERCIALIZATION DEVELOPMENT AWARDS”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (2), (7), and (8);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), respectively;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘commercialization development program’ means a program established by a covered Federal agency under paragraph (1); and

“(B) the term ‘covered Federal agency’—

“(i) means a Federal agency participating in the SBIR program or the STTR program; and

“(ii) does not include the Department of Defense.”; and

(5) by striking “pilot program” each place it appears and inserting “commercialization development program”.

SEC. 6302. ENFORCEMENT OF NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS GOAL FOR FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 9(h) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(h)) is amended to read as follows:

“(h) **NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS GOAL FOR FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator, in consultation with Federal agencies, shall establish a Governmentwide goal for each fiscal year, which shall be not less than 10 percent, for the percentage of the amounts made available for research or research and development that shall be obligated for funding agreements—

“(A) with small business concerns; or

“(B) that will facilitate the development of research and development small business concerns.

“(2) **AGENCY GOALS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of each Federal agency which has a budget for research or research and development in excess of \$20,000,000, in consultation with the Administrator, shall establish a goal for the Federal agency for each fiscal year that is appropriate to the mission of the Federal agency for the percentage of such budget that shall be obligated for funding agreements—

“(i) with small business concerns; or

“(ii) that will facilitate the development of research and development small business concerns.

“(B) **LIMITATION.**—The head of a Federal agency may not establish a percentage goal under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year that is less than the percentage goal that was established under subparagraph (A) for the Federal agency for the previous fiscal year.”.

SEC. 6303. PROTECTING INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(tt) **PROTECTING INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.**—

“(1) **COST-REIMBURSEMENT CONTRACTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B)(ii), the cost of seeking protection for intellectual property, including a trademark, copyright, or patent, that was created through work performed under an STTR award that uses a cost-reimbursement contract or an SBIR award that uses a cost-reimbursement contract is allowable as an indirect cost under that award.

“(B) **CLARIFICATION OF PATENT COSTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A Federal agency shall not directly or indirectly inhibit, through the policies, directives, or practices of the Federal agency, an otherwise eligible small business concern performing under an award described in subparagraph (A) from recovering patent costs incurred as requirements under that award, including—

“(I) the costs of preparing—

“(aa) invention disclosures;

“(bb) reports; and

“(cc) other documents;

“(II) the costs for searching the art to the extent necessary to make the invention disclosures;

“(III) other costs in connection with the filing and prosecution of a United States patent application where title or royalty-free license is to be conveyed to the Federal Government; and

“(IV) general counseling services relating to patent matters, including advice on patent laws, regulations, clauses, and employee agreements.

“(ii) **RECOVERY LIMITATIONS.**—The patent costs described in clause (i) shall be allowable for technology developed under a—

“(I) Phase I award, as indirect costs in an amount not greater than \$5,000;

“(II) Phase II award, as indirect costs in an amount not greater than \$15,000; and

“(III) Phase III award in which the Federal Government has government purpose rights (as defined in section 227.7103-5 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations).

“(2) **FIRM FIXED-PRICE CONTRACTS.**—An otherwise eligible small business concern performing under an STTR award that uses a firm fixed-price contract or an SBIR award that uses a firm fixed-price contract may recover fair and reasonable costs arising from seeking protection for intellectual property, including a trademark, copyright, or patent, that was created through work performed under that award.”.

SEC. 6304. ANNUAL GAO AUDIT OF COMPLIANCE WITH COMMERCIALIZATION GOALS.

Section 9(nn) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(nn)) is amended to read as follows:

“(nn) **ANNUAL GAO REPORT ON GOVERNMENT COMPLIANCE WITH GOALS, INCENTIVES, AND PHASE III PREFERENCE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the SBIR and STTR Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2016, and every year thereafter until the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of the SBIR and STTR Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business

and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report that—

“(1) discusses the status of the compliance of Federal agencies with the requirements or authorities established under—

“(A) subsection (h), relating to the establishment by certain Federal agencies of a goal for funding agreements for research and research and development with small business concerns;

“(B) subsection (y)(5)(A), relating to the requirement for the Department of Defense to establish goals for the transition of Phase III technologies in subcontracting plans;

“(C) subsection (y)(5)(B), relating to the requirement for the Department of Defense to establish procedures for a prime contractor to report the number and dollar amount of contracts with small business concerns for Phase III SBIR projects or STTR projects of the prime contractor; and

“(D) subsection (y)(6), relating to the requirement for the Department of Defense to set a goal to increase the number of Phase II SBIR and STTR contracts that transition into programs of record or fielded systems;

“(2) includes, for a Federal agency that is in compliance with a requirement described under paragraph (1), a description of how the Federal agency achieved compliance; and

“(3) includes a list, organized by Federal agency, of small business concerns that have asserted to an appropriate Federal agency that—

“(A) the Government or prime contractor—

“(i) did not protect the intellectual property of the small business concern in accordance with data rights under the SBIR or STTR award; or

“(ii) issued a Phase III SBIR or STTR award conditional on relinquishing data rights;

“(B) the Federal agency solicited bids for a contract, or provided funding to an entity other than the small business concern receiving the SBIR or STTR award, that was for work that derived from, extended, or completed efforts made under prior funding agreements under the SBIR program or STTR program;

“(C) the Government or prime contractor did not comply with the SBIR and STTR policy directives and the small business concern filed a comment or complaint to the Office of the National Ombudsman or appealed to the Administrator for intervention; or

“(D) the Federal agency did not comply with subsection (g)(12) or (o)(16) requiring timely notice to the Administrator of any case or controversy before any Federal judicial or administrative tribunal concerning the SBIR program or the STTR program of the Federal agency.”.

SEC. 6305. CLARIFYING THE PHASE III PREFERENCE.

Section 9(r) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(r)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4), and transferring such paragraph to after paragraph (3); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) **PHASE III AWARD DIRECTION FOR AGENCIES AND PRIME CONTRACTORS.**—To the greatest extent practicable, Federal agencies and Federal prime contractors shall issue Phase III awards relating to technology, including sole source awards, to the SBIR and STTR award recipients that developed the technology.”.

SEC. 6306. IMPROVEMENTS TO TECHNICAL AND BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.

Section 9(q) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(q)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND BUSINESS” after “TECHNICAL”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “a vendor selected under paragraph (2)” and inserting “1 or more vendors selected under paragraph (2)(A)”;

(ii) by inserting “and business” before “assistance services”; and

(iii) by inserting “assistance with product sales, intellectual property protections, market research, market validation, and development of regulatory plans and manufacturing plans,” after “technologies,”; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “, including intellectual property protections” before the period at the end;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “Each agency may select a vendor to assist small business concerns to meet” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each agency may select 1 or more vendors from which small business concerns may obtain assistance in meeting”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) SELECTION BY SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—A small business concern may, by contract or otherwise, select 1 or more vendors to assist the small business concern in meeting the goals listed in paragraph (1).”; and

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting “(A)” after “paragraph (2)” each place it appears;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$5,000 per year” each place it appears and inserting “\$6,500 per project”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$5,000 per year” each place it appears and inserting “\$35,000 per project”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “which shall be in addition to the amount of the recipient’s award” and inserting “which may, as determined appropriate by the head of the Federal agency, be included as part of the recipient’s award or be in addition to the amount of the recipient’s award”;

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting “or business” after “technical”;

(ii) by striking “the vendor” and inserting “a vendor”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: “Business-related services aimed at improving the commercialization success of a small business concern may be obtained from an entity, such as a public or private organization or an agency of or other entity established or funded by a State that facilitates or accelerates the commercialization of technologies or assists in the creation and growth of private enterprises that are commercializing technology.”;

(E) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting “or business” after “technical” each place it appears; and

(ii) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “the vendor” and inserting “1 or more vendors”; and

(II) by striking “provides” and inserting “provide”; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) MULTIPLE AWARD RECIPIENTS.—The Administrator shall establish a limit on the amount of technical and business assistance services that may be received or purchased under subparagraph (B) by small business concerns with respect to multiple Phase II SBIR or STTR awards for a fiscal year.”.

SEC. 6307. EXTENSION OF PHASE 0 PROOF OF CONCEPT PARTNERSHIP PILOT.

Section 9(jj) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(jj)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6) by striking “The Director” and inserting “Not later than February 1, 2019, the Director”; and

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

TITLE LXIV—PROGRAM DIVERSIFICATION INITIATIVES

SEC. 6401. REGIONAL SBIR STATE COLLABORATIVE INITIATIVE PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (mm)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2017” and inserting “2021”;

(ii) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(K) funding for improvements that increase commonality across data systems, reduce redundancy, and improve data oversight and accuracy.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS; FAST PROGRAM.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘covered Federal agency’ means a Federal agency that—

“(i) is required to conduct an SBIR program; and

“(ii) elects to use the funds allocated to the SBIR program of the Federal agency for the purposes described in paragraph (1).

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—Each covered Federal agency shall transfer an amount equal to 15 percent of the funds that are used for the purposes described in paragraph (1) to the Administration—

“(i) for the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program established under subsection (uu);

“(ii) for the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program established under section 34; and

“(iii) to support the Office of the Administration that administers the SBIR program and the STTR program, subject to agreement from other agencies about how the funds will be used, in carrying out those programs and the programs described in clauses (i) and (ii).

“(8) PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Of amounts provided to the Administration under paragraph (7), not less than \$5,000,000 shall be used to provide awards under the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program established under subsection (uu) for each fiscal year in which the program is in effect.

“(B) DISBURSEMENT FLEXIBILITY.—The Administration may use any unused funds made available under subparagraph (A) as of April 1 of each fiscal year for awards to carry out clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (7)(B) after providing written notice to—

“(i) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(ii) the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”; and

(2) by adding after subsection (tt), as added by section 6303 of this Act, the following:

“(uu) REGIONAL SBIR STATE COLLABORATIVE INITIATIVE PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(i) a research institution; and

“(ii) a small business concern;

“(B) the term ‘eligible State’ means—

“(i) a State that the Administrator determines is in the bottom half of States, based on the average number of annual SBIR program awards made to companies in the State

for the preceding 3 years for which the Administration has applicable data; and

“(ii) an EPSCoR State that—

“(I) is a State described in clause (i); or

“(II) is—

“(aa) not a State described in clause (i); and

“(bb) invited to participate in a regional collaborative; and

“(C) the term ‘EPSCoR State’ means a State that participates in the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research of the National Science Foundation, as established under section 113 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1862g);

“(D) the term ‘FAST program’ means the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program established under section 34;

“(E) the term ‘pilot program’ means the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program established under paragraph (2);

“(F) the term ‘regional collaborative’ means a collaborative consisting of eligible entities that are located in not less than 3 eligible States; and

“(G) the term ‘State’ means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall establish a pilot program, to be known as the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program, under which the Administrator shall provide awards to regional collaboratives to address the needs of small business concerns in order to be more competitive in the proposal and selection process for awards under the SBIR program and the STTR program and to increase technology transfer and commercialization.

“(3) GOALS.—The goals of the pilot program are—

“(A) to create regional collaboratives that allow eligible entities to work cooperatively to leverage resources to address the needs of small business concerns;

“(B) to grow SBIR program and STTR program cooperative research and development and commercialization through increased awards under those programs;

“(C) to increase the participation of States that have historically received a lower level of awards under the SBIR program and the STTR program;

“(D) to utilize the strengths and advantages of regional collaboratives to better leverage resources, best practices, and economies of scale in a region for the purpose of increasing awards and increasing the commercialization of the SBIR program and STTR projects;

“(E) to increase the competitiveness of the SBIR program and the STTR program;

“(F) to identify sources of outside funding for applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program, including venture capitalists, angel investor groups, private industry, crowd funding, and special loan programs; and

“(G) to offer increased one-on-one engagements with companies and entrepreneurs for SBIR program and STTR program education, assistance, and successful outcomes.

“(4) APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A regional collaborative that desires to participate in the pilot program shall submit to the Administrator an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Administrator may require.

“(B) INCLUSION OF LEAD ELIGIBLE ENTITIES AND COORDINATOR.—A regional collaborative shall include in an application submitted under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the name of each lead eligible entity from each eligible State in the regional collaborative, as designated under paragraph (5)(A); and

“(ii) the name of the coordinator for the regional collaborative, as designated under paragraph (6).

“(C) AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATION.—A regional collaborative shall include in an application submitted under subparagraph (A) an explanation as to how the activities of the regional collaborative under the pilot program would differ from other State and Federal outreach activities in each eligible State in the regional collaborative.

“(5) LEAD ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible State in a regional collaborative shall designate 1 eligible entity located in the eligible State to serve as the lead eligible entity for the eligible State.

“(B) AUTHORIZATION BY GOVERNOR.—Each lead eligible entity designated under subparagraph (A) shall be authorized to act as the lead eligible entity by the Governor of the applicable eligible State.

“(C) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each lead eligible entity designated under subparagraph (A) shall be responsible for administering the activities and program initiatives described in paragraph (7) in the applicable eligible State.

“(6) REGIONAL COLLABORATIVE COORDINATOR.—Each regional collaborative shall designate a coordinator from amongst the eligible entities located in the eligible States in the regional collaborative, who shall serve as the interface between the regional collaborative and the Administration with respect to measuring cross-State collaboration and program effectiveness and documenting best practices.

“(7) USE OF FUNDS.—Each regional collaborative that is provided an award under the pilot program may, in each eligible State in which an eligible entity of the regional collaborative is located—

“(A) establish an initiative under which first-time applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program are reviewed by experienced, national experts in the United States, as determined by the lead eligible entity designated under paragraph (5)(A);

“(B) engage national mentors on a frequent basis to work directly with applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program, particularly during Phase II, to assist with the process of preparing and submitting a proposal;

“(C) create and make available an online mechanism to serve as a resource for applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program to identify and connect with Federal labs, prime government contractor companies, other industry partners, and regional industry cluster organizations;

“(D) conduct focused and concentrated outreach efforts to increase participation in the SBIR program and the STTR program by small business concerns owned and controlled by women, small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (as defined in section 8(d)(3)(C)), and historically black colleges and universities;

“(E) administer a structured program of training and technical assistance—

“(i) to prepare applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program—

“(I) to compete more effectively for Phase I and Phase II awards; and

“(II) to develop and implement a successful commercialization plan;

“(ii) to assist eligible States focusing on transition and commercialization to win Phase III awards from public and private partners;

“(iii) to create more competitive proposals to increase awards from all Federal sources, with a focus on awards under the SBIR program and the STTR program; and

“(iv) to assist first-time applicants by providing small grants for proof of concept research; and

“(F) assist applicants for an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program to identify sources of outside funding, including venture capitalists, angel investor groups, private industry, crowd funding, and special loan programs.

“(8) AWARD AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall provide an award to each eligible State in which an eligible entity of a regional collaborative is located in an amount that is not more than \$300,000 to carry out the activities described in paragraph (7).

“(B) LIMITATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An eligible State may not receive an award under both the FAST program and the pilot program for the same year.

“(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to prevent an eligible State from applying for an award under the FAST program and the pilot program for the same year.

“(9) DURATION OF AWARD.—An award provided under the pilot program shall be for a period of not more than 1 year, and may be renewed by the Administrator for 1 additional year.

“(10) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on September 30, 2021.

“(11) REPORT.—Not later than February 1, 2021, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program, which shall include—

“(A) an assessment of the pilot program and the effectiveness of the pilot program in meeting the goals described in paragraph (3);

“(B) an assessment of the best practices, including an analysis of how the pilot program compares to the FAST program and a single-State approach; and

“(C) recommendations as to whether any aspect of the pilot program should be extended or made permanent.”.

SEC. 6402. FEDERAL AND STATE TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 34 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2001 through 2005” and inserting “2017 through 2021”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “fiscal years 2001 through 2005” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

(2) in subsection (i), by striking “September 30, 2005” and inserting “September 30, 2021”.

TITLE LXV—OVERSIGHT AND SIMPLIFICATION INITIATIVES

SEC. 6501. DATA REALIGNMENT AND MODERNIZATION.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding after subsection (uu), as added by section 6401 of this Act, the following:

“(vv) SBIR AND STTR INTERAGENCY POLICY COMMITTEE.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘Committee’ means the SBIR and STTR Interagency Policy Committee established under paragraph (2);

“(B) the term ‘participating Federal agency’ means a Federal agency with an SBIR program or an STTR program; and

“(C) the term ‘phase’ means Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an interagency committee to be known as the ‘SBIR and STTR Interagency Policy Committee’.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall include—

“(A) 4 representatives from each participating Federal agency, of which—

“(i) 1 shall have expertise with respect to the SBIR program and STTR program of the Federal agency;

“(ii) 1 shall have expertise with respect to the broader research and development missions and programs of the Federal agency;

“(iii) 1 shall have expertise with respect to marketplace commercialization or to the transition of technologies to support the missions of the Federal agency; and

“(iv) 1 shall have expertise with respect to the information technology systems of the Federal agency; and

“(B) 2 representatives from the Administration, of which—

“(i) 1 shall serve as chairperson of the Committee; and

“(ii) 1 shall be from the Information Technology Development Team of the Office of Investment and Innovation of the Administration.

“(4) WORKING GROUPS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall establish working groups as necessary to ensure consistency and clarity between the participating Federal agencies.

“(B) DATA REALIGNMENT AND MODERNIZATION WORKING GROUP.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall establish a data alignment and modernization working group, which shall review the recommendations made in the report to Congress by the Office of Science and Technology of the Administration entitled ‘SBIR/STTR TechNet Public & Government Databases’, dated September 15, 2014, and the practices of participating Federal agencies to—

“(I) determine how to collect data on achievements by small business concerns in each phase of the SBIR program and the STTR program and ensure collection and dissemination of such data in a timely, efficient, and uniform manner;

“(II) establish a uniform baseline for metrics that support improving the solicitation, contracting, funding, and execution of program management in the SBIR program and the STTR program;

“(III) normalize formatting and database usage across participating Federal agencies; and

“(IV) determine the feasibility of developing a common system across all participating Federal agencies and the paperwork requirements under such a common system.

“(ii) MEMBERSHIP.—Each member of the Committee shall serve as a member of the data alignment and modernization working group.

“(5) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than September 31, 2018, the Committee shall brief the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on the solutions identified by the working group under paragraph (4) and resources needed to execute the solutions.”.

SEC. 6502. IMPLEMENTATION OF OUTSTANDING REAUTHORIZATION PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9(mm) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)), as amended by section 6401(1) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (3) and (9)”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) SUSPENSION OF FUNDING.—

“(A) FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal years 2018 and 2019, any Federal agency that has not implemented each provision of law described in clause (i)—

“(I) shall continue to provide amounts to the Administration in accordance with paragraph (7)(B); and

“(II) may not use any additional amounts as described in paragraph (1) until 30 days after the date on which the Federal agency submits to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives documentation demonstrating that the Federal agency has implemented and is in compliance with each provision of law described in clause (ii).

“(ii) PROVISIONS.—The provisions of law described in this subparagraph are the following:

“(I) Subsection (r)(4), relating to Phase III preferences.

“(II) Paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (y), relating to insertion goals.

“(III) Subsection (g)(4)(B), relating to shortening the decision time for SBIR awards.

“(IV) Subsection (o)(4)(B), relating to shortening the decision time for STTR awards.

“(V) Subsection (v), relating to reducing paperwork and compliance burdens.

“(B) FOR ADMINISTRATION.—For fiscal years 2018 and 2019, if the Administration is not in compliance with subsection (b)(7), relating to annual reports to Congress, the Administration may not use amounts received under paragraph (7)(B) of this subsection for a purpose described in clause (iii) of such paragraph (7)(B).”

(b) CLARIFICATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 9(b)(7) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)(7)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “not less than annually” and inserting “not later than December 31 of each year”.

SEC. 6503. STRENGTHENING OF THE REQUIREMENT TO SHORTEN THE APPLICATION REVIEW AND DECISION TIME.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(4), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) make a final decision on each proposal submitted under the SBIR program—

“(i) for the Department of Health and Human Services, not later than 1 year after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes, with a goal to reduce the review and decision time to less than 10 months by September 30, 2019;

“(ii) for the Department of Agriculture and the National Science Foundation, not later than 6 months after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes; or

“(iii) for any other Federal agency—

“(I) not later than 90 days after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes; or

“(II) if the Administrator authorizes an extension with respect to a solicitation, not later than 90 days after the date that would otherwise be applicable to the Federal agency under subclause (I);”;

(2) in subsection (o)(4), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) make a final decision on each proposal submitted under the STTR program—

“(i) for the Department of Health and Human Services, not later than 1 year after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes, with a goal to reduce the review and

decision time to less than 10 months by September 30, 2019;

“(ii) for the Department of Agriculture and the National Science Foundation, not later than 6 months after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes; or

“(iii) for any other Federal agency—

“(I) not later than 90 days after the date on which the applicable solicitation closes; or

“(II) if the Administrator authorizes an extension with respect to a solicitation, not later than 90 days after the date that would otherwise be applicable to the Federal agency under subclause (I);”.

SEC. 6504. CONTINUED GAO OVERSIGHT OF ALLOCATION COMPLIANCE AND ACCURACY IN FUNDING BASE CALCULATIONS.

Section 5136(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (15 U.S.C. 638 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “until the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and insert “until the date on which the Comptroller General of the United States submits the report relating to fiscal year 2019”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) assess whether the change in the base funding for the Department of Defense as required by subparagraphs (J) and (K) of section 9(f)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(f)(1))—

“(i) improves transparency for determining whether the Department is complying with the allocation requirements;

“(ii) reduces the burden of calculating the allocations; and

“(iii) improves the compliance of the Department with the allocation requirements; and”;

(3) in paragraph (2) by striking “under subparagraph (B)” and inserting “under subparagraphs (B) and (C)”.

SEC. 6505. COORDINATION BETWEEN AGENCIES ON COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (j), as amended by section 6202(a) of this Act, by adding at the end the following:

“(5) COORDINATION OF COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directive issued pursuant to this subsection to clarify that a small business concern receiving training through the Innovation Corps program with administrative funds made available under subsection (mm) shall not receive discretionary business assistance funds for the same or similar activities as allowed under subsection (q).”;

(2) in subsection (p), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) COORDINATION OF COMMERCIALIZATION ASSISTANCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directive issued pursuant to this subsection to clarify that a small business concern receiving training through the Innovation Corps program with administrative funds made available under subsection (mm) shall not receive discretionary business assistance funds for the same or similar activities as allowed under subsection (q).”.

TITLE LXVI—PARTICIPATION BY WOMEN AND MINORITIES

SEC. 6601. SBA COORDINATION ON INCREASING OUTREACH FOR WOMEN AND MINORITY-OWNED BUSINESSES.

Section 9(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) to coordinate with participating agencies on efforts to increase outreach and awards under each of the SBIR and STTR programs to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4).”.

SEC. 6602. FEDERAL AGENCY OUTREACH REQUIREMENTS FOR WOMEN AND MINORITY-OWNED BUSINESSES.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (11), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) implement an outreach program to small business concerns for the purpose of enhancing its SBIR program, under which the Federal agency shall—

“(A) provide outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4); and

“(B) establish goals for outreach by the Federal agency to the small business concerns described in subparagraph (A).”;

(2) in subsection (o)(14), by striking “SBIR program;” and inserting “SBIR program, under which the Federal agency shall—

“(A) provide outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4); and

“(B) establish goals for outreach by the Federal agency to the small business concerns described in subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 6603. STTR POLICY DIRECTIVE MODIFICATION.

Section 9(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(p)), as amended by section 6505 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directive issued pursuant to this subsection to provide for enhanced outreach efforts to increase the participation of small business concerns owned and controlled by women and socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4), in technological innovation and in STTR programs.”.

SEC. 6604. INTERAGENCY SBIR/STTR POLICY COMMITTEE.

Section 5124 of the SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1837) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee shall meet not less than twice per year to carry out the duties under subsection (c).

“(2) OUTREACH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES.—If the Interagency SBIR/STTR Policy Committee meets to discuss outreach and technical assistance activities to increase the participation of small business concerns that are underrepresented in the SBIR and STTR programs, the Committee shall invite to the meeting—

“(A) a representative of the Minority Business Development Agency; and

“(B) relevant stakeholders that work to advance the interests of—

“(i) small business concerns owned and controlled by women, as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and
 “(ii) socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, as defined in section 8(a)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(4)).”

SEC. 6605. DIVERSITY AND STEM WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

(2) the term “covered STEM intern” means a student at, or recent graduate from, an institution of higher education serving as an intern—

(A) whose course of study studied is focused on the STEM fields; and

(B) who is a woman or a person from an underrepresented population in the STEM fields;

(3) the term “eligible entity” means a small business concern that—

(A) is receiving amounts under an award under the SBIR program or the STTR program of a Federal agency on the date on which the Federal agency awards a grant to the small business concern under subsection (b); and

(B) provides internships for covered STEM interns;

(4) the terms “Federal agency”, “SBIR”, and “STTR” have the meanings given those terms under section 9(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e));

(5) the term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given the term under section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a));

(6) the term “person from an underrepresented population in the STEM fields” means a person from a group that is underrepresented in the population of STEM students, as determined by the Administrator;

(7) the term “pilot program” means the Diversity and STEM Workforce Development Pilot Program established under subsection (b);

(8) the term “recent graduate”, relating to a woman or a person from an underrepresented population in the STEM fields, means that the woman or person from an underrepresented population in the STEM fields earned an associate degree, baccalaureate degree, or postbaccalaureate from an institution of higher education during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the internship;

(9) the term “small business concern” has the meaning given the term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and

(10) the term “STEM fields” means the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM FOR INTERNSHIPS FOR WOMEN AND PEOPLE FROM UNDERREPRESENTED POPULATIONS.—The Administrator shall establish a Diversity and STEM Workforce Development Pilot Program to encourage the business community to provide workforce development opportunities for covered STEM interns, under which a Federal agency participating in the SBIR program or STTR program may make a grant to 1 or more eligible entities for the costs of internships for covered STEM interns.

(c) AMOUNT AND USE OF GRANTS.—

(1) AMOUNT.—A grant under subsection (b)—

(A) may not be in an amount of more than \$15,000 per fiscal year; and

(B) shall be in addition to the amount of the award to the recipient under the SBIR program or the STTR program.

(2) USE.—Not less than 90 percent of the amount of a grant under subsection (b) shall

be used by the eligible entity to provide stipends or other similar payments to interns.

(d) EVALUATION.—Not later than January 31 of the first calendar year after the third fiscal year during which the Administrator carries out the pilot program, the Administrator shall submit to Congress—

(1) data on the results of the pilot program, such as the number and demographics of the covered STEM interns participating in an internship funded under the pilot program and the amount spent on such internships; and

(2) an assessment of whether the pilot program helped the SBIR program and STTR program achieve the congressional objective of fostering and encouraging the participation of women and persons from underrepresented populations in the STEM fields.

(e) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate after the end of the fourth fiscal year during which the Administrator carries out the pilot program.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the pilot program.

TITLE LXVII—TECHNICAL CHANGES

SEC. 6701. UNIFORM REFERENCE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) in subsection (cc), by striking “National Institutes of Health” and inserting “Department of Health and Human Services”; and

(2) in subsection (dd)(1)(A), by striking “Director of the National Institutes of Health” and inserting “Secretary of Health and Human Services”.

SEC. 6702. FLEXIBILITY FOR PHASE II AWARD INVITATIONS.

Section 9(e)(4)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)(4)(B)) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(1) by striking “, which shall not include any invitation, pre-screening, or pre-selection process for eligibility for Phase II.”; and

(2) by inserting “in which eligibility for an award shall not be based only on an invitation, pre-screening, or pre-selection process and” before “in which awards”.

SA 4677. 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:

On page 508, strike line 10 and all that follows through “(d) TRAINING.—” on line 15 and insert the following:

Section 2332 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) TRAINING.—

On page 901, strike lines 8 and 9.

On page 1018, strike line 13 and all that follows through “(e) REPEAL.—” on line 24 and insert the following:

(d) REPEAL.—

On page 1064, line 23, strike “conducting one or more of the following” and insert “building the capacity of such country or countries to conduct one or more of the following”.

On page 1124, beginning on line 14, strike “GENERALLY.—” and all that follows through “Subject” on line 15 and insert the following: “GENERALLY.—Subject”.

On page 1124, strike lines 19 through 21.

On page 1129, line 11, insert “available” before “unobligated”.

On page 1129, line 15, insert “Such funds transferred in to the fund shall retain its original period of availability.” after “subsection (a).”.

On page 1129, line 20, insert “available” before “unobligated”.

Strike section 2812.

SA 4678. Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER) 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. REPORT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CLASS III GAMING.—The term “class III gaming” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703).

(2) EXCLUSIVITY CLAUSE.—The term “exclusivity clause” means a provision that requires a Tribe to pay to a State a percentage of gross gaming revenue only if the State does not change the law of the State to permit commercial gaming activity by any other person.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 calendar days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the number of Tribal-State compacts, and amendments to such compacts, that contain exclusivity clauses that may be impacted by a determination of the Secretary of the Interior to approve a compact or compact amendment that could have the effect of advancing commercial gaming activity on non-Indian land where such activity is owned or operated, directly or indirectly, by 1 or more Indian tribe; and

(2) the extent to which gaming regulations and laws in States where class III gaming occurs on Indian land pursuant to a Tribal-State compact, approved under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), meets or exceeds standards established in that Act or regulations issued by the National Indian Gaming Commission.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall consult with Indian tribes, State governments, and commercial gaming enterprises before issuing the report required under subsection (b).

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT SELF-DEFENSE AND PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2137, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2137) to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 2137) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TO TAKE CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS INTO TRUST FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE SUSANVILLE INDIAN RANCHERIA

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2212 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2212) to take certain Federal lands located in Lassen County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Susanville Indian Rancheria, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 2212) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

INDIAN TRUST ASSET REFORM ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 812, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 812) to provide for Indian trust asset management reform, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 812) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LOREN R. KAUFMAN VA CLINIC

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1762 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1762) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in The Dalles, Oregon, as the "Loren R. Kaufman VA Clinic."

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 1762) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 489, S. Res. 490, S. Res. 491, S. Res. 492.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolutions by title en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 489) honoring the life and achievements of Muhammad Ali.

A resolution (S. Res. 490) expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing

adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams.

A resolution (S. Res. 491) designating June 12, 2016, as a national day of racial amity and reconciliation.

A resolution (S. Res. 492) designating the week of June 6 through June 12, 2016, as "Hemp History Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m., Monday, June 13; 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; further, that all postcloture time on S. 2943 expire at 11 a.m., Tuesday, June 14; finally, that if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2578, it be considered to have been invoked at 10 p.m., Monday, June 13.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016, AT 4 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:09 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 13, 2016, at 4 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LOOKING BACK OVER THE PAST 13 YEARS OF THE CATALINA ISLAND CONSERVANCY

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as Tony Budrovich readies to take the reins as president and CEO of the Catalina Island Conservancy, it is important to step back and look over the successful tenure of Ann M. Muscat, who announced her June 25 retirement last year. She has served as president and CEO for more than 13 years—the second longest tenure of any previous Conservancy president.

Ann will continue to serve the Conservancy as its president emeritus until October 7, 2016. She will focus on serving as a resource to Tony, transitioning donor relationships, continuing fundraising for the Conservancy's first every capital campaign, IMAGINE CATALINA, and completing design of the new visitors' center, The Trailhead.

"Ann and the Conservancy have achieved a lot," Los Angeles County Supervisor Don Knabe said. "I've had the great pleasure of working with Ann and her team, all of them consummate professionals who are dedicated to getting things done."

"Under Ann's leadership, the Conservancy has become a living laboratory of innovation in conservation, education and financial sustainability for nonprofit organizations," Catalina Island Conservancy Board of Directors Chair Stephen Chazen said. "The Conservancy has significantly improved the Island's ecological health, greatly increased access to Catalina's wildlands and expanded and enhanced its educational programs to better serve students living in Avalon and visitors from the mainland."

Here is a look back at how the Conservancy and its stewardship of Catalina Island have flourished since Muscat joined the organization in 2003.

During Ann's 13-year tenure, and through its Catalina Habitat Improvement and Restoration Program (CHIRP), the Conservancy staff has completed vegetation mapping of the entire Island, including non-native and invasive plant species. It has controlled and eradicated numerous invasive plant species that were eliminating native and rare biodiversity. It also expanded the native plant nursery's scope to include landscaping initiatives on the Island, along with restoration, and significantly expanded the native seed collection.

The Conservancy has been a leader in removing non-native and highly destructive animal species from the Island, leading to the re-discovery of native plants previously believed to be extinct. It also brought the Catalina Island fox back from the brink of extinction and supported the successful recovery of the bald eagle.

Its wildlife biologists have implemented innovative social (repatriation) and scientific methodologies (contraception) for managing the bison herd. They also have conducted bird and small mammal surveys, discovering nesting sea birds on cliffs and nearby rocks, and implementing protective measures for bat populations.

In addition, the Conservancy has pursued research partnerships with universities and museums from across the country, including a multi-institution collaboration that resulted in a comprehensive look at the Island's oak woodlands.

Working with the Long Beach Unified School District, the community and philanthropic organizations, the Conservancy has greatly increased access to natural and intellectual resources over the past 13 years. It implemented extensive educational enrichment and internship programs for the local school population through the establishment of the K–12 NatureWorks workforce development and STEM education initiative.

In its continuing service to the local community, the Conservancy provided free access to the wildlands of Catalina for Island families without vehicles. It implemented a free of charge Naturalist Training Program for tour operators and local businesses, as well as Conservancy front line staff.

To ensure visitors to the Island could access the wildlands and learn about Catalina's ecosystem, the Conservancy created the 37.5 mile Trans-Catalina Trail. It also has secured funding and developed plans for further trail improvements and expansions.

It significantly expanded and improved the Jeep Eco-Tour program and developed a signage and way finding system across the Island. It added new running and biking events, an Island Ecology Travel Program and Wild Side Art Program to increase access and awareness. In addition, it increased volunteer program initiatives to include AmeriCorps, American Conservation Experience and numerous university-level spring break programs.

So that visitors and others had more information about Catalina Island and the Conservancy, it added a Nature Center in Avalon and a Mobile Nature Station that has served Avalon and Two Harbors, along with interpretive panels in the Garden and at campgrounds and trailheads. The Conservancy also expanded and revamped its outreach and marketing materials, including maps, field guides, monthly e-newsletters, videos, an extensive photo library and expanded web site.

To serve a greater good beyond Catalina's shores, the Conservancy launched a successful radio show and web site, Isla Earth, on environmental issues that aired for 10 years on over 320 radio stations across the country.

To provide the needed programs and ensure the organization's long-term financial health, the Conservancy has focused on raising revenues and creating a sustainable business model that will ensure the Island will con-

tinue to be restored and protected for future generations.

In the past 13 years, the Conservancy has increased its operating budget nearly three times through an increase in philanthropic giving and mission-based earned income. It has significantly expanded its donor base and created a reserve fund to address deferred maintenance projects across its 42,000 acres. Projects have included improvements at Airport in the Sky, across its road and bridge system, a new pier, replacement and expansion of its vehicle fleet and upgrades to its numerous buildings.

The Conservancy also revamped its organizational structure, adding new departments and expanding existing functions while providing professional development and training for all staff. The Conservancy's staff has doubled in size and moved to a more customer service/community orientation. The Conservancy also expanded and updated employee housing, adding 14 new units, to support recruitment and retention of staff.

The Board of Directors and the Conservancy's staff have worked together to develop a strategic vision for the organization's future, called IMAGINE CATALINA. They worked with nationally recognized sustainability architect William McDonough and landscape architect Thomas Woltz to develop a long-term strategic vision.

It imagines an Island that represents California as it can be, demonstrating how nature and humans can thrive together. It envisions Catalina and the Conservancy serving as models for science-based conservation, for training tomorrow's stewards of the natural world, for connecting people to nature and for creating sustainable finances and operations.

To implement IMAGINE CATALINA, the Board and staff launched the Conservancy's first-ever capital campaign, and they are more than three-fourths of the way to fully funding the first phase. They plan to celebrate the groundbreaking for the campaign's flagship project, The Trailhead Visitor Center, on June 24. Another groundbreaking is scheduled on October 14 for the next major project, improvement and expansion of Catalina's trail system, and planning is well underway for a major ecological restoration effort on the Island's West End.

"Ann and her team's excellent stewardship work at the Catalina Island Conservancy is leading edge and has served as a model for many other land trusts," said California Council of Land Trusts Executive Director Darla Guenzler.

Ann has also been a leader beyond Catalina. She was a founding Board member of the California Council of Land Trusts and served as its Chair of the Board. She is also a member of the Steering Committee for the Southern California Open Space Council and an Advisory Board member of USC's Wrigley Institute for Environmental Studies.

● 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.

COMMENDING THE PACIFICA
INSTITUTE FOR ITS WORK

HON. SUZAN K. DELBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Pacifica Institute in Bellevue for their work to generate interfaith dialogue and promote cross-cultural ties. Pacifica Institute has built up ties of mutual understanding and strengthened communities throughout the state of Washington.

Pacifica Institute has continually engaged the community in activities to foster shared experiences. Their efforts have helped remove barriers, building confidence and trust to create a peaceful society through newfound relationships.

Through their vision of promoting social justice through shared networks, Pacifica Institute has provided our district with the opportunity to foster mutual appreciation in a respectful environment.

I'm pleased to join Pacifica Institute in their annual Ramadan Interfaith Friendship Iftar in Redmond this weekend. I am looking forward to coming together with members of our community to celebrate various religious backgrounds.

As President John F. Kennedy said, "If we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity." Pacifica Institute works to do just that. Its commitment to educating communities serves as a positive voice bringing people together to combat prejudice and intolerance.

TIBET AND THE VISIT OF HIS HO-
LINESS THE DALAI LAMA TO
WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, His Holiness the Dalai Lama will be in Washington, DC next week. As the spiritual leader of Tibetans, the Dalai Lama is an energetic and unflinching ambassador for human rights and the rights of the Tibetan people. Sadly, his visit reminds us again about the dire situation of the Tibetan people inside China.

The Tibetan people have a right to practice their religion, preserve their culture, and speak their language. They have a right to do so without restriction or interference. The Chinese government does not agree. To them, the Tibetans are a people to be pacified. Their faith and culture are problems to be solved, not a heritage to be preserved, honored, and protected. To them, the Dalai Lama is an agitator and revolutionary, not a world-renowned and respected voice for peace and harmony.

The recent State Department Human Rights Report offered a withering criticism of the Chinese government's oversight of Tibetan and Tibetan areas of China. It said the "government engaged in severe repression of Tibet's religious, cultural and religious heritage by, among other means, strictly curtailing the civil rights of China's ethnic Tibetan population, including the rights to the freedom of speech,

religion, association, assembly, and movement."

I am the Chair of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China. Our reporting on Tibet draws similar conclusions about China's rough oversight of Tibetans. Over the past several years, the Chinese government has constructed more obstacles to efforts by Tibetans to preserve their culture and religion.

Sadly, we know that Tibetans have used self-immolations as a protest against the religious and political oversight of the Chinese government.

It is difficult to fathom the despair and desperation felt by Tibetans who take this last act of defiance. The Chinese government has blamed the Dalai Lama and "foreign forces" for self-immolations instead of looking at how their own policies created such deep grievances.

The Chinese government also expanded its efforts last year to transform Tibetan Buddhism into a state-managed institution. They sought to undermine the devotion of the Tibetan people to the Dalai Lama and control the process of selecting Buddhist leaders.

One Chinese government official admitted that control over the selection of Tibetan Buddhist leaders, including the next Dalai Lama, was "an important political matter" and a critical part of the Chinese government's "sovereignty over Tibet."

The Chinese government wants a Tibetan Buddhism that is attractive to tourists, but which allows the Communist Party to completely manage its affairs.

The UN Special Rapporteur on Religion said recently criticized China's efforts to control Tibetan Buddhism and the process of selecting leaders. He said "the Chinese government is destroying the autonomy of religious communities . . . creating schisms, and pitting people against each other in order to exercise control."

This is exactly what the Chinese government has done to other religious groups, including Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, and Falun Gong. When the faithful don't fall in line, they are jailed, harassed and bribed until they do.

Religious freedom is an essential part of dealing with the grievances of the Tibetan people, but China's answer is always the same—control, manage, and repress. It is counterproductive and it violates China's international obligations.

The China Commission has a prisoner database that contains records on 643 known Tibetan political and religious prisoners. 43 percent of those detained are monks, nuns, and religious teachers. Almost all were imprisoned since 2008.

Substantive dialogue between the Dalai Lama's representatives and the Chinese government and Communist Party have not occurred in the past five years. This is the longest break since the dialogue started in 2002.

A government "White Paper" on Tibet, published this April, states that China will "only talk with private representatives of the Dalai Lama" to discuss "the future of the Dalai Lama" and how he can "gain the forgiveness of the central government and the Chinese people."

Instead of asking for the Dalai Lama's forgiveness for the decades of brutal repression, the Chinese government asks for his. This is the state of affairs in Xi Jinping's China.

This is unfortunate and counterproductive. If China's goal is to build a "harmonious society" in Tibet, it cannot be done without the Dalai Lama.

He is the spiritual leader of the Tibetan people. His views are widely shared by those in Tibetan society, he can be a constructive partner for China in addressing continuing tensions, and deep-seated grievance, in Tibetan areas.

In our dealings with Chinese government and officials, Members of Congress and the Administration should affirm the peaceful desires of the Tibetan people for greater autonomy and freedoms within China.

We should stress that China's policies are counterproductive, they are brutal, and they hurt China's international prestige.

We also need to speak with a unified voice to end the repression of the Tibetan people. U.S. leadership on this issue is critical, because our allies in Europe and Asia can be bullied by Chinese threats of economic boycotts.

U.S. officials must demonstrate that Tibet matters, human rights matter, and religious freedom matters to U.S.-China relations and China's future stability and prosperity.

RECOGNIZING DELEGATES AT THE
CONGRESS FOR FUTURE MED-
ICAL LEADERS

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize five high school students from the fourth district of Colorado, who were selected to represent the state of Colorado as delegates at the Congress for Future Medical Leaders. The students are Carter Goodard of Frederick Senior High School, Alexandria Rivera of Sky View Academy, Victoria Rubio of Silver Creek High School, Anna Schulhoff of Legend High School, and Megan Weigand of Erie High School.

The Congress of Future Medical Leaders is an honors program that recognizes exceptional high school students who are pursuing careers as a physician or in medical research.

These students are the future leaders of the medical field and our country. Through their studies, they have embodied the meaning of hard work and perseverance to achieve their goals, and will better the health of future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize these five students for their hard work and service to their community. I wish them luck in their future endeavors.

RHODE ISLAND VETERANS OF
FOREIGN WARS 97TH ANNUAL
STATE CONVENTION

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women of the Rhode Island Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is holding its 97th Annual State Convention this Saturday.

All of us are fortunate to live in a free and safe society because of the brave actions and extraordinary sacrifices of the men and women who have worn the uniform of the United States Armed Forces.

We owe our troops, veterans and their families our gratitude and deep respect, in addition to the exceptional care and benefits they have earned while serving our great nation.

The Rhode Island VFW has been the leading voice for veterans and their families in my home state for decades.

I am proud to work with them to strengthen mental health services, expand job training opportunities, and ensure that all of Rhode Island's veterans have the tools and resources they need to get ahead.

Rhode Island is home to more than 70,000 veterans today. They are all our heroes.

I congratulate the Rhode Island Veterans of Foreign Wars on their 97th Annual State Convention, and I look forward to joining them this Saturday.

HONORING MR. MARK DELLINGER

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mark Dellinger who will retire after 31 years of public service with Lake County in California.

After growing up in New York and the Midwest, Mr. Dellinger moved west to pursue higher education. He earned his Bachelor of Science from Northern Arizona University and then earned his Master's Degree in Geography from the University of Idaho.

Mr. Dellinger joined the Lake County Planning Department's Resource Management Division as a Geothermal Coordinator in 1984 and joined the Special Districts office in 1992 as a Resource Manager. Mr. Dellinger joined Calpine in the private sector to manage compliance for geothermal power plants in 2001, but returned to Lake County as the Administrator of Special Districts in 2002. In this position, he was responsible for fiscal, personnel, and project management.

For his work on the Southeast Geysers Effluent Pipeline Project, or "Flush to Flash," Mr. Dellinger received the Geothermal Resources Council Special Achievement Award in 1997. This project, co-led by Mr. Dellinger and Eliot Allen, used treated wastewater to recharge the geothermal steam field in Lake County. The Special District Leadership Foundation also awarded Mr. Dellinger the Special District Administrator Certification in 2011 after he completed a rigorous examination demonstrating his expertise in management and governance.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dellinger dedicated his career to ensuring that the residents of Lake County, California had access to high quality public services. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today and extend our best wishes for an enjoyable retirement and many happy memories to come with Carol, his wife, and their sons Jared and Quinn.

RECOGNIZING DELEGATES AT THE CONGRESS OF FUTURE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY LEADERS

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize six high school students from the fourth district of Colorado, who have been chosen to represent the state of Colorado as delegates at the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders. The students are Jamison Cavanagh of Ponderosa High School, Tanner Cavanagh of Ponderosa High School, Victoria Messmore of Legend High School, Dominic Plaia of Chaparral High School, Amber Storch of Fort Morgan High School, and Caleb Vannest of Greeley West High School.

The Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders is an honors program that recognizes exceptional high school students who are pursuing careers as engineers, scientists, or technologists.

These students are the future leaders of the STEM fields and our country. Through their studies, they have embodied the meaning of hard work and perseverance to achieve their goals, and will advance science and technology for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize these six students for their hard work and service to their community. I wish them luck in their future endeavors.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 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 \$19,230,270,048,404.99. We've added \$8,603,392,999,491.91 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING DR. ELLA WHITE CAMPBELL

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize Dr. Ella White Campbell—a passionate educator who devoted her life to improving the lives of her neighbors.

A South Carolina native, Dr. Campbell moved to Maryland at a young age and graduated at the top of her class from the historic Wiley H. Bates High School in Annapolis while helping to care for her siblings. She later earned three degrees—including one Doctoral Degree—from Morgan State University, Johns

Hopkins University and the University of Maryland.

Dr. Campbell began her teaching career at a middle school in the Cherry Hill neighborhood of Baltimore City, where residents were so impressed with her leadership abilities, they asked her take over the local recreation center. She eventually chaired the city's English Department and was promoted to Assistant Principal. She helped design a curriculum that increased test scores of hundreds of students.

You would be hard pressed to find a community organization that Dr. Campbell did not, at some point, belong to or lead. While too numerous to mention in their entirety, Dr. Campbell was President of the Gwynnvale Civic Association, President of the Liberty Road Community Council, President of the Liberty Randallstown Coalition, President of the Stevenswood Improvement Association and Founder of the Randallstown NAACP chapter.

Dr. Campbell advocated tirelessly for better schools, recreation facilities, libraries and public transportation in her community. I had the privilege of working with Dr. Campbell for many years. Believe me, you did not want to find yourself on the wrong side of Dr. Campbell because you can bet she had already briefed the community on her position—and convinced them to agree. She was instrumental in securing \$1 million to implement the Liberty Road Streetscape Project, helped to stop area flooding through the Red Run Dam project and established the Liberty Assistance Center for county residents in need.

A decorated member of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Dr. Campbell is listed in the Who's Who in The East, Who's Who in America and Community Leaders of the World. Perhaps most importantly, she was a devoted wife, mother, grandmother and great-grandmother.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join with me today to honor the life and legacy of Dr. Ella White Campbell. Although she will be sorely missed, Dr. Campbell's impact on Baltimore County and people's lives—including my own—will last forever. She was a true inspiration.

TRIBUTE TO TIM CADDELL, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ADMINISTRATOR

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Tim Caddell, a member of our local government who is retiring after 15 years of public relations work in Pinellas Park.

Mr. Caddell joined the Pinellas Park staff in 2001. He initially served as Public Events Director, planning events such as the Harvest Moon Festival and Country in the Park. Towards the end of his first year, he took on the role of Public Information Officer cultivating and maintaining vital relationships with the local media outlets. Additionally, he led an important effort in Tallahassee lobbying on behalf of Pinellas Park when the city was in need of funds for drainage improvements at Park Boulevard.

Finally, in 2008, he was promoted to Government Relations Administrator where he

thrived. In this role, Mr. Caddell was responsible for establishing the Pinellas Park Performing Arts Center after the city had purchased the space. He recalls this event as one of the brightest moments in his career.

In addition to his official role, Mr. Caddell demonstrated his commitment to Pinellas County through his service in various charitable organizations. He served as executive director for the group "Girls Inc." which focuses on programs for girls that enrich their studies in a variety of academic and professional fields. He also served the St. Petersburg Police Department as a Private Investigator and was an assistant to the publisher for Pinellas Park News.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize and thank Tim Caddell for his dedication to Pinellas County throughout his career. He will be truly missed for his innovative ideas and strong work ethic. I ask that this body join me in thanking Mr. Caddell for the work he did for our community and in wishing him all the best in his next chapter of his life.

PURPLE HEART DISTRICT

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to California's Fifth Congressional District as home to recipients of the Purple Heart. So many of our residents have honorably served our nation in its time of need. As a reflection of Northern California's role in war efforts past and present and the deep personal sacrifice of so many of our residents, I stand to assert that California's Fifth Congressional District should be recognized as a "Purple Heart District."

The Purple Heart is one of the oldest and most recognized American military medals, awarded to service members who were killed or wounded by enemy action. In 1782, George Washington created the Badge of Military Merit to reward "any singularly meritorious action" displayed by a soldier, non-commissioned officer, or officer in the Continental Army. This award was intended to encourage gallantry and fidelity among soldiers. General Douglas MacArthur (then Army Chief of Staff) revived the award on February 22, 1932, the 200th anniversary of George Washington's birth. Since its inception and through several wars and conflicts, the Purple Heart has been given to an estimated 1.8 million military members wounded or killed while serving our nation. I received my Purple Heart while serving in the 173rd Airborne Brigade in Vietnam.

California has a strong military tradition, home to many significant installations and countless remarkable individuals. Our district includes the former Mare Island Naval Shipyard—the first U.S. Navy base on the Pacific coast—and is adjacent to Travis Air Force Base, which handles more cargo and passengers than any other military air terminal in the United States. Many notable veterans have called our district home, including pioneering pilot and General of the Army and Air Force Henry "Hap" Arnold. Over 45,000 veterans currently reside in our district, including thousands from the wars in Iraq and Afghani-

stan, who are living with the wounds of war at higher rates than any other conflict in our history. I am honored to represent all of these valiant men and women.

Mr. Speaker, California has dispatched thousands of its sons and daughters to fight the enemy. Many have sacrificed their health, and many have sacrificed their lives. We will never forget their sacrifices and are grateful for the brave men and women who have been harmed defending our country and our freedom.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognition and appreciation of California's Purple Heart recipients past and present. Now, in the spirit of that appreciation, let it be known that California's Fifth Congressional District should be recognized as a "Purple Heart District."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Number 269 for passage of H. Con. Res. 129, Roll Call Number 270 for passage of H.R. 4906, Roll Call Number 271 for passage of H.R. 4904, Roll Call Number 272 for passage of H.R. 1815 which took place Tuesday, June 7, 2016, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted Aye on Roll Call Number 269 for passage of H. Con. Res. 129, on Roll Call Number 270 for passage of H.R. 4906, on Roll Call Number 271 for passage of H.R. 4904, and on Roll Call Number 272 for passage of H.R. 1815.

TRIBUTE TO FLORIDA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Florida Chamber of Commerce on their 100th anniversary and for their tireless efforts to secure Florida's future.

On April 29th, 1916, The Florida Chamber was founded to help support the Florida business community. At the time, many businesses were faltering and the agriculture industry, the state's leading economic source, was struggling with a cattle tick that was threatening livestock. The chamber was created with the goal of securing that state's future by preserving our vital agriculture industry and creating jobs and economic opportunities. Today, Florida's economic challenges have changed, but the Chamber's mission has always remained the same: securing Florida's economic future.

In the past 100 years, Florida has developed into an economic powerhouse with the support of the Florida Chamber of Commerce. Today, Florida's economy accounts for 1 in 12 jobs being created in the United States and independently the Floridian economy is the 18th largest market in the world. As the population continues to grow and diversify Florida's economy and population of roughly 19 million

residents to continue to enrich our nation's economy.

The primary goal of the Chamber has been to promote a business-friendly atmosphere in order to attract employees with highly specialized skills and continue to aid our economy. The Chamber has done that and more for Florida and our community of Pinellas as well. It has strengthened our agriculture industry, embraced the military and defense industry, promoted technology and innovation, advanced education, and strengthened our infrastructure.

Even though the main industries in our community and state are agriculture, tourism, and construction, the Chamber is helping ensure that we are looking towards a more diverse economy with life sciences and biotech, energy, international trade, and advanced manufacturing and space technologies. With our state ever increasing in population, we can feel secure that the Florida Chamber will continue to create jobs and opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our Florida Chamber for maintaining their goal of nurturing and supporting business within Florida. I ask that this body join me in recognizing what the Florida Chamber has done for the Florida economy in the past 100 years and will continue to do in the future.

HONORING THE EXTRAORDINARY LIFE OF PATRICK OROSZKO

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Patrick Oroszko of Worcester, Massachusetts.

Pat passed away on Sunday following a brave and inspirational battle with esophageal cancer. He was just 34 years old.

I first met Pat several years ago when he interned in my Washington, DC office. He was exceptional. He was whip smart and detailed oriented. Pat made you feel comfortable the moment you started talking to him. He was easy-going and unassuming, despite his height. And above all, he was kind.

Born and raised in Worcester, Pat graduated from St. John's High School in Shrewsbury where he excelled in basketball. He went on to receive degrees from Clark University and Anna Maria College.

It was at Clark University that Pat truly felt at home. While at Clark, he was a member of the school's basketball team which qualified for the postseason in all four of his years and made it to the Elite Eight of the NCAA Division III tournament two years. He served as team captain his junior and senior years.

Most recently, Pat served as Director of Student Recruitment for Clark's Graduate School and, for the past seven years, as an Assistant Men's Basketball Coach.

And Clark is where Pat met the love of his life and best friend, Courtney.

Today, it's the Clark University basketball gymnasium—the Kneller Athletic Center—where family and friends will gather to celebrate his life. It was one of Pat's favorite places. And at his request, the gym will be set up just as it would be for a game day, with the bleachers pulled out, home and visitor benches, the scoring table and the scoreboard on.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my deepest sympathy to Pat's wife Courtney; his young children, Allison and Ryan; his parents, Charlie and Linda; his brother, Chris and all of his extended family and friends and the entire Clark University family.

Mr. Speaker, Pat Oroszko was a wonderful person who touched so many lives. And we're all going to miss him immensely.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for roll call vote 283 on Thursday, June 9, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on roll call vote 283.

OPPOSITION TO H. CON. RES. 89
AND H. CON. RES. 112

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the two resolutions brought to the floor today, H. Con. Res. 89 and H. Con. Res. 112. These resolutions are a time-wasting distraction from the real work that this Congress should be doing—finding ways to invest in America, grow paychecks and create good jobs for the middle class and those struggling to get by.

The oil fee and carbon tax are two proposals to address the problem of climate change and, in the case of the oil fee, provide needed funds for infrastructure reform. While we can debate the merits of these particular approaches, at least they are efforts to take on real challenges facing our country and the world.

Instead, the majority simply wants to stick their heads in the sand and wish these challenges away. That may appease their Trump Tea Party base, but it represents a total lack of leadership.

And make no mistake, inaction on climate change does not just risk our future—it is costing us today. The increase in extreme weather events is hitting Americans in the pocketbook, through higher insurance rates and home repair costs, and this will only get worse from our failure to act. The greater harm is through the missed opportunity to create high-paying jobs for American workers. We can be the world's green-economy leader, supporting millions of new jobs in research and manufacturing in the process, but it requires Congress to act. Republicans would rather we sit on the sidelines while other countries seek the mantle of climate-change leader, and those countries reap the benefit of high-paying technology jobs that will come with it.

Now, we should have a discussion on the best ways to boost our economy by combatting climate change, reducing our reliance on fossil fuels, and finding ways to properly invest in our nation's infrastructure. In that vein, I've introduced the Healthy Climate and Family Se-

curity Act, a cap-and-dividend plan that would help us combat climate change and support economic growth and a thriving middle class. It boosts the purchasing power of families in Maryland and across the country while achieving the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions necessary to address the economic and health risks of climate change, using a market-based approach.

Similarly, last year I introduced the GROW AMERICA Act, a bill which would boost infrastructure spending and help pay for it by closing the egregious inversions loophole which allows corporations to shift their tax obligations onto hard-working Americans just by changing their mailing address. My Democratic colleagues have many other thoughtful ideas on how we can address these important issues.

But today's resolutions are not a thoughtful discussion on addressing climate change or funding our infrastructure—in the text of these resolutions, the terms "climate change" and "infrastructure" are nowhere to be seen. In fact, these resolutions are a waste of time meant to appease the Trump Tea Party base. The American people need us to do our job, so let's get to the real work of creating broadly shared prosperity. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

TRIBUTE TO PRINCIPAL MICHAEL
FEENEY

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Principal Michael Feeney for his efforts in improving one of our local schools, Oldsmar Elementary. On May 17th 2016, Mr. Feeney received an award from the Oldsmar City Council for his exemplary work.

Mr. Feeney began his career in education at Oldsmar Elementary as a teacher, but soon after starting he realized that school administration was his calling. He assumed the role of Assistant Principal for two years and was promoted to Principal for another four years. Under Mr. Feeney's guidance, Oldsmar Elementary has gone from a "C" to an "A" grade school and his efforts have changed the lives of so many children and families throughout our community.

Although Mr. Feeney will be leaving Oldsmar Elementary to serve at another school, his dedication to excellence and commitment to his students has left a lasting legacy at Oldsmar Elementary. I ask that this body join me in recognizing Mr. Feeney's accomplishments and wish him the best of luck as he begins the next chapter of his life.

IN MEMORY OF HELEN CHÁVEZ

HON. TONY CÁRDENAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to honor the life and legacy of Helen Chávez, who passed away on Monday, June 6, 2016. Helen was a civil rights icon in her own right, and the widow of one of my heroes, César Chávez.

Throughout her life, Helen Chávez faced many challenges, yet she had a fierce determination and always kept moving forward.

When she was just 12 years old, Helen's father passed away. In order to help her mother support her five siblings, Helen began working in the California fields. Later, Helen went on to meet the love of her life, César, and became a caring mother to their eight children in East Los Angeles. However, it was her passion for César's initiative to bring justice to farm workers that inspired her to return to Delano to work in the fields.

Helen devoted her life to civil rights by bringing awareness to the cause. She inspired people to join the initiative to fight for farmworker rights. Helen and César formed the United Farmworkers Union where Helen worked tirelessly running the credit union put in place for the workers. And when times were tough, Helen did not back down. She turned to her faith for words of encouragement. She never gave up.

With Helen's encouragement and unconditional support, César went on to inspire a labor movement of farmworkers that would go on to level the playing field in the conflict over the right to form a union. This led to the most powerful and significant alliance between unions and communities in the modern day labor movement.

It is clear that Helen was more than a mother and a wife. She had an essential part in the accomplishments of her husband. Helen Chávez is one of this country's greatest advocates. She helped bring human rights to the forefront. Her quiet resiliency drove the heart of this movement.

As the son of farmworkers from the Central Valley, her work and César's initiative have made it possible for me to become a Congressman. The outcome of my life and the lives of millions of Americans who come from farmworkers and families in the labor industry are forever changed because of their fearless pursuit of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the life of Helen Chávez. Her legacy is a testament to the greatness that is these United States of America.

HONORING MS. FIONA BULLOCK

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Fiona Bullock for her 26 years of service as an educator and institutional leader at Pacific Union College.

Ms. Bullock completed her Bachelor of Arts in Social Work at Pacific Union College in 1983, before going on to earn her Master's of Social Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley in 1990.

After completing her degree, Ms. Bullock spent 26 years in the Social Work Program at her alma mater, Pacific Union College. During her time at Pacific Union College she has held positions including Associate Professor, Field Supervisor, Forum Sponsor, and Program Director. Ms. Bullock has also contributed to the field of social work through her research and the numerous articles she has authored. Throughout her career, Ms. Bullock dedicated

her time and energy to supporting students' success, including connecting her students with invaluable internships and work experiences.

A long-standing member of the National Association of Social Workers, Ms. Bullock has earned certifications in Critical Incident Stress Management and is a Board Certified Expert in War Trauma and Bereavement Trauma. Ms. Bullock earned recognition from both the National Association of Social Workers of California and the California Assembly for her support of academic freedom in higher education.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Bullock has dedicated her career to serving her students and community through the study, teaching, and practice of social work. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor her here today.

MS. DOT CASE

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Dot Case of Henderson County, North Carolina. On behalf of the people of Western North Carolina, I would like to thank Ms. Case for her dedication to the students of Henderson County, and congratulate her on her retirement after 47 years working towards the betterment of Henderson County Public Schools.

After finishing high school, Ms. Case left Henderson County to complete a degree in History at Appalachian State University, where she graduated in 1969. Later that year, she returned to Edneyville to begin the first of her many years as an educator and role model for so many. In her first job, Ms. Case taught 7th grade physical education and English at Edneyville High School, which later moved to a new campus to become North Henderson High. She soon began to teach 9th grade History, and took on the responsibility of imparting to students an understanding of our past and an appreciation for the history our state, nation, and world. Outside of the classroom, Ms. Case coached basketball, cheerleading, and track and has been a reliable presence at North Henderson's sports events for decades. Among Ms. Case's many experiences and accolades, she has sponsored Student Council programs since 1970 at Edneyville and then at North Henderson, taught AP classes since 1994, received a Social Studies Economic Teacher Award for her work, was named a Presidential Scholars Teacher in 1983, has been teacher of the year twice, and was the Regional teacher of the year in 2010.

Over her 47 years teaching, Ms. Case has shown an exceptional interest in the success of her students. By pushing them to achieve what they might not have thought possible, Dot Case has made an unparalleled impression on generations of Henderson County students and on the community at large. More than an expert educator, Ms. Case has devoted herself to improving the lives of her students in areas beyond the classroom, and has continued to embolden and assist her graduates for years after they leave North Henderson.

Ms. Dot Case is an invaluable and unforgettable member of her community. She has

earned the admiration of many students for the devotion she has given them all, and deserves the respect and gratitude of Western North Carolina. I am proud to honor Ms. Dot Case for her long service to Henderson County and sincerely express the gratitude and best wishes of the people of North Carolina as she enters retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH
ANNIVERSARY OF IBEW LOCAL 252

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local 252 in Ann Arbor Michigan. It is an honor to highlight their commitment to brotherhood and the working families of Washtenaw County and Mid-Michigan.

On June 6th 1916, twelve men, agreeing to the principles and objectives of the IBEW, received their official charter for IBEW Local 252. At the time, working conditions for laborers and trades workers were deplorable. In that era, the death rate for an electrician was more than twice the death rate for trades workers in other industries. It was commonplace that workers in many trades toiled under twelve hour work days for six or seven days a week, with substandard wages and few if any benefits, not to mention training or workplace safety rules. One hundred years later, we have workplace rules, training, safety, fair wages and benefits, and this would not be the case if not for the vision and courage of these original founders, which is why we celebrate this very important milestone. What those founders were fighting for then, and what these union members are fighting for now is a shot at the American dream, a dream that we all must continue to protect for future generations.

Today, under the leadership of Business Manager Tim Hutchens, IBEW Local 252 has grown to a membership of over 800 men and women and continues to grow. Local 252 provides the best trained and most experienced Electricians for many of the most important construction projects in the area. Whether the projects are at the University of Michigan, Eastern Michigan University, or elsewhere, if the job needs to get done right and done right the first time, you call on Local 252 members. With this high level of commitment to quality and skill, it is no wonder that this local has grown over the years to become what it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of IBEW Local 252, and I know we will be celebrating the accomplishments of this local for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO TARPON SPRINGS
LIBRARY

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Tarpon Springs Public Library for its 100 years of service to Pinellas County.

In 1916, Julia Inness started the library in the original City Hall inviting Pinellas residents to explore the exciting world that books provide and engage in meaningful literary dialogue. The library became even more popular than Ms. Inness had predicted, and in 1920, it was moved for the first time to a private home that had more space. As the library expanded, it moved again to the Shaw Arcade and then again to the Tarpon Hotel. In 1964, the "Friends of the Tarpon Springs Public Library" organization, which continues to support the library today, was formed with the intention of helping fund special enhancements to the library. Finally in 1997, the Library's current location, a twenty-thousand square foot building on East Lemon Street, was constructed.

In 1989, the Library joined the Pinellas Public Library Cooperative. The co-op helped equip the library with the necessary materials to serve the diverse population that used the library's services. While there are still local regulars who frequent the library, it has evolved into a very busy and multi-purpose space thanks to the help of the co-op.

The Library also hosts a variety of programs for Pinellas residents including the Public Arts Program and the Cultural and Civic Services program. Additionally, due to the contributions from the Friends of the Tarpon Springs Public Library organization, the Library has been updated with a new audio visual system, new computers, and resources for genealogy research. The Library has also been improving its digital correspondence, providing an online catalog allowing people out of county and state to access the Library.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Tarpon Springs Library on an impressive 100 years and thank them for continuing to provide a valuable service to our community. I am very excited to see what future the Library has in store for us in the next 100 years and ask this body to join me in recognizing the Tarpon Springs Library as a cornerstone of the Pinellas County community.

HONORING RABBI MICHAEL ZEDEK

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Rabbi Michael Zedek, who has retired after being the spiritual leader since 2004 at Emanuel Congregation in the 9th Congressional District of Illinois. He will be missed. Rabbi Zedek is a true community leader and has brought neighbors together, fostered open-mindedness and embraced the incredible diversity of our community.

Ordained in June 1974, Rabbi Zedek was chosen to be alumnus-in-residence at the Cincinnati and Los Angeles campuses of Hebrew

Union College. Rabbi Zedek is the youngest man to receive this honor.

He served as CEO of the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati and as the spiritual leader of Congregation B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City, Missouri for 26 years, where he holds the title of Rabbi Emeritus. During his tenure, the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati received national awards for innovative fundraising and programming. Prior to his service at the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati, Rabbi Zedek was the senior rabbi of Temple B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City, Missouri where he served for many years.

Rabbi Zedek is a truly dedicated community activist, scholar, and teacher. He is deeply involved in civic affairs having served on a number of national and international boards. He has also had numerous teaching and speaking appointments around the world on a wide range of topics, especially focusing on spirituality and folklore. He has taught and lectured in South Africa, Russia, China, the former Yugoslavia, and Israel and in many other countries.

He received a Danforth Graduate Fellowship for outstanding teaching, a Fulbright-Hays Grant for advanced study in the United Kingdom, and is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Hamilton College, Clinton, New York. He will still speak internationally on spirituality and folklore and remain a regular presenter at Rancho La Puerta, a spirituality and retreat center, in Tecate, Mexico. He also serves as the host of a radio show, "Religion on the Line," which has been on the air for more than 20 years. I thank Rabbi Zedek for his leadership and service.

I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring Rabbi Zedek for the work he has done for his congregation, the community, the 9th Congressional District and beyond. We thank him for his invaluable service, and wish him well in all future endeavors.

HONORING TOUGALOO COLLEGE/
DELTA HEALTHPARTNERS
HEALTHY START INITIATIVE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public health program designed to reduce infant mortality in the Mississippi Delta, the Tougaloo College/Delta HealthPartners Healthy Start Initiative.

This initiative is one of the 100 Healthy Start Initiatives throughout the nation working endlessly to give every child a healthy start in life. The Delta HealthPartners' Healthy Start program is housed under the auspices of Tougaloo College within the George A. and Ruth B. Owens Health and Wellness Center, under the direction of Dr. Sandra Carr Hayes, the executive director. The program serves a rural population in a seven county area in the Mississippi Delta (Tunica, Coahoma, Quitman, Tallahatchie, Sunflower, Bolivar, and Washington counties). These counties are among the poorest and most medically underserved in Mississippi and the nation.

The Healthy Start Initiative was implemented in 1999 with funding from the Health

Resources and Services Administration under the leadership of Dr. Beverly W. Hogan, who now serves as President of Tougaloo College. Today, Ms. Arletha Howard serves as the project director. Ms. Howard is a registered nurse with over 28 years of experience in oncology, burn trauma, intensive care unit, pediatrics, home health, maternal and child health. She has worked with the Healthy Start Initiative for 16 years. In 2014, under Mrs. Howard's leadership, the Healthy Start Initiative was upgraded from a Level I individual based program to a Level II community based program.

Since its inception, the Healthy Start Initiative has provided case management services through a home visiting model to (1) high-risk pregnant women of childbearing age 10-44 years, (2) their infants; and (3) fathers/co-parents.

Over the past 16 years, the program has achieved several major accomplishments: The Healthy Start Initiative has case managed over 900 mothers and infants just this past calendar year (January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015).

The Healthy Start Initiative has created the Coahoma County Community Action Network responsible for opening the first Diaper Bank in the state of Mississippi funded by charitable donations and Northwest Mississippi Foundation.

The Healthy Start Initiative serves as the lead agency in partnership with the Mississippi State Department of Health in the Mississippi Delta Regional Fetal Infant Mortality Review program.

The Healthy Start Initiative has created Memorandums of Understandings (MOU) with 22 partnering schools in the Mississippi Delta to provide peer support groups to pregnant/parenting teens and co-parents.

The Healthy Start Initiative has been featured in numerous publications and articles (USA Today, Hechinger Report, Huffington Post, Clarksdale Press Register, Tunica Times, and WABG TV Interview) highlighting the comprehensive services of the project.

The Healthy Start Initiative has partnered with Parents for Public Schools to provide trainings for project parents on advocacy skills and educating and mobilizing parents to strengthen public schools.

The Healthy Start Initiative promotes breastfeeding in two (2) clinic sites by providing health education by project's Certified Lactation Counselors (Women's Clinic-Clarksdale, MS and Gamble Clinic-Greenville, MS).

The Healthy Start Initiative hosts a Community Baby Shower in partnership with local hospitals, Federally Qualified Community Health Centers (FQHC), other health care providers and key stakeholders each year in September to promote awareness of infant mortality during National Infant Mortality Awareness Month.

The Healthy Start Initiative has implemented a male outreach initiative to address parenting issues among male co-parents and hosts an Annual 5k Walk in June to promote Men's Health Awareness.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing The Tougaloo College Delta HealthPartners Healthy Start Initiative for its continued efforts to reduce infant mortality in the Mississippi Delta.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Number 273 on Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res 767, Roll Call Number 274 on Agreeing to the Resolution of H. Res 767, Roll Call Number 275 on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended H.R. 3826, Roll Call Number 276 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775, Roll Call Number 277 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775, Roll Call Number 278 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775, Roll Call Number 279 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775, Roll Call Number 280 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775, Roll Call Number 281 On Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 4775, Roll Call Number 282 On Passage of H.R. 4775 which took place Wednesday, June 8, 2016, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted Aye on Roll Call Number 273 on Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res 767, on Roll Call Number 274 on Agreeing to the Resolution of H. Res 767, on Roll Call Number 275 on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended H.R. 3826 and on Roll Call Number 282 for passage of H.R. 4775.

I would have voted Nay on Roll Call Number 276 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775, on Roll Call Number 277 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775, on Roll Call Number 278 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775, on Roll Call Number 279 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775, on Roll Call Number 280 On Agreeing to the Amendment of H.R. 4775.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF MARC
STEPP

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Marc Stepp, who passed away on June 3rd, 2016, at the age of 93. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends.

Born on January 31st, 1923, in Versailles, Kentucky, he grew up in Evansville, Indiana before coming to Detroit. He was a graduate of the University of Detroit and a U.S. Army veteran.

Marc now rests as a legend of the labor movement—one of the greatest friends to working people that our nation has ever known. I speak here for Detroit, for the members of the United Automobile Workers Union, and the people whose lives he has touched, when I say that we will miss him dearly.

I stand before you today as the Dean of the Congress because when I was a young man, Marc Stepp stood up for me. He provided me crucial guidance, support, and advice as I sought elected office, and throughout my career he has inspired me to fight harder with his own dedication to securing jobs, justice, and peace for all people.

The first African American to lead negotiations with a major Detroit automaker, the second African American member of the United Automobile Workers International Board, and an organizer who fought alongside my father to secure collective bargaining at the major automakers, Marc helped create the reality of an American middle class. Countless workers owed their jobs and the lives and families those jobs made possible to his efforts. His work to save Chrysler in the late 1970s and early 1980s preserved a proud American manufacturer who might have otherwise faded away.

Marc's legacy of advocacy though was not limited to collective bargaining alone. He helped shape movements to secure healthcare for the disadvantaged by establishing the Community Health Association, to elevate our discourse on race as part of the NAACP, and to end apartheid in South Africa. Indeed, some twenty years after helping me get elected to Congress, he helped get me arrested protesting apartheid in front of South Africa's Washington, D.C. embassy—a fight that would be won ten years later when Nelson Mandela became President of South Africa.

The legacy Marc Stepp leaves us goes beyond the wages and conditions he secured and the rights he helped ensure for all. He will remain an example of how to live our lives for generations. He will continue to influence the fight for jobs, justice, and peace through those who he inspired and influenced. He may be gone but he will not be forgotten. I am thankful for his service and his friendship, as are all who knew him and called him friend.

TRIBUTE TO SHERRIE MORTON
TETRICK

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize and express my condolences in mourning the loss of Mrs. Sherrie Morton Tetrick, a distinguished member of our community.

Mrs. Sherrie Morton Tetrick was a member of the Belleair Women's Republican Club for 16 years and held a variety of posts throughout her membership. She began as an assistant treasurer and then, in 2007, was elected to the treasurer position. For eight years she served in this position, managing the club's financial affairs, monitoring and updating the membership roster, reporting to the State of Florida, and planning arrangements for the Belleair Country Club for luncheons.

Sherrie was a well-known and respected member of our community who was known for being willing to help anyone in any way she can. She was strong, courageous, determined, and she will be deeply missed among her family, friends, and all who knew her.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my most heartfelt wishes and thoughts to Sherrie's husband Rick, and her friends and family. Sherrie was an amazing individual that will be sorely missed in Pinellas County. I ask that this body recognize Sherrie Morton Tetrick for her dedication to our community. May God bless Sherrie, Rick, and all those who knew her.

HONORING PASTOR CASEY D.
FISHER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a God-fearing and impressionistic man, Pastor Casey D. Fisher. Pastor Fisher has shown what can be done through tenacity, dedication and a desire to serve God.

A Spirit-fed and Spirit-led minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Pastor Casey D. Fisher was born in Utica, Mississippi, on July 8, 1966. He is the son of Sharkey and Katie Fisher. He received his formal education from the Hinds County School system and graduated from Utica High School in 1984. He attended the University of Southern Mississippi, where he majored in Business Administration. He later received a Bachelor in Religious Education, a Masters of Divinity and a Doctorate of Ministry from Living Word Bible Institution in Tyler, Texas.

Pastor Fisher is married to the former Michele Chambers. They were married on September 17, 1988. He is the father of three lovely children: twin sons, Bryan and Ryan and a daughter, Casey Michele. Pastor Fisher finds time to love and care for his family as Christ does the church. He is devoted to strengthening them and helping them to grow in their everyday walk with the Lord, just as he does with the church.

Pastor Fisher has served his country as a soldier in the United States Army. During this time, he truly accepted Jesus Christ as his personal savior on October 23, 1993 in Livorno, Italy. He served eight years in the U.S. Army, where he was part of two tours in Southwest Asia. He departed military service in July 1997. Afterwards, he was employed with the U.S. Postal Service in Vicksburg, Mississippi, where he recently retired in December, 2010.

He is currently a Life Member of the Vicksburg Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. and serves as the Guide Right Chairman. His purpose is Achievement, in which he mentors young men, twelve through eighteen years of age, providing them with tutoring, community involvement and religious principles. He is also a member of Masonic Order of Prince Hall Free and Accepted Mason.

In 1984, Pastor Fisher became the first known athlete in Mississippi to be selected All-State in four sports. While attending University of Southern Mississippi, he was a member of the basketball team, in which he led the Golden Eagles to the NIT championship in 1987 and later was inducted into the USM hall of fame. Although he loves basketball, he also has a passion for golfing. Dr. Fisher is a die-hard fan of the Los Angeles Lakers and the Dallas Cowboys.

Pastor Fisher's motto is "If you don't take it personal, it will make you a better person". He is inspired by one of the Greatest Ministers, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., because of his willingness to serve and his willingness to give up his life for humanity. Greater Grove Street M. B. Church has stood the test of time through dedication, faith, stewardship, and commitment from this soldier on the battlefield for the

Lord. He is a man of integrity, loyalty, dignity, and honesty leading his people to do the will of God.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Pastor Casey D. Fisher for his dedication to God, family, community and country.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION
EXPANDING THE YELLOW RIBBON PROGRAM

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program. For too long, through too many wars and too many deployments, we have treated our active duty servicemembers and their families as expendable once their usefulness on the battlefield has ended.

We hear too many stories of members of the military who do not have the right tools to adapt back into civilian life. The Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program was aimed at helping address the unique challenges facing the National Guard and Reserve Component community during this transition.

The Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program has helped these Guard and Reserve servicemembers with: accessing benefits, geographic isolation, lack of access to military family support groups in local communities, continued and repeated deployments, and unemployment and underemployment.

The Yellow Ribbon program has also helped to educate servicemembers on the rigors of deployment, implement reintegration curriculum throughout the deployment cycle, and inform servicemembers and their families about the resources available and connect members to service providers who can assist them in overcoming the challenges of reintegration.

The Yellow Ribbon program has been successful in making sure the backbone of our society, those men and women who pursue their chosen profession, but also choose the military as an obligation to secure the liberties and freedoms we hold most dear.

It is only right that we help speed the transition of those active duty servicemembers who have essentially put their lives on hold while they serve in the military full time. They need to have the same access to services and information.

My legislation will expand this successful program to all active-duty servicemembers and their families. This will give these young men and women the ability and information to transition successfully to civilian life after protecting of our freedoms for so long.

Once they leave the military and are the responsibility of the VA, it is too late. We need to speed the transition to civilian life and in the process, reduce suicide, and get these soon-to-be veterans in to the VA system for their health and claims benefits.

Many of these men and women, when they leave the military, do not have the support structures they need to successfully reintegrate into civilian society. One young man I know of was homeless and could not have custody of his child and go to school on the

GI Bill because he had stayed in the service on the first day of the month. He was ineligible for his housing stipend due to his service and was homeless.

This is unacceptable and it is obvious that these men and women are being sent out into society unprepared for the decisions they must make: when to wake up, what clothes to buy, how to get housing.

The Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program has been successful in what it was designed to do. We need to expand it to make sure all those who serve get the benefit of the lessons learned from this program.

I am pleased to introduce this legislation to expand the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program to all servicemembers. With this, we can take the next step to ensuring that the young men and women who protect those of us here at home will have a home to return to.

HONORING JACKIE THOMAS
STUMP

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks to honor the life of Mr. Jackie Thomas Stump, who passed away on June 2, 2016. I had the pleasure of serving with Jackie, a coal miner-turned-legislator, in the Virginia House of Delegates, where he represented Buchanan, Tazewell, and Russell Counties.

Jackie was born on January 13, 1948 in Lebanon, Virginia and served in the Air Force from 1967 to 1971, spending 18 months in Saigon as a jet mechanic. When he returned, he mined coal and in 1979 was elected secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers (UMW) District 28. In 1986, he was elected president of the UMW district, which covered most of Virginia.

In 1989, during the Pittston Coal strike, Jackie ran and won a write-in campaign for the House of Delegates as an independent. He served until he resigned for health reasons in 2005.

Jackie was one of a kind and, though he didn't often rise to speak on the floor, I will always remember that when he did, he usually shared the views of the "little guy"—folks who many would say didn't have extraordinary wealth, power, or influence. Jackie also served on several boards and commissions, including the Virginia Parole Board and the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development.

Jackie is survived by his wife of 25 years, Linda Stump, of Abingdon; his daughter, Ahbra Stump, of Abingdon; and his "furry companion," Ruffles. He is also survived by his mother, Margret Stump, of Keen Mountain; his sisters, Wanda Sue Justice and husband Danny, Christine Hicks and husband David, all of Keen Mountain; and numerous nieces and nephews.

I have always appreciated the good working relationship and friendship that Jackie and I had, and will continue fondly remembering how very deeply he cared about Southwest Virginia and those who call it home. I am saddened by Jackie's passing, and extend my prayers and deepest sympathies to his family and loved ones during this time. May God give them comfort and peace.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE PULMONARY HYPERTENSION ASSOCIATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the outstanding efforts of the Pulmonary Hypertension Association (PHA) in the fight against the rare, debilitating disease, and potentially fatal condition, pulmonary hypertension (PH).

I am proud to represent the Lone Star Chapter of PHA, located in The Woodlands. This disease was first brought to my attention over a decade ago by Chapter member, Jack Stibbs, whose daughter, Emily, had been recently diagnosed at an early age and given a dire prognosis. However, due to Emily's early diagnosis and advancements in medical research, including the development of innovative treatments, she has been able to lead a full life and even recently graduated college.

Most patients are not as fortunate as Emily has been. PH can be idiopathic or occur as the result of sickle cell disease, scleroderma, and other conditions. Nearly 3 out of 4 PH patients are not diagnosed until the disease has reached a late stage, which renders many available therapies ineffective and leaves patients facing a much more serious medical intervention, such as heart-lung transplantation. PH is very aggressive and the average life expectancy without an accurate diagnosis and proper treatment is just under 3 years.

I continually work with my colleagues in Congress to advance efforts that seek to lower healthcare costs, promote quality, and improve outcomes for patients. This is why I work with the PH community to call attention to important legislative efforts, including the Pulmonary Hypertension Research and Diagnosis Act (H.R. 3520), which seeks to leverage limited resources to ensure more PH patients are diagnosed at an early stage and can benefit from treatments like Emily has.

This June, the PH community will be gathering in Texas for their Semi-Annual International Conference. This is a bittersweet engagement as it will be the last Conference for Rino Aldrighetti, who has served as President and CEO of PHA for 17 incredible years. After PHA was founded around a kitchen table by passionate advocates seeking to improve the lives of affected individuals and families, Rino was one of the first employees the organization hired. Under Rino's leadership the organization grew from modest beginnings to an agent for meaningful change. Today, PHA has expanded to an organization of more than fifty staff with a budget of \$13 million. When Rino started most medical professionals knew little about the disease. There was one FDA approved therapy available, but far too frequently, patients died waiting for a diagnosis. But now, thanks to PHA, coordinated research and patient support efforts we have 14 FDA approved treatment options for PH, and PHA's Research Program has committed more than \$17 million to support cutting edge research focused on PH. In addition, more than 80 independent PH associations have been established around the world, and PHA has signed Memorandum of Understanding with 35 nations.

More can be done though. I ask my colleagues to recognize Rino and to honor his legacy of service to the PH community by supporting PH patients and early diagnosis legislation.

TRIBUTE TO PALM PAVILION

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Palm Pavilion for its 90th year in business marked this past May 26, 2016.

Started in 1926 by five partners, Palm Pavilion was intended to serve as a bathing pavilion for local patrons. One of the founders, Jesse Smith, recalls that it was open daily and was comprised of a bathhouse with changing rooms, a booth for towel and bathing suit rentals, a dance floor with jukebox music, a picnic area, and a kitchen. They served food like hamburgers and hot dogs while sodas and beer were kept cold in ice bins.

For thirty eight years, Jesse Smith and his wife were the main owners of Palm Pavilion, but in the sixties, they sold it, Howard and Jean Hamilton. The Hamiltons worked to modernize by removing the bath house and focusing more on food and beverages, yet they made every effort to maintain the fun and relaxed atmosphere for which Palm Pavilion was known.

Today, the Grill and Bar has expanded, providing seating for more than 300 beachgoers and serving all types of food. It also employs more than a hundred people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Palm Pavilion for being a cornerstone of our community. For nearly a hundred years, it has been a point of interest for locals and tourists alike, and I ask that this body join me in celebrating their continued success.

HONORING CHIEF CHRIS PALMER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Chris Palmer.

Chief Chris Palmer was born to Carl Palmer and the late Classie Palmer. He is the fourth of six children. Chief Palmer is married to Kathy Robinson and they have five children and six grandchildren. He attended Crystal Springs High School and graduated from Jackson State University with a B.S. degree in Criminal Justice and Corrections.

Chief Palmer began his career with the Crystal Springs Police Department as a Dispatcher and became a Patrolman in 1994. During his tenure on patrol, Chief Palmer was contracted to the Mississippi Bureau of Narcotics as an undercover agent.

Four years later, Chief Palmer became the investigator for the City of Crystal Springs. As investigator, Chief Palmer worked all felony cases in the city for the next 15 years. These cases included Murder, Aggravated Assault, and Burglary along with numerous white collar crimes. While investigating these crimes Chief

Palmer worked over 175 cases per year with a solvability rate of 94.6 percent and a conviction rate of 99.7 percent.

In February, 2015, Chief Palmer was promoted from Investigator to Captain. After a brief stint as Captain, Chief Palmer was promoted to his current position as Chief in October, 2015. Chief Palmer has an excellent staff that includes fifteen (15) police officers, six (6) dispatchers, a Court Clerk and a Deputy Court Clerk. Chief Palmer works diligently each day to make sure all employees are updated with hourly classes to make them better Dispatchers, Court Clerks and Officers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Chief Chris Palmer for his dedication to serving our great state of Mississippi.

REMEMBERING DAVID GILKEY

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, David Gilkey, an NPR photojournalist from Portland, Oregon, was killed with his Afghani translator, Zabihullah Tamanna, in a Taliban ambush in Afghanistan.

I cannot express fully my gratitude for David's tireless commitment to his profession. His evocative, powerful work, and many contributions to NPR will be remembered for generations.

Graduating from Wilson High School in Portland in 1985, David followed the path of his father, Richard Gilkey, to Oregon State University, before following his passion of photojournalism at the Boulder Daily Camera, and then the Detroit Free Press before joining NPR in 2007.

David covered conflict areas from around the globe, ethnic violence in Rwanda and the Balkans, apartheid in South Africa, famine in Somalia and violence in the Gaza Strip. Since 2001 he extensively covered the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

He was one of the most decorated of photojournalists, winning an Emmy in 2007 for a documentary video series and receiving 36 honors from the White House. In 2015, he was the first multimedia journalist to be awarded the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's prestigious Edward R. Murrow Award for Journalism.

David and journalists like him play an essential role in helping us all better understand global events, putting themselves in harm's way to open the world's window for the rest of us. They are true heroes.

Our hearts go out to David's mother and father, Alyda and Richard Gilkey, his circle of family and friends, and to his entire NPR family for their loss.

CONGRATULATING RICHARD
GABBERT ON HIS SELECTION AS
A MANSFIELD FELLOW

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Richard Gabbert on his selec-

tion as a Mansfield Fellow. Mr. Gabbert is among ten federal government officials who will begin the year-long Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program in Japan this year. Congress established the Mansfield Fellowship Program in 1994 to build a corps of U.S. government officials with substantial Japan expertise. Since then one hundred and forty Fellows—representing twenty-seven U.S. government agencies, commissions and the U.S. Congress—have entered the Fellowship Program.

Mr. Gabbert is a member of the twenty-first group of Mansfield Fellows, chosen through a selective recruitment and vetting process. Japan has long been an important part of Mr. Gabbert's life, and he is highly qualified for this unique professional development opportunity. He spent part of his childhood and early career in Japan, and continued this engagement during law school and in private practice.

As a Senior Special Counsel at the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), Mr. Gabbert helped develop a cross-border regulatory framework for the over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives markets and the global financial institutions active in those markets. His Mansfield Fellowship will give him the contacts and understanding needed to facilitate U.S. Japan coordination in this area, coordination that is critical for a smooth transition to this new regulatory framework in our countries and globally.

Mr. Gabbert will begin his Fellowship in Japan this summer with a seven-week homestay and language training in Ishikawa Prefecture. This will be followed by ten months of practical experience in Japanese government offices in Tokyo. During his placements he will work side-by-side with Japanese financial regulators. He will seek to understand the Japanese response to the 2008 financial crisis and its aftermath, particularly the legislative and regulatory reforms designed to increase transparency and stability in the OTC derivatives markets. He also will explore current issues in the implementation of these reforms in Japan, including the challenges of cross-border regulation and supervision of these markets, in order to support effective domestic regulatory efforts.

As a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and its Subcommittee on the Asia-Pacific, I understand the important role Japan plays in the global economy and the critical need to coordinate with Japan on financial and other matters. Close coordination requires U.S. government officials like Mr. Gabbert who are prepared to develop the contacts and expertise needed to facilitate their agencies' work on Japan-related programs.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Gabbert on his selection as a Mansfield Fellow. I am confident his Mansfield Fellowship experience will enhance the work of the SEC and deepen its cooperation with Japan.

I hope you will also join me in recognizing the value of the Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program and the opportunities it provides U.S. government officials like Mr. Gabbert to learn about Japan and its government and to strengthen the U.S. relationship with this important ally.

COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND EMPLOYERS

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the National Association of Colleges and Employers—NACE—on its 60th anniversary of service to, leadership of, and advocacy for the community of college career services professionals and HR/recruiting professionals who are focused on the employment of the college educated. Located in Bethlehem, PA, NACE boasts more than 10,000 members across the country who perform work vital to our national labor force and national interests.

Founded in 1956, NACE supports the critical work of its members through research, advocacy, and professional development and serves the greater public by providing key data and insight to further the goals and dreams of those who choose higher education as their path to a rewarding and successful career. NACE's initiatives expand beyond its membership to also serve the larger national community and help our graduates achieve successful outcomes. To that end, NACE has undertaken efforts to ensure new college graduates can transition into the job market with the competencies they need to succeed and to keep our nation competitive in the global marketplace.

As NACE continues to look to the future and address critical issues facing our labor force, employment community, and country, I congratulate NACE on this 60th anniversary and wish it continued growth and prosperity in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY WILLIAMS
AND JEVON GRAHAM, ASSISTANT
CHIEFS, CLEARWATER FIRE
& RESCUE

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize two men, Larry Williams and Jevon Graham, and congratulate them for being named Assistant Chiefs of Clearwater Fire and Rescue.

Larry Williams and Jevon Graham were recently promoted to Assistant Fire Chiefs after achieving the top two scores among 43 applicants for the position. Mr. Williams and Mr. Graham, the first African American administrators in the history of the department, are making strides in their field and helping pave the way for future generations of the Clearwater Fire and Rescue teams.

In the City of Clearwater, there are 196 Fire and Rescue employees and only 14 of them are African-American, comprising seven percent of the force. Mr. Williams and Mr. Graham's promotion to Assistant Fire Chiefs is a tremendous step forward for the Tampa Bay area and I applaud Mr. Williams and Mr. Graham for their efforts in our community.

Mr. Williams' own heroes and mentors were firefighters who also broke racial barriers at

the St. Petersburg Fire and Rescue station. He has served for 20 years with Clearwater Fire and Rescue. I thank him for the decades of service he has already given to us. Mr. Williams will be becoming the Assistant Chief of Suppression.

Mr. Graham became a firefighter in 1998 and at the time was one of three minority firefighters in the department. He has worked for 17 years with Clearwater Fire and Rescue in various capacities including as a member of the dive team, technical rescue team, and as a lieutenant for 12 years. He will serve as Assistant Chief of Health and Safety.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and acknowledge Mr. Graham and Mr. Williams for their dedication to our community and to Clearwater Fire and Rescue. They are role models for Pinellas County. I ask that this body join me in thanking them for their service and wishing them success in their new roles as Assistant Chiefs of Clearwater Fire and Rescue.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF MR. MCBURNETT JAMES
KNOX, JR.

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. McBurnett James Knox, Jr., better known as "Coach Mac," who passed away on May 29, 2016, at the age of 89.

Coach Mac served his country in the United States Navy, and was a retired United States postal worker and longtime employee of the New Orleans Recreation Development Commission (NORD). He was best known as the longtime supervisor at the Pontchartrain Park in New Orleans and legendary coach of the Pontchartrain Park Patriots.

Coach Mac coached every sport and activity possible. His teams won city championships in baseball, football, basketball, softball and track. Coach Mac coached all-star teams in Babe Ruth Baseball, Biddy Basketball, and the National Youth Games. He was able to win both a state and a national championship in his career. Also, during Coach Mac's four plus decades at the Pontchartrain Park, he ran a softball league for postal workers and other adult leagues.

Mr. Speaker, as a beneficiary of Coach Mac's commitment and sacrifice, I celebrate his life and legacy, because he has touched the lives of many children and citizens in New Orleans, Louisiana. His wife preceded him in death; however, my thoughts and prayers are with his five children and the other members of his family.

VVA SUPPORT OUR TROOPS
RALLY

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 2016, Vietnam Veterans of America, Chapter 862 will sponsor its 15th annual Support Our

Troops Rally to honor the courageous individuals serving in our armed forces as well as our veterans. It is an opportunity to pay our respects to our troops stationed both here at home and overseas.

We should never fail to recognize the irreplaceable contributions of our service members, and we should never take their service for granted. As civilians, it is often easy to go about our daily lives, enjoying our freedoms, without remembering the sacrifices that purchased them.

Robert Gwin organized the first Support Our Troops Rally 15 years ago, and the tradition has only grown stronger, with the rally drawing larger crowds every year. This is a testament to the value of institutions like Vietnam Veterans of America in demonstrating gratitude to our troops who need to know how much their service means to the rest of us.

The Support Our Troops Rally fosters a strong sense of patriotism and appreciation in our community. Most important, it helps us convey our gratitude to our veterans and troops, particularly those overseas in dangerous areas of the world.

HONORING TOMMY L.
MCCULLOUGH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Tommy L. McCullough, who was born in Pickens, Madison County, Mississippi to the late parents of W.E.L. and Classie McCullough. He was the youngest of twenty siblings where ten (10) were added by marriage.

Mr. Tommy L. McCullough was raised in Valley View, Mississippi and attended Nichols School until the eighth grade. Later he went to Cameron Street High School and left to go to the Army while he was in the 12th grade.

Mr. McCullough entered the Army on December 13, 1954, he was in the 25th Division at Scofield Barracks in Hawaii. While there an Honor Guard was formed after a few months and height requirements were 5 feet 10 inches tall, but because he was sharp and intelligent he was chosen to be a Guard, although he was 5 feet 8 inches tall. They later changed the title from Guard to Drill Platoon. No one could handle a rifle the way Mr. McCullough handled it and he was recognized with many letters of congratulations for his performance in the Drill Platoon, he also went to the Non-Commission Officer Academy and received a diploma. Within two years he went from a Private to SP3 (Specialist 3rd class). There he stayed until his discharge on November 27, 1956 and went back to Jackson, Mississippi.

He had many friends who were Civil Rights Activist, one of them was a Freedom Rider, Mr. Jake Freeze, who was one of the leaders in the Freedom Riders Movement that lived in his house in 1963, which was later called the Freedom House in Madison County. Pictures are on the wall of the Civil Rights Museum in Canton, Mississippi, today.

Mr. McCullough afterwards moved to Louisville, KY in 1965. He worked at Harshaws Chemical Company for about five years. He

missed Mississippi so much that he came back and opened up a night club, Billa Farro, for five years in Jackson and later opened a Car Dealership, TC and III, and then he retired.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Tommy L. McCullough for his dedication to serving others.

THE GIFT, RUNNING ON THE WIND,
THE BREEZE—IN HONOR OF
MIDFIELDER FRANK URSO

HON. MARKWAYNE MULLIN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of The University of Maryland Midfielder Frank Urso, who received the prestigious Teewaarton Legend Award on June 2nd at the Native American Museum in Washington, DC. Frank was a four-year 1st Team All American, leading The Terps to two National Championships, and Two National Championship finals in his four years at Maryland. He joins the likes of Jim Brown, Gary Gate, and Eamon McEnneny. I would like to submit this poem in honor of him and the Native Americans who created the magnificent game of lacrosse, penned by fellow teammate Albert Carey Caswell.

Long before Basket and Baseball or Football
ever came to be
All out across this great land this sweet
Country tis a thee
Came on the wind, came running on the
breeze
All out there upon those fields of green as so
to be
But came The Native Americans so all at
speed.
All in this their game of such intensity
Of such power and might, grace and speed
As the fastest game on foot you'll ever see
Ah' poetry in motion
as is this sport of beauty and combat all
interweaved.
As is Lacrosse their great gift to you and
me.
A gift to Mankind which one day would in-
tercede
Capturing little boys and girls hearts all at
speed
With stick in hand as they become one to
compete
While, into the night against a wall chasing
their dreams.
To Be The Best on fields of green.
Bagattaway, as it all began with the mag-
nificent Native Americans you see
Who are The Very Heart of what it all so
means to be an America indeed.
A people of such character and courage,
strength and speed
Who to Nature so respect and heed.
A race of people who were the antifascist of
living free.
Running on the wind, the breeze.
Training mighty warriors for the rigors of
combat, as they would bleed
Turning boys to men, giving them the
strength, training, and confidence they
would need.
Running on the wind, the breeze, as all
across this Nation their great game
came to be
As why to this day with such high regard the
world envies
As they'd pass this game down through the
generations to their families, from

dream time of their great ancestors in history
 This gift we now know as LACROSSE, so much achieves.
 Building character and strength, and such teamwork to cement all who intervene
 Now, growing far and wide all throughout our country sides
 For no greater game has yet to be devised
 As it reaches deep down into ones very soul
 As does their fine gift to America to behold.
 Running on the wind.
 To them so much we owe.
 Ode to The Native American, who've given us this great game we all love and know
 Of stamina and courage, and of grace, which put smiles upon our face
 Of skill and such grit, and the teamwork so all in it
 With such might and speed she gives us all we need.
 Ah' running on the wind, the breeze, Lacrosse
 All in this Native American's Game of Speed.

TRIBUTE TO ROB VAN TASSEL,
 FLORIDA BIG BROTHER OF THE
 YEAR

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a member of our community, Rob Van Tassel, for being named Florida's Big Brother of the Year.

Mr. Van Tassel is a logistics manager with Southwire, a manufacturing company based in Clearwater, Florida. He graduated from Dunedin High School in 1975 and has been a Pinellas County resident for many years now. Inspired by the way his father had raised him and encouraged by his own daughter, Mr. Van Tassel decided to join Big Brothers and Big Sisters and give back to the community that had given him and his family so much. In 2008, Mr. Van Tassel was matched with his current little brother Seth. For Seth, Rob is a supportive shoulder to lean on and a thoughtful advisor who keeps him focused on his education and making decisions that are beneficial for the rest of his life. Rob's work with Seth is truly exceptional.

Rob believes that children need strong mentors for guidance, and that it is our responsibility to help guide children and young adults who need help finding their way. In addition to being named Florida's Big Brother of the Year, Mr. Van Tassel is also being considered for the national Big Brother of the Year award.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Rob Van Tassel for dedicating his time and efforts to our community. He has a strong desire to give back and, in turn, has inspired others to do so as well. I thank Rob for what he has done and I ask that this body join me in honoring and acknowledging Rob for his award and dedication to Pinellas County.

CELEBRATING DÍA DE PORTUGAL

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with Mr. NUNES of California, Mr. VALADAO of California, Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island, Mr. DENHAM of California, Mr. ZELDIN of New York, Ms. LOFGREN of California, Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, and Mr. HONDA of California to recognize Día de Portugal. On June 10 each year, Día de Portugal celebrates the Portuguese people, their strong heritage, and their beautiful country and culture.

Día de Portugal honors the death of the revered Portuguese poet Luís Vaz de Camões in 1580. While his mastery of verse has been compared to both Shakespeare and Dante, Camões is famously known for his epic "Os Lusíadas," one of Portugal's most treasured literary works. The poem pays tribute to Portugal's golden age of exploration and celebrates the many world-changing discoveries made by its seafaring explorers in the 15th century.

In his poem, Camões speaks of the Portuguese as destined to accomplish great deeds, and they have. This rings especially true of the more than one million Portuguese-Americans who have been contributing to and enriching culture in the United States for generations. Americans of Portuguese descent are responsible for tremendous growth and innovation, whether it be in the arts, agriculture, sports, or the highest levels of American government. The unbreakable bond between Portugal and the United States goes back many years—to the very founding of our nation.

After the Revolutionary War, Portugal was one of our first allies and one of the first countries to officially recognize the United States. In 1791, President George Washington formalized diplomatic relations with Portugal, and our relationship is stronger than ever more than 200 years later.

Today, Portugal is not just our friend and ally, but an important strategic partner for the United States. We must never forget the role of Portugal and Lajes Field during World War II, when the Portuguese helped us protect supply ships, identify U-boats, and win the war against fascism. As home to the U.S. Air Force's 65th Air Base Wing, Lajes Field was instrumental in our efforts during the Cold War and the Yom Kippur War and continues to be a critical asset in the Atlantic.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I join hands with the people of Portugal to reaffirm our commitment to strengthening the many ties between us, and we vow to ensure our relationship remains strong and robust. Along with the people of Portugal and Portuguese-Americans throughout the United States, we wish everyone a happy and joyous Día de Portugal.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Number 283 on Consideration of the Resolu-

tion for H. Res. 771 which took place Thursday, June 9, 2016, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted Aye on Roll Call Number 283 on Consideration of the Resolution for H. Res. 771.

HONORING PATRICIA D. WISE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Judge Patricia D. Wise. Elected in 1989, she is one of four Chancellors of the Fifth Chancery Court District of Hinds County, Mississippi.

Formerly, Mrs. Wise was managing attorney and partner in the law firm of Dockins & Wise, Attorneys at Law, Jackson, Mississippi. Her private practice was in the area of Domestic Relations-Family Law, Personal Injury and General Civil practice. She served as Family Law Resource Attorney for Central Mississippi Legal Services.

An Oxford, Mississippi native, she has lived in Jackson, Mississippi for the past thirty-five years. She received her Bachelor of Science in Special Education, her Master's of Communicative Disorders and her Juris Doctorate degree all from the University of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Judge Patricia D. Wise for her dedication to serving others.

TRIBUTE TO KEN DEKA

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 10, 2016

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. Ken Deka, a veteran and member of our community, for his work to honor our troops on a nightly routine.

Mr. Deka moved to Indian Rocks Beach after retiring. He would occasionally play "Taps" on his bugle for his neighbors, and it soon became a nightly tradition. Now, Mr. Deka's rendition of "Taps" has become a community staple, and he can be heard playing it every night for his neighbors on Indian Rocks Beach.

Mr. Deka says he does it for the men and women currently serving, veterans, those military personnel who have already passed, and family members of his who have served, like his brother, a veteran who passed away five years ago. He wants to continue to honor those who, like Mr. Deka and his brother, have given so much to our country and remind all of his neighbors to be grateful for our military.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank and acknowledge Mr. Ken Deka for his service to our country, and for his continued efforts to remember and recognize our men and women in uniform. I ask that this body join me in thanking Mr. Ken Deka for his continued support for our veterans.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3787–S3812

Measures Introduced: Three bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3048–3050, and S. Res. 488–492. **Page S3795**

Measures Passed:

James H. Meredith March Against Fear 50th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 488, recognizing the historical significance and the 50th anniversary of the “James H. Meredith March Against Fear”, a 220-mile walk down Highway 51 from Memphis, Tennessee, to Jackson, Mississippi.

Page S3790

Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act: Senate passed H.R. 2137, to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough.

Pages S3811–12

Susanville Indian Rancheria: Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2212, to take certain Federal lands located in Lassen County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Susanville Indian Rancheria, and the bill was then passed.

Page S3812

Indian Trust Asset Reform Act: Senate passed H.R. 812, to provide for Indian trust asset management reform.

Page S3812

Loren R. Kaufman VA Clinic: Committee on Veterans’ Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1762, to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in The Dalles, Oregon, as the “Loren R. Kaufman VA Clinic”, and the bill was then passed. —

Page S3812

Honoring the Life of Muhammad Ali: Senate agreed to S. Res. 489, honoring the life and achievements of Muhammad Ali.

Page S3812

Ambush Marketing: Senate agreed to S. Res. 490, expressing the sense of the Senate that ambush marketing adversely affects the United States Olympic and Paralympic teams.

Page S3812

National Day of Racial Amity and Reconciliation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 491, designating June 12, 2016, as a national day of racial amity and reconciliation.

Page S3812

Hemp History Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 492, designating the week of June 6 through June 12, 2016, as “Hemp History Week”.

Page S3812

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:

Pages S3787–90, S3790

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 4607, to amend the provision on share-in-savings contracts.

Pages S3788–90

Reed (for Reid) Amendment No. 4603 (to Amendment No. 4607), to change the enactment date.

Pages S3788–90

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 68 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. 97), 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 bill.

Page S3789

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 4 p.m., on Monday, June 13, 2016, Senate resume consideration of the bill, post-cloture; that all post-cloture time on the bill expire at 11 a.m., on Tuesday, June 14, 2016; and that if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, it be considered to have been invoked at 10 p.m., on Monday, June 13, 2016.

Page S3812

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S3793**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3793–94**

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S3795–96
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
 Pages S3796–98
Additional Statements: Pages S3792–93
Amendments Submitted: Pages S3798–S3811
Record Votes: One record vote was taken today.
 (Total—97) Page S3789
Adjournment: Senate convened at 8:15 a.m. and
 adjourned at 12:09 p.m., until 4 p.m. on Monday,

June 13, 2016. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3812.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 11 public bills, H.R. 5445–5455; and 2 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 136; and H. Res. 776, were introduced.
 Pages H3703–04

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H3704–05

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 3636, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow labor organizations and management organizations to receive the results of visa petitions about which such organizations have submitted advisory opinions, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 114–614);

H.R. 5169, to strengthen welfare research and evaluation, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–615, Part 1);

H.R. 5170, to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–616);

H.R. 5050, to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–617, Part 1); and

H.R. 4612, to ensure economic stability, accountability, and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on midnight rules during a President's final days in office, and for other purposes, (H. Rept. 114–618, Part 1).

Page H3703

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Poe (TX) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.
 Pages H3667

Expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 89,

expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, by a yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 163 nays with two answering "present", Roll No. 295.

Pages H3669–77, H3693

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 Wednesday, June 8th.

Expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 112, expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil, by a yea-and-nay vote of 253 yeas to 144 nays with two answering "present", Roll No. 296.

Pages H3677–83, H3693–94

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 Wednesday, June 8th.

Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2017: The House passed H.R. 5325, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 175 nays, Roll No. 294. Consideration began yesterday, June 9th.
 Pages H3683–93

Rejected the Castro (TX) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 170 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 293.
 Pages H3691–92

Agreed to:

Gosar amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 114–611) that prohibits any funds for delivering printed copies of the United States House of Representatives Telephone Directory to the office of any Member of the House of Representatives;
 Page H3684

Gosar amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 114–611) that prohibits any funds for delivering printed copies of the President’s Budget to the office of any Member of the House of Representatives;

Page H3684

Grayson amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 114–611) that expands the list of parties with whom the federal government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of the contractors; and

Pages H3684–85

Russell amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 114–611) that prohibits use of funds under this Act to be used to deliver a printed copy of the Federal Register to a Member of the House of Representatives.

Page H3686

Rejected:

Ellison amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 114–611) that was debated on June 9th that sought to reprogram funds to create an Office of Good Jobs for the House of Representatives (by a recorded vote of 157 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 289);

Page H3688

Blackburn amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 114–611) that was debated on June 9th that sought to provide for a one percent across the board cut to the bill’s spending levels; accounts for the Capitol Police, Architect of the Capitol-Capitol Police Buildings, Grounds and Security, and Office of the Sergeant At Arms shall not be reduced (by a recorded vote of 165 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 290);

Pages H3688–89

Takano amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 114–611) that sought to appropriate \$2.5 million to re-institute the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), offset from funds from the Architect of the Capitol’s Capital Construction and Operations Account (by a recorded vote of 179 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 291); and

Pages H3685–86, H3689–90

Pearce amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 114–611) that sought to reduce the Office of Congressional Ethics budget to FY16 levels and transfers remaining funds to the deficit reduction account (by a recorded vote of 137 ayes to 270 noes, Roll No. 292).

Pages H3686–88, H3690

H. Res. 771, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5325) was agreed to yesterday, June 9th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, June 13th for Morning Hour debate.

Pages H3696

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3688, H3688–89, H3689–90, H3690, H3692, H3692–93, H3693, and H3694. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:19 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ADVANCING PATIENT SOLUTIONS FOR LOWER COSTS AND BETTER CARE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Advancing Patient Solutions for Lower Costs and Better Care”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HOME APPLIANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled “Home Appliance Energy Efficiency Standards Under the Department of Energy—Stakeholder Perspectives”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

18F AND U.S. DIGITAL SERVICE OVERSIGHT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Information Technology; and Subcommittee on Government Operations, held a joint hearing entitled “18F and U.S. Digital Service Oversight”. Testimony was heard from Mikey Dickerson, Administrator, U.S. Digital Service; Phaedra S. Chrousos, Commissioner of Technology Transformation Service, Government Services Administration; David Powner, Director, IT Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 5053, the “Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act”; H.R. 5293, the “Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2017” [general debate only], 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of June 13 through June 17, 2016

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at approximately 4 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of S. 2943, National Defense Authorization Act, post-cloture.

On *Tuesday*, at 11 a.m., Senate will vote on passage of S. 2943, National Defense Authorization Act. Following disposition of S. 2943, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2578, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: June 14, 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", 9:30 a.m., SD-124.

June 15, 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", 10 a.m., SD-138.

June 16, Full Committee, business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017", and an original bill entitled, "Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017", 10:30 a.m., SD-106.

Committee on Armed Services: June 16, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of General David L. Goldfein, USAF, for reappointment to the grade of General, and to be Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: June 14, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Securities and Exchange Commission, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: June 15, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SR-253.

June 15, 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, 2 p.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: June 14, to hold hearings to examine oil and gas pipeline infrastructure and the economic, safety, environmental, permitting, construction, and maintenance considerations associated with that infrastructure, 10 a.m., SD-366.

June 15, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 2839 and H.R. 3004, bills to amend the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Act to extend the authorization for the Gullah/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. 1662, 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 Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia, to revise the boundary of that monument, S. 1824, 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. 2805, to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, S. 2923, to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the "Saint-Gaudens National Park for the Arts", 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. 3027, to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, and S. 3028, to redesignate the Olympic Wilderness as the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness, 2:30 p.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: June 14, 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, 3 p.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance: June 14, to hold hearings to examine energy tax policy in 2016 and beyond, 10 a.m., SD-215.

June 15, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine challenges and opportunities for United States business in the digital age, 2 p.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: June 15, Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues, to hold hearings to examine barriers to education globally, focusing on getting girls in the classroom, 10 a.m., SD-419.

June 15, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine United States policy in Libya, 2:15 p.m., SD-419.

June 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine our evolving understanding and response to transnational criminal threats, 9:30 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: June 15, to hold hearings to examine implementing the Child Care Development Block Grant Act of 2014, focusing on perspectives of stakeholders, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: June 15, to hold hearings to examine America's insatiable demand for drugs, focusing on examining solutions, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: June 16, 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, 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 Small Business and Entrepreneurship: June 16, to hold hearings to examine keeping the American dream alive, focusing on creating jobs under the National Labor Relations Board's new joint employer standard, 11 a.m., SR-428A.

Select Committee on Intelligence: June 14, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

June 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 9 a.m., SH-216.

Special Committee on Aging: June 15, to hold hearings to examine innovations to promote Americans' financial security, 2:30 p.m., SD-562.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, June 14, Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy and Credit, hearing to review the impact of G-20 clearing and trade execution requirements, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, June 14, Full Committee, markup on Homeland Security Appropriations Bill for FY 2017; and Report on the Revised Interim Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2017, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

June 15, Full Committee, markup on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for FY 2017, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, June 15, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Department of Defense Update on the

Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Plan", 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, June 15, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Congressional Budgeting: The Need for Fiscal Goals", 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

June 16, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Members' Day Hearing on Budget Process Reform", 10:30 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, June 14, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Combatting Superbugs: U.S. Public Health Responses to Antibiotic Resistance", 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

June 14, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled "FCC Overreach: Examining the Proposed Privacy Rules", 10:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, June 14, Full Committee, hearing entitled "U.S. Policy Toward Putin's Russia", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 15, Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled "Egypt: Challenges and Opportunities for U.S. Policy", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 16, Full Committee, markup on the "Digital Global Access Policy Act of 2016"; the "State Sponsors of Terrorism Review Enhancement Act"; H.R. 5208, the "North Korea State Sponsor of Terrorism Designation Act of 2016"; and H.R. 5332, the "Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2016", 9:45 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 16, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled "The Global Religious Freedom Crisis and Its Challenge to U.S. Foreign Policy", 12:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, June 14, Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, hearing entitled "Overstaying Their Welcome: National Security Risks Posed by Visa Overstays", 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

June 15, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Cybersecurity Act of 2015: Industry Perspectives", 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources, June 14, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 5259, the "Certainty for States and Tribes Act", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 14, Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs, hearing on H.R. 4685, the "Tule River Indian Reservation Land Trust, Health, and Economic Development Act"; and H.R. 5379, the "Requirements, Expectations, and Standard Procedures for Executive Consultation with Tribes Act", 11 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

June 14, Full Committee, markup on pending legislation, 4 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 15, Full Committee, markup on pending legislation (continued), 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

June 15, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "State Perspectives on BLM's Draft Planning 2.0 Rule", 2:30 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, June 14, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Oversight of the National Park Service", 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 14, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Oversight of the State Department”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 15, Full Committee, markup on H. Res. 737, condemning and censuring John A. Koskinen, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 16, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Firearms and Munitions at Risk: Examining Inadequate Safeguards”, 11 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, June 14, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 5293, the “Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2017” [amendment consideration], 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, June 15, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled “Innovation in Solar Fuels, Electricity Storage, and Advanced Materials”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

June 15, Subcommittee on Space, hearing entitled “Human Spaceflight Ethics and Obligations: Options for Monitoring, Diagnosing, and Treating Former Astronauts”, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

June 16, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled “SBIR/SSTR Reauthorization: A Review of Technology Transfer”, 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, June 14, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing entitled “Coast Guard Mission Needs and Resources Allocation”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

June 15, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled “A Review of the Federal Aviation Administration’s Air Traffic Controller Hiring, Staffing and Training Plans”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, June 15, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing entitled “Investigating VA’s Management of Veterans’ Paper Records”, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

June 15, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing entitled “Examining 21st Century Programs and Strategies for Veteran Job Seekers”, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, June 14, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing entitled “Expanding U.S. Agriculture Trade and Eliminating Barriers to U.S. Exports”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

4 p.m., Monday, June 13

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, June 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 2943, National Defense Authorization Act, post-cloture.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Black, Diane, Tenn., E880, E883, E888
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E886
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E885
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E884
Buck, Ken, Colo., E878, E879
Cárdenas, Tony, Calif., E881
Cicilline, David N., R.I., E878
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E879
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E886

Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E883
Costa, Jim, Calif., E888
DeBene, Suzan K., Wash., E878
Dent, Charles W., Pa., E886
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E882
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E885
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E881
Jolly, David W., Fla., E879, E880, E881, E882, E884,
E885, E886, E888, E888
Lowenthal, Alan S., Calif., E877
McGovern, James P., Mass., E880

Meadows, Mark, N.C., E882
Mullin, Markwayne, Okla., E887
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E887
Rothfus, Keith J., Pa., E887
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E879
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E882
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E878
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E883, E884, E885, E887,
E888
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E879, E880, E881
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E881



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.