United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2015 No. 10

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 21, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

PRISONERS ARE BEING RELEASED FROM GUANTANAMO AT AN ALARMING RATE

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation I introduced last week as a companion piece to a bill offered by Senator KELLY AYOTTE to protect the safety of the United States and its allies and restrict the transfers of detainees from Guantanamo Bay.

Since mid-November, the President and his administration have ramped up an effort to make good on a campaign promise to increase the number of Guantanamo detainee transfers. Last night during his State of the Union Address, the President reaffirmed his commitment to close this facility once and for all, and he is releasing prisoners at an alarming rate. Twenty-one terrorists have been released just in November alone to foreign countries. This comes at the expense of our own national security.

H.R. 401, the Detaining Terrorists to Protect America Act of 2015, would suspend the transfer of high- and medium-risk detainees and prohibit any detainee transfers to Yemen as well as increase transparency regarding the remaining Guantanamo detainees.

Detainees at GTMO pose a real threat to our national security. When I speak with folks at home, my constituents, moms and dads, and they ask me how safe we really are, this rate of reengagement comes to mind. The U.S. intelligence community reports that the number of former GTMO detainees who reengage in terrorism has steadily increased since 2002.

According to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, they reported the combined and suspected confirmed reengagement rate of former GTMO detainees has risen to more than an alarming 30 percent. Before we proceed with any more additional transfers, we must ensure the transfer process is further examined and improved.

In order to protect our fellow Americans, we must stop releasing some of the world's most dangerous terrorists, especially given the fact that they are already reengaging in hostilities against the United States and our allies.

This measure would repeal current law that has allowed the administration to transfer prisoners to foreign countries and reduce the population at GTMO down to 127. The bill also would prohibit transfers of terror suspects to a foreign country if there has been a confirmed case where an individual was transferred from GTMO and engaged in any other terrorist activity.

The bill would also prohibit the transfer of terror suspects considered to be high or medium risk. Some of the most recent transfer detainees fell into those categories.

In addition, this bill would stop the transfer of detainees to Yemen because the country has become a hotbed for terrorist activities. It makes no sense to send terrorists to a country where there is an active al Qaeda network that we know has been engaged in targeting the U.S.

Most importantly, Yemen's branch of al Qaeda, commonly known as AQAP, was founded by former GTMO detainees. Counterterrorism experts have declared AQAP to be al Qaeda's most effective affiliate, posing the greatest danger to the American homeland.

We cannot risk trusting the world's most dangerous terrorists to its most dangerous places, nor should we simply cut them loose in rich, stable countries with no security safeguards in place. We have to ask ourselves today: How much are we really willing to risk with our own national security in our American homeland?

I want to thank Senator AYOTTE for working with me, and I look forward to working with her to advance this legislation. I look forward to continuing our partnership to prevent the release of dangerous terrorists who seek to reengage in terrorism against the U.S. and our allies. This bill ensures our homeland remains safe from those terrorist attacks.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

CONGRESS CAN LEARN FROM CHERYL STRAYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The Chair recognizes

the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last night for the State of the Union address by President Obama, my guest was a Portlander, Cheryl Strayed, the author of the best-selling book, ''Wild,'' who is currently being portrayed on the big screen by Reese Witherspoon. This epic story is about how a young woman, reeling from the loss of her mother and the cascading challenges of her life, undertook a journey 1100 miles along the Pacific Coast Trail. It was 96 days of an amazing struggle, overcoming all sorts of difficulties, adversities, as she helped work out her own challenges and issues.

I invited her because I thought the story that she portrayed, the experience that she had, was an interesting metaphor for the sorts of things that we should be doing here. Perhaps we might be able to come together as a Congress, supporting legislation that would help protect some of those special places that are portrayed in her powerful book and in the excellent movie.

In the course of her visit, another thought has made its way to me as I watched her interact with dozens of young people in a variety of meetings on Capitol Hill, fellow Members of Congress, and many other people who were touched by the story of her journey and it made a profound effect on them. She continues to receive hundreds of emails a day from people who were inspired by that effort and her magnificent book.

It occurs to me that it is an appropriate metaphor for what our challenge is as Members of the 114th Congress, because this, after all, is a 2-year journey on behalf of the American people. The question for us is: If we can struggle with that heavy pack, navigate areas where sometimes the trail is a little obscure, can we put our trust in strangers who help us along this difficult journey? Can we be resolute in putting one foot in front of another on behalf of the American public?

Mr. Speaker, it was a very profound experience to watch those interactions, after having seen the movie, and having been entranced by the book. I am absolutely convinced that this is our moment, our journey into something that doesn't necessarily have to be ''Wild,'' even though there is a roller coaster of legislative activity. I am convinced there ought to be enough common interest, common commitment, common goals that we ought to be able to tease out elements that enable us to be successful in our journey.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that people will reflect on that experience of this young woman who was able to overcome adversity and open up an amazing chapter in her life and beyond. I hope we will be able to do the same for the people we represent.

BATTLE OF THE BULGE 70TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind everybody about a real-life story of being outnumbered 10 to 1, a story of courage, will, discipline, suffering, immense sacrifice, and success, a tale of two great militaries, surprise, weather, overwhelming force, and sheer resolve. It is marked with the graves of thousands and exemplifies the struggle for the very future of freedom in our world.

The story ends with the 101st Airborne and Patton's Armor being victorious in January and February of 1945, and I think it is important to recognize the accomplishments of all the units who struggled and suffered greatly under the German siege of a small town in Belgium named Bastogne. This January and the recent December marks the 70th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge.

Most people know of the 101st Airborne, nicknamed the ''battling Bastards of Bastogne,'' and the plight of Patton's Armor, as chronicled in so many stories and movies now burnished into the collective consciousness of our Nation, and rightly so.

However, Mr. Speaker, on this 70th anniversary, I want to remind us of an often untold story of the other heroes of the Battle of the Bulge and the little but critical town of Bastogne. It is a story of the American soldiers of the 28th Division from Pennsylvania, who held at all costs.

In late October to mid-November of 1944, the battle of the Hurtgen Forest was described as a meat grinder. The 28th Division was in a fierce battle with the German 73rd Corps. For the 28th, the battle losses were 248 officers and 5,452 enlisted men. After the battle, the weary division needed a rest.

The Ardennes Forest was thick and seemingly impenetrable. It was known as a quiet sector in which the 28th could reequip, reorganize, and assimilate thousands of new replacements into the ranks while the division rested.

Greatly weakened by the previous battle, the 28th Division was spread out over some 25 miles along a front which was more than double that which was recommended in standard practice by any division at the time.

On the morning of 16 December 1944, the peace was shattered by the opening barrage of the Germans opening up one of the largest displays of artillery bombardment ever, signaling the start of Hitler's last great offensive on the Western Front in World War II.

For the next 4 days, without any sleep, often without food, elements of the 28th Division and their affiliates fought continuously, often until the last bullet and life, to deny the enemy success. It was exceptionally cold, foggy, damp, and, of course, snow covered, exactly what Hitler had counted on, as the winter would only add to the element of surprise.

The German 5th and 15th Panzer Armies, 6th SS, and 7th Army attacked the U.S. 8th Army in a line between Aachen and Bastogne with a plan to go as close as possible down the seam between American, Canadian, and British forces to split them.

After crossing the Meuse River, the attacking Panzers were to turn north and capture the port city of Antwerp, thus collapsing the supply lines and the alliance.

The timetable established by the German general staff and German high command called for the capture of the entire 28th Division sector early in the morning of 16 December and the capture of Bastogne by the same evening of that day. Bastogne was a major road junction which was needed by the Germans for armor and resupply units.

In the early morning hours of 16 December, the 28th Division received a message telling them to hold at all costs. Keystoners, as they were known, were dug in and began the slow and painful art of trading space for time, trading space for time and life.

The 110th Regiment was soon surrounded and fought to the last round. From 0530 that morning of the 16th until sometime late in the afternoon of the 18th and early on the 19th in some locations, men of the 110th Infantry Regiment fought and held, giving ground only when forced out, but all the while buying precious time for General Eisenhower to find and move reserves forward from deep inside France.

The other two regimental combat teams of the division, the 109th and 112th Infantry Regiments, did only slightly better. The 110th Regiment stayed in place as they were assigned the center sector of the division. The regiment alone fought elements of five German divisions, of which it was outnumbered at times 7 to 1.

I must abbreviate due to time.

While there are many things that come to mind when we think of the Battle of the Bulge like the 101st Airborne, Patton's Armor, or Easy Company from the Band of Brothers, please also remember the names and places familiar to those others who held at all costs: the 103rd, the 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th of the 28th. These are the echoes of the 28th Division and the men who held at all costs and traded space for time so that the 101st and Patton's Third Army could get into position in time to defeat the German offensive.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, we can learn a lot from these dedicated soldiers who refused to surrender but fought on for what they believed in. I just wanted to remind everyone and to offer my salute to these finest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind everybody about a real life story of being outnumbered 10 to 1.

A story of courage, will, discipline suffering, immense sacrifice and success. A tale of two great two militaries, surprise, weather, overwhelming force and sheer resolve. A story marked with the graves of thousands, and that exemplifies the struggle for the very future of freedom in our world.

The story ends with the 101st Airborne Division and Patton's Armor victorious in January and February of 1945.

We must recognize the accomplishments of all the units that struggled and suffered greatly under the German siege of a small town in Belgium named Bastogne.

This past December 2014 through the end of January 2015 marks the 70th Anniversary of the one of the most significant and deadly battles of World War II—the Battle of the Bulge.

We must also remember the German units and the actions of their Soldiers committed to their nation's cause. We must recount their actions as well—the cause of their leadership, the unfortunate actions that occurred in those desperate hours and learn from that history so that we may never again have to re-endure them.

Most people know of the 101st Airborne (nicknamed the ''Battling Bastards of Bastogne'') and the plight of Patton's Armor as chronicled in so many stories and movies now burnished into the collective consciousness of our Nation—and rightly so. However Mr. Speaker, on this 70th Anniversary, I'm reminded of an often untold story of other heroes of the Battle of the Bulge, in the little but critically important town of Bastogne. It's the story of the American Soldiers of the 28th Division from Pennsylvania who held at all costs.

In late October to mid-November of 1944, occurred the Battle of the Huertgen Forest—described as ''the meat grinder''—where the 28th Division fought a fierce and deadly battle with the German 73rd Corps. For the 28th, battle losses were 248 officers and 5,452 enlisted men, after which the battle-weary Division needed a rest and were moved to the Ardennes Forest, thick and seemingly impenetrable but quiet sector in which the 28th Division could reconstitute, reorganize and assimilate thousands of replacements into the ranks while the Division recovered. Greatly weakened by the previous battle, the 28th Division was spread out over some 25 miles along a front more than double that which was recommended in standard practice by any division at the time. On the morning of 16 December 1944, the peace was shattered by the opening barrage of the Germans in one of the largest and most deadly artillery bombardments ever—signaling the start of Hitler's last great offensive on the Western Front in WWII. For the next four days without any sleep, and often without food, elements of the 28th Division and their Allies fought tirelessly—to the last bullet in most cases—as well as to the last life, to deny the enemy success.

The day and night were punishing—freezing, wet, foggy and snow-covered—exactly what Hitler had counted on, as the winter would only add to the element of surprise and exponentially increase his chances for success. The German 5th and 15th Panzer Armies, 6th SS and 7th Army attacked the U.S. 8th Army and aligned between Aachen and Bastogne with a plan to fight as close as possible down the seam between American, Canadian and British forces in order to split them. After crossing the Meuse River, the attacking Panzers were to turn north and capture the port city of Antwerp, thus collapsing the supply lines and the Alliance. The timetable established by the German General Staff and High Command called for the capture of the entire 28th Division sector early in the morning of 16 December, and the capture of Bastogne by the same evening. Bastogne was a major road junction that was needed by the Germans for armor and resupply units.

In the early morning hours of 16 December the 28th Division received the order to ''Hold at all costs!''

''Keystoners'', as they were known, were dug in and began the slow and painful art of trading space and lives for time—time enough for the 101st Airborne and Patton's Armor to get into the fight, and win it.

The 110th Infantry Regiment soon was surrounded and fought to the last bullet. From 0530 hours on 16 December, until sometime late in afternoon of the 18th and early on the 19th in some locations, men of the 110th Infantry fought and held—giving ground only when forced out—but while buying precious time for General Eisenhower to find and move reserves forward from deep inside France.

The other two Regimental Combat Teams of the Division—the 109th and 112th—did only slightly better, and the 109th ran out of ammunition on the 18th. These scattered and battered units of the 28th Division held out in the face of overwhelming odds—delaying the Germans as long as they was by any standard a miraculous feat because of the complete and massive confusion of the Battle.

However, the 110th Regiment stayed in place as they were assigned the center sector of the Division. This Regiment alone fought elements of five German divisions, outnumbering the Americans 7 to 1.

Overall the 28th Division would identify elements of 9 divisions in its sector before the Battle was over. Early on, the force ratios reached 10 to 1 in the Germans' favor, but still Pennsylvania's 28th Division valiantly held its ground.

Small determined units, low on ammunition, food, water, anti-tank weapons, and morale, continued to stand and fight until forced to retreat, captured or killed.

The old 110th, which had served the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Nation since 1873, started to fight with just over 2200 Soldiers. When all was said and done, less than 750 officers and men could be found still fighting. Some unit strength reports have it just around 500 unit members still standing. The German Fifth Panzer Army was so ravaged by the Keystoners that many say it ultimately cost the Germans the battle.

The Division held until it could hold no more, and it never ordered a single retreat. It was a continuous fighting withdraw under fire—described as ''We made the Germans pay for every yard, every road junction, and fighting house by house, floor by floor, often hand-to-hand when the ammunition ran out.''

The 28th inflicted 11,700 casualties on the enemy at a cost of 3850 Americans killed and wounded, and another 2000 captured when they simply ran out of ammunition.

There are many footnotes to this intense Battle:

On 17 December, Allied prisoners of war were executed in cold blood by elements of the 6th SS Panzer Army. Some 100 prisoners were killed where they stood at Malmedy on direct orders from German Colonel Joachim Peiper.

On 19 December, 6000 Allied Troops surrendered to the encircling German Army at Schnee Eiffel.

On 20 December, the 101st Airborne Division at Bastogne completely was encircled by the German 47th Panzer Corps and the US 10th and 19th Armored Divisions completely were encircled by the German advance. After holding on to Bastogne for a full week while encircled, the 101st repelled the final German thrust with the arrival of the 4th Armored Division.

On 25 December, the 2nd Panzer Division was stopped by a combined force of British and American armor made up of General Montgomery's 29th Armored Brigade and the American 2nd Armored Division.

7 February 1945 marked the end of the battle where the German casualty count was a staggering 82,000 men, matched only by the 77,000 casualties suffered by the American Army.

While many things come to mind when we think of the Battle of the Bulge—like the 101st, Patton's Armor or Easy Company (made famous by the book and movie, ''Band of Brothers'', please also remember the names and places familiar to the others that held at all costs:

The 103rd, 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th Infantry Regiments; the towns and grounds of Clervaux, Wilt, the Clerf River, Foy and Noville; and the other units like Combat Command B, 48th Armored Field Artillery, Combat Command R, 158th Engineer Battalion, 630th Tank Destroyer Battalion, 1278th Engineer Battalion and the 299th Engineer Battalion who suffered and fought to reconstitute and support this brave endeavor. These are the echoes of the 28th Division and the men and units who held at all costs and traded space for time so that the 101st and Patton's 3rd Army could get into position in time to defeat the German offensive.

Mr. Speaker, we could learn so much from these dedicated Soldiers who not only refused to surrender, but fought for what they believed in.

I remind us all of this tale of heroism, tireless and selfless service, and salute these brave Americans.

MAINTAINING AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the prior gentleman's commendation of those who fought on behalf of liberty at the Battle of the Bulge. We bow before them. They bequeathed liberty to this generation. It is a heavy burden. Let us hope that we can measure up to it in tribute to their valor.

At last night's State of the Union Address, passing a transportation and infrastructure bill to repair America and build forward a new century, as we create hundreds of thousands of jobs, got the broadest bipartisan applause. You could hear it on both sides of the aisle. So I come to the floor this morning to

say, Let's do it. Let's do it. Chairman BILL SHUSTER and Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO are two Members who can get us there. We want to help them. I know the majority of Members feel that way. So my words to them are: Onward, gentlemen; lead America forward by passing that bill through us.

On another front, I rise to express deep dismay at what I believe to be Republican efforts to weaken and begin dismantling the Social Security and disability insurance program that so many Americans depend upon. The headline in yesterday's Politico reads: ''Social Security disability under attack by the GOP.''

As this Congress starts, Republicans have quietly and without consulting Democrats tucked into the rules of this House a point of order provision that aims to harm our Nation's 8,950,000 disabled citizens and weaken the related Social Security earned benefit program. The number of Americans on disability today in a Nation of over 310 million people amounts to less than 3 percent of our population. That is actually a very small number when you think about it. God has been good to most of us, but that isn't true physically and mentally with many of our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, even though the number of disability approvals has been declining since 2010, Republicans have begun this Congress by singling out the disabled. They haven't targeted Wall Street moguls who brought our economy down and stole trillions of dollars of home equity and the very homes from our families. No, Republicans are targeting the injured, the suffering, and those not able to fend for themselves. Even to touch this subject so callously is a cruelty. It causes worry and trepidation. It makes life more uncertain.

Why should such an important change not be debated on this House floor? Republicans instead hope to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people by hiding it in an obscure rule that was part of a massive parliamentary package for this 114th Congress. But I tell you what, not all Americans have been fooled. Despite this subtle attempt to pit Social Security pensioners against disabled beneficiaries, our office has already received a great number of calls and letters from citizens sick over the possibility that a 20 percent benefit cut could adversely affect our neighbors and relatives most in need.

These proposed cuts in Social Security and disability insurance—and I underline the word ''insurance''—set the stage for what Republicans truly want, and I fear: severe cuts, a weakened Social Security system, and ultimately dismantling one of our greatest American legacies, earned Social Security benefits and earned disability benefits for our old, our ill, and our disabled. Our disabled and senior citizens have the right to live out their lives with dignity. And for so many, their lives are not easy.

I remind my colleagues who visit nursing homes and who have neighbors or relatives in their own family who endure pain every day how vital these programs are. There but for the grace of God go you.

This Congress should oppose these backhanded cuts, and at the same time we should support the passage of the transportation and infrastructure jobs bill to build our Nation forward. There are items we can agree on, and there will be items that we disagree on. But our roads, our bridges, our harbors, our airports, our rail systems, the St. Lawrence Seaway System, and navigable waters all deserve our attention. We can make it happen this year. Let's do it.

[From POLITICO, Jan. 20, 2015]

REPUBLICANS TARGET SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY

(By David Rogers)

Like Mrs. O'Leary's cow, House Republicans kick-started a bigger fire than many imagined with an opening day rules change that revived Social Security as a hot issue for this Congress—and the 2016 presidential elections.

The GOP's immediate target is Social Security's sprawling disability insurance program, which has grown at a pace far beyond its revenues and will exhaust its trust fund reserves by December 2016, threatening a 19 percent cut in benefits.

In the past, Congress has simply shifted revenues from Social Security's larger retirement account to fill holes in the disability fund. But the new House rule throws up a roadblock by creating a point of order against any such bill that does not improve the ''actuarial balance'' of the combined funds.

''What we want to do is not kick the can down the road anymore,'' said Rep. Sam Johnson (R–Texas), who promoted the change as chairman of the Social Security panel on the House Ways and Means Committee. ''The rule is intended to get the Congress to at least take a first step toward solving the Social Security problem. If we continue the way we are, it's a go-broke operation.''

''If all they're doing is rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul, that's going to be subject to a point of order, and rightly so in my opinion,'' added Rep. Thomas Reed (R–N.Y.). ''We have to protect the retirement fund and the retiree.''

It all sounds like ''good government,'' but the politics are rich.

House Democrats were not consulted on the rules change, and liberals accuse the GOP of trying to cull the weak from the herd, pitting the disabled against pensioners to undermine the larger Social Security coalition.

In fact, the new rule's fine print leaves an escape hatch for Republicans to move tens of billions into the disability fund if this gambit fails. Still, the upshot could be a one-two punch Democrats most fear: a first-round debate over disability funding in 2016 followed by a bigger battle over all of Social Security in 2017, when Republicans hope to control both Congress and the White House.

''They're looking for a new weapon,'' said Michigan Rep. Sander Levin, the ranking Democrat on Ways and Means. ''What they're doing in this rule is to use any problems within disability as a way to attack the whole system. It's dangerous doubletalk when they have been the problem, not the answer.''

Adding to Levin's fears was testimony last week before Ways and Means, in which Harvard economist Martin Feldstein promoted the idea of Congress gradually raising the eligibility age for full Social Security benefits to as high as 70. That would increase labor-force participation among people older than 65, expanding the economy, Feldstein said. But raising the retirement age would add to the strain on the disability fund, which has had to cover more workers longer since the retirement age was raised from 65 to 67.

These tensions fueled a separate uproar last week over remarks by 2016 presidential hopeful Sen. Rand Paul about the disability program.

Testing the waters in an appearance in New Hampshire, the Kentucky Republican suggested that half the people on Social Security disability had no more to worry about than achy backs and anxiety in the morning. ''Join the club. Who doesn't get up a little anxious for work and their back hurts,'' Paul said disparagingly.

After video of his remarks went online, Paul quickly backtracked: ''We absolutely should take care of those truly in need of help,'' he said in a statement.

At this stage, the White House and Treasury show no sign of backing down from their intent to pursue a straight reallocation of funds from the retirement account, formally known as the Old Age Survivors Insurance or OASI trust fund. Given all the divisions already in Washington, adding a new procedural hurdle is ''unhelpful,'' an administration official said icily.

Indeed, transfers between the two Social Security funds have gone on for years. Each relies on a percentage of the same payroll tax, and the disability program helped the retirement trust fund in the 1980s by reducing its own share of the tax revenue.

What's most changed now is that critics are singling out the disability fund as the profligate partner—and a harbinger of bad times ahead for all.

Without doubt, the growth of the disability program has been explosive.

In the past 20 years, the number of workers getting disability payments has more than doubled to 8.95 million last month. About $140 billion went out the door in fiscal 2013, double what the costs were just 10 years before. And like food stamps in the Farm Bill debate, disability payments are common enough now to be a whipping boy for conservatives like Paul, playing on resentment toward people receiving government aid during hard economic times.

At one level, this is all political catnip for Democrats, eager to be seen as defenders of Social Security and its New Deal heritage. But given their history, Republicans don't come to the table with clean hands.

For example, the GOP's 2011 budget deal with President Barack Obama held out the promise of millions in appropriations to help the Social Security Administration fight precisely what Republicans complain about in the disability program: medical fraud. But for 2012 and 2013, House Republicans failed to approve the money, thereby adding to Social Security's woes.

Moreover, an analysis by Social Security's chief actuary, Stephen Goss, suggests there's less to the new House rule than meets the eye. That's because the point of order is triggered only if lawmakers exceed a ''0.01 percent'' threshold, which equates to a $38.6 billion cap on what any one Congress can move from the retirement fund, Goss told POLITICO.

That leaves too little room for some long-term, multiyear reallocation of payroll tax revenues but it is enough to get past 2016, by Goss' calculations.

''We're projecting [disability] trust funds will be depleted in December of 2016. . . . The shortfall for the ensuing 12 months would come to about $29 billion,'' Goss said. ''What that means is that we could have a tax rate reallocation that could apply in 2016 or 2016 and 2017 that would generate up to $30 billion or even $35 billion transferred to the [disability] trust fund, which would at least extend its reserve depletion date for one more year.''

It's a stop-and-go scenario that serves neither party's goals in the end. Much depends in the interim on Johnson and new Ways and Means Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R–Wis.).

Ryan has boasted that Ways and Means will be ''command central'' for the GOP's agenda, and he has installed his own staff in Johnson's Social Security subcommittee. In the previous Congress, the disability debate among Republicans was shaped by flamboyant personalities such as the now-retired Sen. Tom Coburn (R–Okla.) and Rep. Darrell Issa (R–Calif.), who has had to surrender his platform as chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. But now, Ryan would like to be the architect for reforms in the social safety net.

There is room for compromise. The crisis is no surprise—as long ago as 1995, Social Security's actuaries were predicting 2016 as a breaking point for the disability fund. And multiple academic papers from the center-left and center-right outline changes Congress could consider.

Three potential areas of agreement: First, find a dedicated source of money for Social Security to expedite so-called continuing disability reviews, which have been shown to generate savings. Second, limit recipients' ''double-dipping'' among disability and other government benefits. And third, experiment with ways to help people with disabilities to stay in the workforce or return more quickly.

The past year has seen some turnaround on funding for the disability reviews. In the fiscal 2014 and 2015 Social Security budgets, House Republicans finally agreed to the extra ''program integrity'' appropriations that the budget deal had called for. The Social Security Administration says every dollar spent here can lead to $9 in long-term savings, and in 2013—the latest year for which data are available—more than 17,000 workers were disqualified as a result of these medical reviews.

The administration estimates that as many as 790,000 continuing disability reviews will be conducted this year, a 50 percent increase over 2014 and double the annual average from 2009–2013. To maintain this effort, the 2016 budget that Obama proposes in February is expected to ask again for close to the $1.4 billion provided in 2015.

The White House is also expected to come back to Congress with a set of demonstration programs to test and gather data on the effectiveness of early intervention—with workers and employers—rather than individuals simply surrendering to going on disability. The omnibus bill approved in December provided $35 million for this purpose, far less than what the administration had hoped for.

''I think it's clear that the system needs to be improved,'' said Jeffrey Liebman, a Harvard professor who served in the Office of Management and Budget during Obama's first term. ''I also think it's clear that we don't yet know enough about the cost and benefits of specific proposals to make wholesale changes.''

Part of the challenge for policymakers is the unique nature of disability insurance.

Unlike many other disability programs, Social Security's covers only total disability—not partial or short term. Benefits are a function of how much a worker previously earned and put into the system, but on average these run under $1,200 per month. On top of this, a worker is allowed to earn some outside income, but this is capped at less than $1,100 a month.

The result is that many households can be locked in at 200 percent of poverty or lower once the decision is made to go on disability. That's why early intervention can help both the government and the worker. But how early to intervene—and at what cost—remain big questions.

''They are really only biting at the outer edges of the issue. Their idea of early intervention is way too late,'' said Richard Burkhauser of Cornell University and the University of Melbourne. Burkhauser argues that the U.S. must look to European countries like the Netherlands that ''have really done major things that have fundamentally altered their system.''

The Dutch model, for example, requires employers to cover more of the first two years of disability costs, thereby encouraging more management involvement in trying to help employees rehabilitate themselves and stay in the workforce. Yet selling this to a pro-business Republican Congress may take more than a little doing.

''The Dutch still spend more of [gross domestic product] than we do on disability benefits,'' Liebman said. ''They came from spending a lot more than we do to spending more than we do.''

Johnson is certainly not eager for big new expenditures. But for all his famous crustiness, the Texas conservative was not unsympathetic to people who depend on the current system.

''We want to work to protect the disability program, but we want to consider how to help those who can and want to work,'' Johnson said. ''And those who can or want to work ought not to be sentenced to a lifetime of near poverty with no way out.''

For all the partisanship now, the disability insurance program was born in the mid-1950s under a Republican president, Dwight Eisenhower. Ronald Reagan triggered bitter fights 25 years later when he sought cuts in the early 1980s. That sparked a backlash from Democrats in Congress, which led to changes making it easier for more people to qualify.

But the enrollment numbers really took off in the mid-1990s, as more baby boomers moved into their late 40s and began applying during an otherwise strong economy. The Great Recession accelerated this trend as workers turned to disability as a last resort after unemployment benefits ran out. But the prime mover for the past 20 years has been demographics—changes set in motion generations ago.

These include not just the baby boom, but the fact that women have worked long enough now to qualify for disability benefits. All this comes, most importantly, at a time when the drop in birth rates has left fewer younger workers to help absorb the costs.

If all these forces make disability insurance the black sheep now, it will soon have company: The retirement side of Social Security is feeling the same forces, while new enrollment numbers suggest the spike in disability has peaked. Data show a steady drop in the number of new disability awards since their high in 2010.

''The increasing effects of [disability insurance] are over. We're done with that,'' Goss said. ''The bad news is now the boomers are moving to the higher ages and once they get there, they'll have the lower-birth-rate generation below them. . . . This is unfortunately kind of like the tide.''

As the waters recede, rural low-income states like Kentucky, Arkansas, Mississippi and Maine face a larger concentration of disability cases as a percentage of the population. Workers complain of a slow, almost Dickensian application process that can put their lives on hold for months. This same environment can attract aggressive attorneys, who boast in phone book ads that this is their briar patch—just call.

Fresh indictments this past week in Puerto Rico are a reminder of the risk of fraud—and collusion among doctors, lawyers and administrative judges. Government Accountability Office reports have raised questions about workers double-dipping, by stringing together payments from Social Security disability along with jobless benefits or non-combat-related disabilities covered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

None of this alters the 2016 deadline.

''The trust fund programs really are special because they cannot borrow. The reserves deplete. Congress has to act,'' Goss said. ''We'll still have revenue come in, but our projection is we'll only have 81 cents of tax revenue coming at that time for every dollar of benefits.''

But under the new House rule, Goss said, any single piece of legislation can give the program at most ''a one-year or slightly more than a one-year extension of the reserve depletion date.''

Does that mean Congress should do more than one year?

The actuary chuckled. ''The good news,'' he said, ''is that given we have 535 members of Congress, we'll hear lots of arguments and that will likely be one.''

ENDING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues would agree that we have many needs in our districts. For example, my district has an inlet that cannot be dredged, which causes an economic problem. And the reason it cannot be dredged is because of lack of funds. We continue to spend billions of dollars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but there is no money for necessary infrastructure projects back here in North Carolina and across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have been outspoken on the continuation of war in Afghanistan. I would like to recite a segment from Rudyard Kipling's poem, ''Epitaphs of the War,'' as Ron Paul did when we went into Iraq: ''If any question why we died, tell them because our fathers lied.''

Mr. Speaker, a recent letter to the editor of the Marine Corps Times echoed the same sentiment. Bryan Chou wrote:

> ''Remember the part I said about ending the Marines' presence in Afghanistan? I lied,'' said every politician.

I assume Mr. Chou was referring to the President's recent statement that the war in Afghanistan is over.

How can the war be over when we just committed to a 10-year bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan to keep thousands of troops there while spending millions of dollars? The Afghan Parliament voted on the bilateral security agreement while we in Congress had no discussion and no debate.

According to the Constitution, the President does not need to come to Congress for permission on an agreement, but I think we have a responsibility to the American taxpayer and our men and women in uniform to discuss an agreement that will keep more taxpayer dollars and more troops in Afghanistan in the coming years.

Just a couple of weeks ago the Marine Corps announced that the marines at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina's Third District, which I represent, are getting ready to deploy to Afghanistan. When does it end, Mr. Speaker? When does it end?

I would like to quote Grant Filbeck from Erie, Pennsylvania, who wrote a letter to the Marine Corps Times last week about Afghanistan:

> I believe in the mission 100 percent, but we have given the Afghans the tools to succeed, and it's up to them to use them. We have been in the country for more than 13 years. That is ridiculous. We have spent so much money funding these guys. If the Afghans want to fight for their country, then they will, or the Taliban will take over without much of a fight.

These two men whose letters I referenced are marines who have been to Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, this is a poster from a book titled, ''How U.S. Taxpayers Bankroll the Taliban.'' It was written several years ago by Douglas Wissing. It is a great expose on how the taxpayers' money ends up in the hands of the Taliban, to kill Americans and to blow up the buildings that we built for them with taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we owe it to the American people, our military, and our Constitution to debate war. As James Madison wrote: ''The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.'' I agree with James Madison and urge the Congress to meet its constitutional duty to debate war and not let any President have an AUMF to send our young men and women overseas to die and see the taxpayers' money wasted.

May God continue to bless our troops, and may God continue to bless America.

A SQUANDERED OPPORTUNITY

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment in the address by the President last night in this Chamber.

Twenty years ago, President Clinton was in a similar position. He realized his policies weren't working; they had just been overwhelmingly rejected by voters and he faced the first Republican Congress in 40 years. So in his State of the Union Message 20 years ago, President Clinton changed course, proclaiming: ''The era of Big Government is over.'' And he made good on that proclamation. He reached across the aisle to the Republican Congress, and together they achieved some amazing things for the American people.

Together, they reduced Federal spending by a remarkable 4 percent of GDP. They reformed entitlement spending—in Bill Clinton's words, ''ending welfare as we know it.'' They approved what amounted to the biggest capital gains tax cut in American history. They produced the only four balanced budgets that we have seen in 50 years.

And the economy blossomed. We enjoyed one of the longest periods of economic expansion in our Nation's history.

It wasn't a bipartisan lovefest. They clashed bitterly on matters great and small. Yet their accomplishments produced prosperity for our Nation and ensured President Clinton's popularity that endures to this day.

President Obama thus has a working, proven model to salvage the last 2 years of his failed Presidency, and instead, he is squandering it. The President says he wants to sock it to the wealthy by placing new and heavy taxes on investment. But the simple truth of the matter is, when you tax something, you get less of it. When you tax investment, you get less investment at precisely that time when our economy desperately needs greater investment for more and better-paying jobs.

A smaller percentage of our people are working today than at any time in more than 30 years. Until last year, median family income had fallen throughout this administration. The American people don't want more government handouts. They need more jobs and better jobs, and that means more investment, not less. They need a job market that isn't flooded with millions of illegal immigrants undercutting their wages and opportunities. Indeed, it was recently estimated that the number of illegal immigrants working in direct defiance of Federal law is as much as the net increase in jobs throughout this administration. Most Americans are not getting ahead.

We now suffer the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world, and American businesses are fleeing from it.

Who would have thought that socialist Sweden would today be considered a tax haven compared to the United States? Our people need those American jobs back in America.

Yet the President seeks to raise taxes still further at a time when the Federal Government is already extracting record tax revenues from our people. The percentage of our economy now consumed by Federal taxes is well above the 40-year average. Our economic problems are not the fault of taxpayers for not paying enough taxes.

The President says he wants to help the middle class, but the proposals he set before us last night would drag the middle class still further down the dark road of debt and doubt and despair that we have been on. If higher taxes and more burdensome regulations were the path to prosperity, we should be enjoying a new economic golden age today. If higher government spending and soak-the-rich policies were the antidote to income inequality, we should today be enjoying an egalitarian paradise.

The reality is these policies have never worked. They have suppressed what should have been a robust economic recovery. They have increased the economic inequalities in our society. They have buried our children under a mountain of debt that will stalk them for the rest of their lives.

The answer to income inequality and economic stagnation is genuine economic growth that requires reducing the burdens that government has placed on our economy. It worked when Bill Clinton did it, when Ronald Reagan did it, and when John F. Kennedy did it. In fact, Kennedy was right: a rising tide lifts all boats. Yet Barack Obama clings obstinately to the opposite policies. It shouldn't surprise us that he is getting the opposite results.

□ 1030

He had a fleeting opportunity last night to bend to the will of the voters, reverse these policies, and redeem his place in history. Instead, Whittier's words seem appropriate this morning:

> Of all sad words of tongue or pen, this saddest are these: ''It might have been.''

HONORING WILLIAM M. ALLEN

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, this past December, the community of Pinellas County, Florida—indeed, the Nation—lost an American hero, William M. Allen.

Bill Allen was 83 years old and had served in the United States Army from 1949 to 1953 as a sergeant, Charlie Company, 19th Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division.

Mr. Allen was a prisoner of war from January 1, 1951, until August 1953, held captive during the Korean war after being overcome by Chinese troops. Mr. Allen was just 19 years old at the time.

To those who knew Mr. Allen, he was one of those remarkable people that left a lasting impression on you after just a single encounter. He was a patriot. He would share his stories not for his own attention, but to impart on each of us the story of sacrifice that our men and women in uniform make so that the United States—all Americans—might live in peace, protected by those who serve.

Mr. Allen's story was most human. In his own words, he wrote this about his enlistment in the Army and subsequent deployment:

> Then there are people like myself, the little guy who went to Korea as a young kid, still wet behind the ears, fresh out of high

school, who joined a peacetime army, but soon found himself in one of this country's most controversial military and political situations known at that time.

When it was over, we came home as veterans; no longer were we the kids down the street. We were now that guy home from war, the war that only a very few knew very much about, a war that was unpopular, and a war that was soon to be forgotten, forgotten only by those who didn't have to fight it.

Mr. Allen did fight that war for us, and his sacrifice truly became real the day he knew he had been overcome by Chinese forces. He recalls wondering at that very moment would they shoot him, and in those brief moments, Mr. Allen recalled that he knew then that the course for his life would forever change. Two things he said he knew for sure: one, he was still alive; and, two, he was now a prisoner of war.

Indeed, the course of Mr. Allen's life had changed forever. He endured many terrible moments as a POW. His family endured much grief, much worry, much pain; but his life had also changed forever because Mr. Allen would later find another calling in life, that of teaching others the importance of service, teaching about the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, sharing with others the true cost of freedom.

He would share these lessons with anyone he would encounter, but he also did something very special. He contributed many of his personal items from the war—letters, telegrams, newspaper articles—to the Armed Forces History Museum in Largo, Florida, for a permanent display dedicated to his POW story. Moreover, he then volunteered his time to teach young people at the museum the very lessons of service, to share with visitors his deeply personal story.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Allen served our Nation in war, but he then served his community here at home, passing down a rich legacy to generations that follow. I was one of those individuals who had an opportunity to share in that story, and I am blessed by my experiences with Mr. Allen.

For his military service, Mr. Allen was awarded many medals, including the Combat Infantry Badge, the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and others.

Mr. Allen is survived by his wife, Helen, of whom he once wrote:

If she was not with me, I don't know what I would have done. She was not only my wife, but she is my best friend.

Mr. Allen is also survived by his children, Susan and Bill, and many grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, before Mr. Allen's passing, he presented me with a copy of his book, ''My Old Box of Memories,'' and inscribed on the inside jacket is his message, ''Freedom is not free.'' Indeed, we know freedom is not free.

Today, I rise to remember and honor Mr. Allen, to remember and honor his legacy, a legacy that will live on through the many people he has touched and, most importantly, through individuals, children, and youth that he devoted his time to educating about the cost of war, the importance of sacrifice, and the dignity of service.

I thank Mr. Allen today for his service to our Nation and to pay a most fitting tribute, that for a man who sacrificed so much on behalf of our Nation, today is remembered in the well of this House—the people's House—by Members of Congress and by a grateful Nation.

May God bless Bill Allen; may God bless his wife, Helen; may God bless his family; and may God richly bless each and every American who today serves and protects and defends the United States of America.

RESTORE AN OPPORTUNITY GOVERNMENT THROUGH RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCLINTOCK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, last night, we gathered here in the House of Representatives for a great American tradition: the State of the Union—the Presidential address where we celebrate openness and transparency in our government, where a vision is laid out that we are free to disagree with or agree with components of but, nonetheless, points to this great American ideal that we are a people who self-govern and that we are accountable in an open way to the people who sent us here, even in the midst of deep philosophical divides about the direction of our Nation—and, of course, the world was watching.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important, though, that we take a moment of reflection and be honest about this moment in time and the current conditions in our society. Many Americans do face downward mobility, stagnant wages, and an increased cost of living.

Many people feel very abandoned in the face of a Washington-Wall Street axis, where more and more power is concentrated into fewer and fewer hands. But I think we have to be careful about something. We have to be careful about seeing the solution as lying in more government.

I think our Nation deserves a smart and effective government, and I think our job here in Congress is to continue in an open way, look at the past, and see what worked and see what doesn't work, to let go of that which is tired and old and worn out and continues to linger, and to invest more in that which is smart and effective and can truly build a good society that creates opportunity for all.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that we shouldn't divide ourselves by class and income and that, in a healthy economy, it is one that is focused on small business. This is where most new jobs are created in our country.

Particularly for young people, I think we need to create a culture of creativity, one in which a person who has an idea can seize the moment and use the gifts of their own two hands and their own intellect to make good things, to create benefit for others, to create jobs, hire people, protect families, and to make a contribution to society.

Many young people want to pursue these avenues; yet we have to be honest about what is happening. We are entering, in this country, into an entrepreneurial winter. What does that mean? In other words, the number of startup businesses—small businesses—is less than the number of small businesses dying.

We do not have a net increase in the number of small businesses; and, again, this is where most Americans live and work, making good things for others, in small business. That is where jobs are created.

How do we address this problem? Well, the tendency, again, in our body is to think about public solutions, but let's examine—not through my opinion but just the analytics—as to why small businesses are not creating new jobs and are not starting up as aggressively as they have in the past.

It is really two things. It is health care and regulations. Smart regulations are necessary to protect the health and well-being of all Americans, but when you have oppressive regulations that tend to stack the deck toward those who are larger and can hire an army of lawyers and accountants, it represses the ability of small businesses to take risks and create jobs.

The second problem we have is health care. Mr. Speaker, I got an email yesterday from someone who said: ''Congressman, my health care has gone up so much that I have to move into government housing.'' Now, think of the irony of that.

Again, we need the right type of health care reform, one that is going to reduce costs and improve health care outcomes while we protect vulnerable persons. But what has happened? Some people have been helped by the new law, but many, many families have been hurt with escalating health care costs, and, again, it creates an environment in which small business is repressed.

Mr. Speaker, again, I think our government should be smart and effective, and I think that is what most Americans want, but Washington continues to remain mired in mediocrity, and political dysfunction and partisan gridlock have made smart and proper government difficult.

This arthritic recovery has dimmed the financial prospects of too many individuals who, again, have stagnant wages or who have given up hope and feel directionless, isolated, and alone. We can do better, and we must do better.

Despite these challenges, I believe the start of a new Congress is an exciting time to renew our government and this promise of our Nation. I would like

to say this, Mr. Speaker: there is nothing wrong in America that can't be fixed by what is right in America, but it is going to require bold resolve, innovative public policy, and a return to our highest ideals.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Most Reverend Richard Pates, Bishop of the Diocese of Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Blessed are You, Lord God of all creation. You bless us with life. You fill each lengthening day with more light, a generous light which shines on all people.

We seek Your light, O God, in our midst this day, for each woman and man of this House, each entrusted to cooperate in the making of just laws which promote the flourishing of human freedom.

Let Your light break forth among these, our public servants. Give us faith that as each new day is bright with promise, so too is Your spirit's power to transform blame and bitterness into concord and unity, for the sake of the common good.

To You, therefore, generous Spirit of God, we commend our work this day, that we might walk freely in Your light, one people whose future is filled with hope.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POMPEO 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

WELCOMING MOST REVEREND RICHARD PATES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce and recognize my friend Bishop Richard Pates of the Des Moines Diocese.

Born in St. Paul, Minnesota, and a huge Vikings fan, Bishop Pates attended Nazareth Hall Seminary and St. Paul Seminary in his hometown.

The bishop went on to graduate school at the North American College in Rome from the prestigious Gregorian University. In 1968, Bishop Pates was ordained at St. Peter's Basilica in Rome.

Bishop Pates' education laid the foundation for his impressive pastoral and administrative service to the church and, I am proud to say, led Bishop Pates to Iowa in 2008, when he was appointed by Pope Benedict XVI to be the ninth bishop for the Diocese of Des Moines. The bishop is also chair of the Iowa Catholic Conference, for which I thank him again for his service to the church and to Iowa.

I want to thank Bishop Pates for opening the House today with a prayer, thank him for his friendship, and ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Bishop Richard Pates to the people's House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow hundreds of young people from across Kansas will join thousands of Americans, young and old, on The National Mall for the March for Life. They are here to remind us all that, in the midst of all the important issues we talk about here in Washington, D.C., every single life is a gift.

This year is the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade. Since then, over 55 million abortions have been performed in the United States. This stain upon our Nation has been allowed to continue for far too long. Yet in the face of this continuing tragedy, I am encouraged by the fact that today the pro-life movement is stronger than ever.

I see the evidence of that movement in the eyes of the young people, young people that will come to Washington tomorrow from Benedictine College, from Conway Springs High School, from Bishop Carroll High School, from Kapaun Mt. Carmel, and from both Kansas State University and Newman University. It will encourage me to continue my efforts to protect the unborn each and every day.

While some just talk the talk, tomorrow the young people from Kansas will walk the walk, and I look forward to joining with them on this very special and important day to protect this very important right.

AMERICA'S FAILING INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday a bridge collapsed in Cincinnati, Ohio, killing one person and injuring another. This tragedy calls to mind the collapse of the Schoharie Creek Bridge in New York in 1987, which killed 10 people, and the collapse of the I–35 West bridge in Minneapolis in 2007, which left 13 dead.

I don't know if more transportation funding would have prevented these collapses, but I do know that every second of every day seven cars drive on a bridge that is structurally deficient. There are 69,000 structurally deficient bridges in the Nation; there are over 99 structurally deficient bridges in western New York alone. These numbers are unacceptable. Congress is failing the American people by failing to address this issue.

Last night we heard from the President a plan to increase funding for infrastructure. That is a start, but I say we can and must do more. I encourage my colleagues to pass an infrastructure bill that is large enough to address the real needs of this Nation.

RECOGNIZING THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE SHOWMEN'S ASSOCIATION

(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, I rise today to recognize the men and women of the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association. These small business owners have been working together since 1967 to keep the outdoor amusement industry alive and strong through their combined efforts to remain one of the best forms of American family entertainment.

I am proud to have many of these individuals and families in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, such as the Bartlebaughs, Carters, Garbricks, and Snyders.

Above and beyond providing good fun and family entertainment, members of the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association have remained dedicated to

giving back by supporting both youth educational scholarships and FFA programs. Since 2005, the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association has raised and donated over $350,000 to youth educational scholarships and FFA programming through the work of more than 100 of their volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association put their individual goals aside for the common goals of the industry to serve the welfare of the community, the State, and the Nation. Their generous record reflects their success, and I thank them for their efforts.

WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS MUST BE RESPECTED

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this must be Groundhog Day because this House continues to revisit over and over again a woman's right to make decisions about her own health.

Roe v. Wade has long established a woman's constitutional right to have an abortion prior to a fetus' viability, yet Republicans continue to introduce legislation like H.R. 36 to ban abortions beginning at 20 weeks, with very limited exceptions.

In Congress and in several States, politicians are interfering in complicated private medical decisions that should be left to a woman, her family, and her doctor. That is why I am proud to cointroduce the Women's Health Protection Act, a bill making it unlawful for States to pass restrictive legislation that will endanger women's health and safety. Women's reproductive rights must be respected.

RECOGNIZING THE MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42-year anniversary since the Supreme Court decided Roe v. Wade. Since then, millions of innocent lives have been lost.

This is also a time to renew hope, as Americans continue to advocate for the respect of all human life. Tomorrow, upwards of a quarter of a million people from across the Nation and many from my district will march from The National Mall to the Supreme Court.

In Congress, we are working to help their efforts. I am cosponsoring H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation would limit abortion after the age at which evidence shows an unborn child can experience pain.

We must continue to stand for legislation that defends the right to life, without which all other rights are impossible.

REMEMBERING SISTER ANN KEEFE

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

Mr. CICILLLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sister Ann Keefe, who passed away on Sunday, January 18.

In 1982, Sister Ann joined the ministry at Saint Michael's in Providence and began her lifelong fight for those who had no voice and those particularly vulnerable and marginalized. Recognizing the challenges that faced our city and our State, Sister Ann took action to help the poor, empower workers, advocate nonviolence, and promote justice for all.

Providing 30 years of service to our community, she cofounded the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence, which is credited with helping to sharply cut the city's murder rate. She started Providence City Arts to help at-risk youth through the arts, and she was involved in creating two dozen other organizations that continue to create opportunity for so many.

I had the extraordinary honor of working with Sister Ann over many years and treasured our friendship. She was a remarkable and strong woman who leaves behind a great legacy. Her passing is a tremendous loss for Rhode Island, but her presence will continue to be felt in the community through the organizations she helped found and run and the positive impact she has had on so many.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family and loved ones.

Rest in peace, Sister Ann.

FIXING THE VA IS DIFFICULT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the President drove right past the Phoenix VA hospital, the facility at the center of the biggest scandal plaguing our Nation's veterans, without taking a second to stop.

Last night in his hour-long speech, the President hardly skimmed the surface in addressing the major challenges our veterans are facing, but he did mention we need to do more to provide our veterans more job opportunities.

We agree. In fact, on this same floor just a few weeks ago, Members of the House passed legislation that would do just that: encourage our employers to hire more of our heroes.

Astonishingly, though, our President failed to even mention one word about the excessive wait times, second-rate care, fraudulent records, destroyed files, and complete incompetence that had been brought to light last year in the VA.

He made no mention on the appeals process or recommendations to improve the lengthy process our veterans face to access the care and treatment they deserve, a topic the House is scheduled to have a hearing on tomorrow.

Fixing the VA is difficult but not impossible. We are here to provide solutions, but we need our leader to be ready to work with us, to be ready to help us so we can finally give our veterans a system that works for them, not against them, in a timely fashion.

THE MIDDLE CLASS DESERVES A BREAK

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, the three most important topics in the President's State of the Union last night were, in order of importance: middle class, middle class, and middle class.

Now, some have called the President's desire to strengthen the middle class with a tax cut class warfare. Well, I have got to tell you, if you have been in the middle class, you feel like you have survived a war over the past many years.

There was the Great Recession, which was created by bad economic policies between 2000 and 2008. You lost your home values. You lost your 401(k). You watched your paychecks shrink.

Now you have gone through a recovery where the statistics tell you that things are going well: the economy has improved 12 percent; that is good news. Corporate profits are up 46 percent; that is good news. The stock market is up 92 percent; that is good news. But you look at your pay stub and say: Where is my good news? I am not keeping pace with everybody else.

In 1992, Jim Carville famously said, ''It's the economy, stupid.'' In 2015, it is my paycheck, stupid. It is paramount that this Congress, Democrats and Republicans, find ways to provide tax cuts to provide the break that the great middle class deserves and the break that has eluded them for too long.

This is not class warfare, Mr. Speaker. This is growing the great and strong middle class of this country.

□ 1215

HONORING LEGACY OF BAYARD WINSLOW ''CHIP'' KENNETT II

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and legacy of Chip Kennett from Conway, New Hampshire, who passed away this weekend at the age of 34 after a heroic 2-year battle with lung cancer.

Chip was a dedicated public servant on Capitol Hill, devoted friend, father, husband, and inspiration to us all. Upon his diagnosis, Chip used his Capitol Hill experience to advocate on behalf of lung cancer research, testifying

before a Senate Aging Committee hearing in 2014 to increase the awareness of the disease. He worked to erase the stigma associated with lung cancer and, in doing so, left a legacy that will continue touching countless lives.

To those who mourn with us today, we rest easier knowing that we could not help but profit from his friendship, his optimism, and his sense of humor. He loved life completely and lived it for others. We are all immeasurably better for having known him.

My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and loved ones during this difficult time, especially his wife, Sheila; their two children, Joe Kennett and Crosby Reynolds; as well as his parents, Bayard and Theresa Kennett.

OPPOSING ATTACK ON WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE CHOICE

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against H.R. 36, a bold attack on reproductive freedom. While in the North Carolina House, I fought tirelessly for women's reproductive choice. As the 100th woman in Congress, I will do the same in the U.S. House. The fight begins with speaking against this unconscionable bill.

Mr. FRANKS, women's health decisions are personal. They should be between a woman, her family, and her doctor—not the North Carolina House and not the U.S. House.

H.R. 36 would add barriers for women who often face complicated, heartbreaking circumstances. I join other women who adamantly oppose this bill, including many of my Republican colleagues.

Today, I stand with Senators, Representatives, and NARAL activists in delivering 150,000 American signatures opposing this bill. I respectfully urge my colleagues not to support this legislation.

A woman cannot call herself free who does not own or control her own body.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY WILLIAM TRAMMELL

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor an American hero, Mr. William Trammell, born January 28, 1920. A lifelong resident of Anderson County, he graduated from Clemson University in 1941 in the exceptional class of graduates known as the ''wartime class,'' where 57 of his classmates lost their lives in World War II. They composed the backbone of what we understand today as the Greatest Generation.

Captain Trammell joined the 1st Engineer Amphibian Brigade during the war, and he was sent to Europe to fight the Nazis. He participated in the North Africa invasion, as well as campaigns in Tunisia, southern Italy, and southern France. Fortunately, he returned home after 3½ years overseas suffering only minor injuries.

Once home, he pursued the American Dream. Mr. Trammell successfully operated three businesses, one of which is still in operation today and operated by his oldest son, Steve.

Mr. Trammell, along with his wife, Thelma, worked on the Eisenhower campaign. To this day, he represents the highest quality of individual that we expect as Americans. He has served his community and country with honor, dignity, and love. Today I would like to wish Mr. Trammell a happy 95th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the House, as well as all Americans, to strive to live life as this exceptional man has and to dedicate their lives to something greater than themselves.

WORKING TOGETHER ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last night President Obama called on Congress to work together on behalf of the American people. It is a call I hear from my constituents in Illinois every day. So as we begin the 114th Congress, I rise on their behalf to urge my colleagues to rise above partisanship, to strengthen our economy and put even more Americans back to work.

Today, all signs point to our economy being the strongest it has been in nearly a decade. Businesses are flourishing. We have gained nearly 3 million new jobs. But there are still 8.7 million Americans living in the shadow of the economic crisis who are struggling with chronic unemployment. They deserve a Congress that is focused and united in putting them back to work.

Let's work to reduce the tax burden on the middle class, putting more money in their pockets and making it easier for them to afford their homes and to send their kids to school so that the American Dream is within everyone's reach. Americans want a Congress that can overcome partisan gridlock to put the people first.

I urge my colleagues to put politics aside, to find a middle ground to help our middle class and put more Americans on the path to opportunity and prosperity.

YAKIMA COUNTY CELEBRATES 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as the newly elected Congressman from central Washington, I rise to mark the 150th birthday of Yakima County, a county at the heart of my congressional district and the county where I was born and am proud to call my home. The Washington Territorial Legislature created Yakima County in 1865, nearly 25 years before Washington itself became a State.

I am a third-generation Yakima County farmer. My family and I continue to operate a 600-acre farm near the city of Sunnyside. Even before the creation of Yakima County, the agricultural industry recognized the vast environmental benefits of the region. Today, agriculture remains the lifeblood of Yakima County's economy, and I am pleased to represent those interests before the House Committee on Agriculture.

Today marks Yakima County's sesquicentennial. Happy 150th birthday. It is an honor to represent you in Congress.

FREE TRADE DEALS DISPROPORTIONATELY HURT COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, when jobs are shipped overseas because of bad trade deals, communities of color bear the huge brunt of the loss of those jobs. Of the 2.7 million jobs lost to China as a result of past trade deals, nearly 1 million of those jobs lost belong to people of color—one million jobs.

Even after they lost their jobs, bad trade deals continued to harm them. When they found another job, it was on average for a nearly 30 percent lower wage. Trade deals like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is being negotiated in secret, wreak havoc on communities of color. We cannot allow more bad trade deals to be enacted, especially when unemployment rates and poverty rates in these communities are much too high already.

Congress must consider the consequences of these trade deals on communities of color and all workers in our country given the terrible impacts of past trade deals. We must demand transparency, ensure that environmental and labor standards and food safety standards are protected, and insist that Congress exercise its constitutional responsibility in ensuring fair and free trade. TPP is certainly not fair and must be defeated.

NO MORE ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL FEDERAL DICTATES

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the American people spoke loud and clear in November, but it is evident from last night's State of the Union that President Obama wasn't listening. Despite a rejection of his policies at the ballot

box, the President continues to propose outdated, Washington-centered ideas that simply don't work.

The American people want Washington to stop interfering in their lives, and they don't need more one-size-fits-all Federal dictates. Republicans have a vision for the future, but President Obama appears to be mired in the past.

Last night, the President expressed a willingness to work with Republicans, and I hope that gesture is sincere. In the past, working together too often meant agreeing with whatever the President said. It is time for President Obama to live up to his rhetoric. House Republicans are eager to work together to increase opportunities for all Americans and empower people, not Washington.

A WOMAN'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO CHOOSE

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 36. This bill is a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling 42 years ago in Roe v. Wade. It is a dangerous attack on a woman's constitutional right to choose.

The bill does not include an exception for the physical or emotional health of a woman. It fails to provide sufficient protections for victims of rape and incest, and it has only a very narrow exception when a woman's life is in danger.

In short, the bill significantly reduces the safe, legal options that women have and prevents doctors from providing the most medically appropriate care for their patients.

Republicans have repeatedly demonstrated a disregard for women's health care, and this bill is just one more example of their continuing attack on women's rights. It is a step backward for women's health and, quite simply, a distraction from the important work that we should be undertaking. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF CAROL I. GLOVER

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary woman and admired constituent, Carol Glover, who passed away on Monday, January 12, as a result of the tragic incident aboard Metro train 302.

Carol was a devoted mother who raised her two sons in Alexandria, Virginia. Many of her friends and family describe her as ''the ultimate sports mom cheerleader'' because she could often be found cheering on the sidelines of her sons' football, soccer, and basketball games. Carol was also the den mother for her sons' Cub Scouts troop and was said to treat all like her own children.

Carol had a successful 20-year career as a contractor for the Federal Government. She studied computer programming at Drexel University, where she graduated with honors, and she recently received the Employee of the Year honor. It is clear she was as diligent in her work as she was in raising her children.

Carol will be remembered as a woman of strong faith with a gentle demeanor and warm heart. At her funeral her mother said: ''In life we all have a dark tunnel to go through. Stay on track, and you will see the light at the end of the tunnel.'' Her mother believed that Carol had found that light.

Carol leaves behind sons Anthony, who served in the Marines for 13 years, and Marcus, who works for a Christian nonprofit here in Washington, D.C.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to Carol's family, friends, and to all those whose lives were touched by this amazing woman.

WORKING TOGETHER

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to attend the State of the Union Address last night for the first time, representing the Sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

After listening to the President's speech, I hope that he will find common ground and work with Congress on a number of complex issues facing our Nation, including enacting job-creating policies for hardworking families, fixing our broken health care system, and reining in our out-of-control debt, and that is just to name a few.

But unfortunately, there were a number of veto threats and proposals which amount to more government overreach into the lives of hardworking taxpayers.

Americans are looking for Congress and the President to work together, not for the President to take a go-it-alone approach and repeatedly threaten use of veto power. We are not looking to grow our Federal government any further.

That said, I agree specifically with the President's desire for improving cybersecurity legislation and creating more economic opportunity for our Nation's veterans. I disagree with his approach on other matters discussed, specifically, certain tax reform measures that will ultimately amount to a trickle-down tax increase on middle class Americans.

I am confident we can find some common ground and adequately fund our Nation's transportation and infrastructure needs, and I look forward to doing that.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 39

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Nunnelee to rank immediately after Mr. Womack.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Garrett; Mr. Diaz-Balart; Mr. Cole; Mr. McClintock; Mrs. Black; Mr. Rokita; Mr. Woodall; Mrs. Blackburn; Mrs. Hartzler; Mr. Rice of South Carolina; Mr. Stutzman; Mr. Sanford; Mr. Schock; Mr. Womack; Mr. Brat; Mr. Blum; Mr. Mooney of West Virginia; Mr. Grothman; Mr. Palmer; Mr. Moolenaar; and Mr. Westerman.

Ms. FOXX (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 161, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 38 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 38

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage

without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1230

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 38 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The rule before us today, Mr. Speaker, provides for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It is truly fitting that the House considers this legislation in the shadow of the 42nd anniversary of the Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton decisions that gave Americans abortion on demand at any stage of pregnancy.

This legislation is a commonsense step in recognizing the truth that science has made more clear with the passage of time: the unborn child in the womb is alive and a functioning member of the human family.

Science has shown us that the most fundamental precursors to an unborn child feeling pain are already in place by 8 weeks in development. Necessary connections between the brain and spinal cord are in place and complete by 18 weeks.

The House Judiciary Committee heard testimony by expert physicians that the earlier premature babies are delivered, the more acutely they feel pain. It is clear that unborn children at 20 weeks of development are capable of feeling pain and deserving of protection.

In spite of the 60 percent of Americans who believe we should limit abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will continue to protest this sensible legislation, seeking to keep us in the company of only seven other nations that allow elective abortion after 20 weeks, which includes such well-known human rights leaders as North Korea, China, and Vietnam.

This vital, lifesaving legislation is not the only important legislation the House will consider this week. This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act recognizes the positive impact America's shale revolution has had on energy prices and the potential it holds to lower them further. We are in the midst of another hard winter, and red tape reduction is necessary to ensure we have the infrastructure needed to ensure low-cost natural gas is able to reach our coldest States when they need it most without price shocks or shortages.

H.R. 161 introduces critical reform to ensure prompt consideration of necessary permitting requests for construction or updates to natural gas pipelines, providing certainty to energy companies and the consumers they serve.

The legislation would require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve or deny a requested pipeline certificate no later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed and has engaged in the prefiling process.

H.R. 161 also ensures that relevant agencies provide approval or denial within 90 days of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission completing its final environmental document.

Finally, the legislation would put permits into effect, notwithstanding agencies' failures to provide approval within the time mandated, with allowances for the addition of conditions consistent with the final environmental document.

H.R. 161 is the reintroduction of H.R. 1900, which passed this House on a bipartisan basis in the 113th Congress. H.R. 1900 received extensive committee consideration, including numerous hearings on the underlying issues, prompting the legislation, as well as the subcommittee hearing and subcommittee and full committee markups on the bill.

Both H.R. 36 and H.R. 161 are truly important legislation that Americans would be well-served to have considered this week, and I commend both my bills to my colleagues as deserving of their support.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while I have great respect for the gentlewoman from North Carolina, I don't have a lot of respect for this process. I would like to begin today by saying a word or two about the process being used by the Republicans here on the floor—actually, three words: ''It stinks. Again.''

We are all very happy—delighted even—to hear our Republican friends say that they wanted to make this Congress into a place where we could work together, but actions speak louder than words, and here are some of their actions: five closed rules.

Until yesterday, 100 percent of our Rules Committee meetings have been called so-called emergency meetings, and 100 percent of the bills the committee has sent to the floor have drawn a veto threat, and once again, the Republicans are using one rule for multiple bills. This is a disturbing pattern that is quickly becoming a bad habit.

The Republican leadership apparently isn't content to exclude Democrats from offering substantive, germane, and thoughtful amendments. They are also shutting down the debate itself.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is only a few weeks old. We have 23 months left to go. Are the Republicans really saying that we can't find an extra hour for debate during the next 23 months? Of course we can. They just prefer not to. It is unfair, it is undemocratic, it is unnecessary, and it needs to stop.

Now, as to the bill that is before us today, last night, as we all know, President Obama laid out a bold, clear, and exciting agenda to spur economic growth and ensure that prosperity is shared by all Americans, not just the wealthy few and special interests. I thought it was a terrific speech.

Apparently, my Republican friends weren't paying very close attention. I know they were there in this Chamber because I saw many of them. The Speaker himself was sitting right behind the President. Maybe they were sending each other cat videos or taking selfies because the President made it very clear that if Congress sends him bills that move us backward, he will veto them, and both of these bills deserve his veto.

The first, H.R. 161, is a solution in search of a problem. It is as simple as that. The bill would automatically approve natural gas pipeline projects if FERC or other Federal agencies do not act on required permits or certificates within a rigid, unworkable timeframe.

A GAO report concluded that FERC's pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent, with 91 percent of pipeline applications receiving a decision within 12 months. During committee testimony last Congress, even industry representatives agreed that the current permitting process is ''generally very good.'' It is not every day that regulators and industry agree that the current system works.

So why would we move forward on a bill that disrupts a system that works is beyond me. In fact, this bill makes it more likely that FERC will deny more projects just to comply with the severe timeline.

In Massachusetts, we are dealing with the proposed Tennessee Gas pipeline which would run through parts of my district and would cut through a number of environmentally sensitive

lands, including Northfield State Forest and the Montague aquifer and management area.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment with my good friend Congresswoman NIKI TSONGAS, whose district would also be affected by the proposed pipeline, to keep the existing review process in place for proposed pipelines that cross Federal, State, or local conservation or recreation lands because, if we have already invested Federal and State money into identifying these lands as environmentally sensitive, it doesn't make any sense to expedite the approval of a pipeline that could bulldoze right through them.

It is worth a debate. Unfortunately, Republicans on the Rules Committee voted down this commonsense amendment in a party-line vote.

As the gentlewoman from North Carolina pointed out, both of these rules are completely closed. Even though they did not go through regular order, even though there were no hearings in this Congress or no markup, nobody—no Democrat, no Republican—can offer an amendment.

Then there is H.R. 36. This is just the latest Republican assault on women's reproductive rights. It is their latest attempt to put politicians in the middle of the private medical decisions of women. It is blatantly unconstitutional, and it fails to take into consideration the fact that some pregnancies can have catastrophic, heartbreaking complications, even after 20 weeks.

To make matters worse, this legislation lacks a reasonable exception for victims of rape and incest by requiring victims to report cases of rape and incest to law enforcement in order to have access to an abortion, this despite the fact that research shows that the majority of sexual assaults are unreported, and on top of that, the exception on incest is only for minors.

Mr. Speaker, what really bothers me about bills like this is that the same people who vote for them routinely vote to cut the WIC program, to cut Head Start and childcare programs and SNAP and school lunch programs, and elementary and secondary education funding. This hypocrisy is breathtaking.

Mr. Speaker, leading medical groups agree that doctors, in consultation with women and their families, should make medical decisions, not the politicians.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. They deserve a better process, and they deserve better legislation. We certainly have a lot to do to help get this country to continue on the road to prosperity, to make sure that everybody can share in this economy's growth.

I urge my colleagues: let's focus on those issues, let's come together and do something for the American people, and enough of these message bills.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I need to remind this House that during the Democrats' time in the majority, there were two rules packages providing consideration of seven unrelated measures.

In the 110th Congress, their first year in the majority, the rules package provided for consideration of five measures.

In the 111th Congress, the Democrat majority provided for the consideration of two separate measures in the rules package.

The Democrat majority went directly to the floor with these bills, with no committee consideration and without even allowing the Rules Committee to debate these measures or report an appropriate rule for consideration.

In the 110th Congress, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER and Democrats on the Rules Committee reported three additional closed rules, starting the Congress out with eight closed rules in the opening weeks.

In the 111th Congress, Democrats reported out two additional closed rules, for a total of four closed rules in the opening weeks of that Congress.

Unlike our Democrat colleagues, the Speaker and Chairman SESSIONS had provided the opportunity to have hearings before the Rules Committee.

It is our goal to return to regular order now that our committees are organizing, but the false attacks by my colleagues do not stand up to the light of day when you compare our records.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the preeminent defenders of life in this Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend for yielding and thank her for her strong leadership for human rights and for the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, pain—we all dread it, we avoid it, we even fear it, and we all go to extraordinary lengths to mitigate its severity and its duration; yet an entire age group of human beings are, today, subjected to a deadly, extraordinarily painful procedure, one of which is called the dismemberment method, the D&E.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a modest but necessary attempt to at least protect babies who are 20 weeks old and pain capable from having to suffer and die from abortion. Children, including children with disabilities, Mr. Speaker, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

One leading expert in the field of fetal pain, Dr. Anand, at the University of Tennessee, stated in his expert report, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Justice:

> The human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.

□ 1245

Dr. Colleen Malloy, assistant professor, Division of Neonatology at Northwestern University, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, said:

> When we speak of infants at 20 weeks postfertilization, we no longer have to rely on inferences or ultrasound technology, because such premature patients are kicking, moving, reacting, and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit.

In other words, there are children the same age who, in utero, can be killed by abortion—and painfully—or who have been born and who are now being given lifesaving assistance. She went on to say:

> In today's medical arena, we resuscitate patients at this age and are able to witness their ex-utero growth.

Dr. Malloy concludes:

> I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment or cardiac injection.

Again, that is what the abortionists do.

Surgeons today, Mr. Speaker, are entering the womb to perform life-enhancing and lifesaving corrective surgeries on unborn children. They have seen those babies flinch, jerk around, move around, and recoil from sharp objects and incisions. As they seek to heal, surgeons are today routinely administering anesthesia to unborn children in the womb—a best medical practice—to protect them from pain. We now know that the child ought to be treated as a patient and that there are many anomalies, sicknesses, and disabilities that could be treated with a degree of success while the child is still in utero. The child ought to be seen as a patient. When those interventions are performed, again, anesthesia is given.

Last June, TIME Magazine's cover story, ''Saving Preemies,'' explored the preemie revolution and how cutting-edge medicine and dedicated caregivers are helping the tiniest babies to survive and thrive. TIME says:

> Thanks to advances that had not been made even a few years ago, the odds of surviving and thriving are improving all the time.

Abortionists, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, are in the business of ensuring that children neither survive nor thrive. Children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, I yield myself such time as I may consume as I want to respond to this issue about process.

When Speaker BOEHNER became the Speaker of this House, in his opening speech, one of the things he said was:

> You will always have the right to a robust debate and an open process that allows you to represent your constituents—to make your case, to offer alternatives, and to be heard.

Clearly, we have not been granted that in any way, shape, or form.

While the gentlewoman may point to the sins of the past of Democratic majorities, nothing compares to what the Republicans did in the last Congress. The Republicans presided over the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

I mean, you made history, and that is not something to be proud of.

When my friends talk about openness and transparency and about the desire to allow this to be a deliberative place where people of varying viewpoints can have a forum to debate, it is not reflective of reality. We are beginning this Congress just as my colleagues conducted the last Congress—in the most closed way possible. I regret that very much, especially on bills that have not even been through the committee hearing process in this Congress or that have not been marked up.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I want to thank my colleague for his great work and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today, The Wall Street Journal polled the American public and found that these are their top three priorities: creating jobs, defeating ISIS, and reducing the Federal budget deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I insert that piece from The Wall Street Journal into the RECORD.

[From The Wall Street Journal]

POLL FINDS AGENDA GAP BETWEEN LEADERS, AMERICAN PEOPLE

(By Janet Hook)

Republicans are trying to burnish their party's image—and Congress'—by promising to ''get things done'' now that the GOP controls both the House and Senate. But a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll shows that the public doesn't care much about some of the first things the GOP, or President Barack Obama, is trying to do.

The poll conducted from Jan. 14–17 found that two of the major issues congressional Republicans and the White House have identified as candidates for bipartisan action—trade and simplification of the tax code—didn't even make the top five issues that people feel need to be addressed urgently.

The poll tried to identify the issues that are most important to Americans by asking which issues they considered an ''absolute priority'' for Congress and the president to act on this year, as opposed to issues that they think could be delayed.

The list was topped by enduring concerns: job creation, fighting Islamic militants in Iraq and Syria, reducing the federal deficit and securing the U.S. border.

But people are virtually yawning at the prospect of expanding U.S. trade, a priority for an administration trying to finalize a new free-trade agreement with Asian and Pacific Rim countries. Only 20% said that was an urgent priority for this year, 59% said it could be delayed until next year and 16% said it shouldn't be pursued at all.

''It's a reminder that this is for the most part a very distant economic issue and it's not one that people focus on,'' said Bill McInturff, a Republican pollster who conducted the poll with Democrat Fred Yang.

The apathy about trade is bipartisan. Only 22% of Republicans and 21% of Democrats said it was a top priority.

Simplifying the tax code is also an issue that's not a top-five policy priority for most Americans, but is treated like a motherhood issue by politicians of both parties. Just over half polled said it was an urgent priority—less than the percentage who wanted to make ''efforts to address Iran's nuclear program'' a top agenda item.

Even some of the issues Washington lawmakers are fighting over are matters of only marginal concern to many people. Republicans have acted quickly on a bill to finish construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, and Mr. Obama threw down his first veto threat over it. But nearly four in ten people polled said they didn't know enough about the issue to have an opinion.

The survey of policy priorities underscored another trend that doesn't bode well for bipartisan cooperation: On all but a handful of issues, such as job creation and infrastructure repair, the poll found big disparities in the interests of the two parties. So, while 67% of Democrats identified income inequality as an urgent priority, only 19% of Republicans did. U.S. border security was a top priority for 79% of Republicans but only 43% of Democrats.

It's not surprising, then, that the poll found people were down on the idea of having divided government. Mr. Obama and Republicans in Congress may agree on the need to ''get things done.'' The problem is there isn't a lot of agreement on what ''things'' should get priority.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, why am I bringing that up? The offense, to me, is that there are so many people in Congress who always want to bring up this issue of eating away at Roe v. Wade. They don't have the nerve, I think, really, to try to take that away.

Roe v. Wade gave women a choice, and I believe that, if you don't want to have that choice yourself, don't use it; but what right do people who do not agree with choice have to make it the law of the land—to require everybody to live under what they believe is true?

Now, there is not a scintilla of scientific evidence that at 20 weeks pain is felt. The neural connections are not there to have that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to insert into the RECORD what scientists—the executive vice president and others—have said from the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists in that this is not possible.

JANUARY 21, 2015.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, We, the undersigned medical and public health organizations, stand in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the so-called ''Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act,'' sponsored by Representative Trent Franks (R–AZ) and Representative Marsha Blackburn (R–TN). Politicians are not doctors and should not interfere in personal, medical decisions.

If enacted, H.R. 36 would ban most abortions in the United States at 20 weeks after fertilization, clearly before viability. The bill threatens providers with fines and/or imprisonment for providing professional and compassionate care, and is intended to intimidate and discourage doctors from providing abortion care. This bill places health care providers in an untenable situation—when they are facing a complex, urgent medical situation, they must think about an unjust law instead of about how to protect the health and safety of their patients.

Politicians are not medical experts. H.R. 36 disregards the health issues and real life situations that women can face in pregnancy. Every woman faces her own unique circumstances, challenges, and potential complications. She needs to be able to make decisions based on her physician's medical advice and what is right for her and her family.

H.R. 36 would force a doctor to deny an abortion to a woman who has determined that terminating a pregnancy is the right decision for her, including women carrying a pregnancy with severe and lethal anomalies that may not be diagnosed until after 20 weeks in pregnancy and women with serious medical conditions brought on or exacerbated by pregnancy. H.R. 36 contains no exception to preserve the health of the woman. Instead, it includes a vague life endangerment exception which exposes doctors to the threat of criminal prosecution, limiting their options for care that is often needed in complex, urgent medical situations.

Moreover, H.R. 36 would dictate how physicians should care for their patients based on inaccurate and unscientific claims. Conclusive research shows that contrary to the sponsors' claims, the fetus doesn't have the neurological structures needed to experience pain until significantly later in pregnancy.

We strongly oppose governmental interference in the patient-provider relationship and criminalizing provision of care to women and their families. H.R. 36 jeopardizes the health of women in the U.S. by limiting access to safe and legal abortion and replaces personal decision-making by women and their doctors with political ideology. Our organizations urge you to oppose passage of H.R. 36.

Sincerely,

American College of Nurse-Midwives,
American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists,
American Medical Students Association,
American Medical Women's Association,
American Nurses Association,
American Society for Reproductive Medicine,
Association of Reproductive Health Professionals,
Medical Students for Choice,
National Abortion Federation,
National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health,
National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association,
Physicians for Reproductive Health,
Planned Parenthood Federation of America,
Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine,
Society of Family Planning.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, as a scientist, I have learned that this Congress does not take scientific facts as facts but that it views them as, maybe, suggestions. Yet how often it is that we are playing with people's lives. It is the most personal decision one could ever make, and it should be made between the woman, her family, or whomever she wants to consult—her doctor, her priest, her pastor—anybody—but not the Congress of the United States.

Why do men in blue suits and red ties get to make that decision when it has nothing to do with scientific or medical facts? It is absolutely astonishing to me that this continues over and over again; and in the States that have passed 20-week abortion bills, the bills have always been overturned with regard to the constitutional question, and this will be as well.

Time and time again, when asked about it, neurobiology specialists, obstetricians, and gynecologists the world over have refuted the scientific and factual premises of this bill, but nobody cares about that here. I saw a great button that called the people here who are trying to do this today ''gyneticians.'' A ''gynetician'' is described as a politician who knows more about women's health than doctors do.

We can go on with this, but what we need to remember is that, last night, half of the President's speech dealt with people who are underpaid and who struggle to live in America.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me get right to the chase here.

Barney Frank, our former colleague, said that many people believe that life begins at conception and ends at birth.

I want to know how this Congress is going to comply with what the President asked us last night: Will you give more money for child care? for daycare? Will you give more money for early education? Will you make sure that mothers are paid as much as the men they are working with and that the same jobs pay the same? Will you do something about paid sick leave? Will you help these children get to college?

Absolutely not. The record has been clear on all of these issues.

There is something really awful when we take up the time to please the base of some sort out there against all scientific belief and everything that we know about medicine. I wish this Congress would stop the folly. We are faced with a lot of serious problems in this country. Again, as my colleague points out, we have no ability to amend it. Nobody else can be heard on anything else. It is simply going to be voted on; the Senate may or may not ever take it up; and the President will not sign it. It is the same thing that we did over and over in the last session—kill health care.

Do everything you can. Nothing is going to be signed. No bills will be made. It is a shame. I have labeled it before as ''legislative malpractice,'' and that is exactly what is going on with this bill.

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

Once again, we find ourselves in a position in which we must correct the record.

Over the last 4 years, Republicans have implemented reforms to make the U.S. House of Representatives more open and transparent than ever. Under this GOP majority, Members on both sides of the aisle have been allowed to offer significantly more amendments—and the House has operated under far more open rules—than were allowed under the previous Democrat-controlled House.

The GOP majority allowed nearly 1,500 amendments to be considered on the House floor in the 113th Congress. Under Speaker PELOSI, the House did not consider a single bill under an open rule throughout the 111th Congress. That is the definition of a closed process, Mr. Speaker, and it is precisely what Speaker BOEHNER successfully changed to start the 112th Congress and to continue throughout the 113th Congress. Under the current GOP majority, the House has considered 38 open or modified open rules.

When you compare the record of the Republican majority and the most recent Democrat majority, any fair analysis will show that Republicans are running a more open, transparent House of Representatives that allows for greater participation by all Members.

The problem throughout the last Congress resided in the Senate and its failure to act on almost everything passed by the House. When the Senate did decide to act, then-majority leader, Democrat HARRY REID, virtually locked down the amendment process on the Senate floor. When you compare the nearly 1,500 amendments considered on the House floor with the Senate's record of inaction, a more accurate picture emerges.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and, most importantly, of the underlying bill, H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. I encourage all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support this important job creation bill.

The great State of Maine is home to the most skilled papermakers in the world. Even so, last year, mills in Bucksport, Old Town, and Millinocket closed, laying off 1,000 of our workers. Soon, a fourth mill, which is in Madison, will temporarily shut down, furloughing another 215 workers.

For each mill, the high cost of electricity to run its machinery was a primary reason for closure. Almost half the power plants in New England burn natural gas to generate electricity. We must allow the increased production and transportation of natural gas to drive down the cost of electric power and save our mills, our factories, and save our jobs.

Today, I am proud to cosponsor this new legislation in order to expedite the permitting to construct more and larger capacity natural gas pipelines throughout America. I ask my Republican and Democrat colleagues to band together in supporting this critically important jobs bill. It is the fair and the right thing to do.

Hardworking American taxpayers deserve a more effective government that works together to solve our serious problems. We have the responsibility and the authority to help our families live better lives, with fatter paychecks and more financial security. Let's get this done.

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

Let me just say for the record that facts are facts are facts. There is no denying that the last Republican Congress held the record for the most closed rules in the history of the United States.

Maybe I am misunderstanding the current rule, but to the best of my knowledge, not a single amendment is allowed, notwithstanding that in this Congress there have been no hearings and no markups.

Is it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for me to ask unanimous consent to amend H.R. 36 and make it an open rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina would have to yield for such a request to be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina yield?

Ms. FOXX. I will not yield.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So there it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the ranking member for yielding, for his leadership, and for really making it clear exactly what we are dealing with today and why many of us strongly oppose this rule and this bill.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the anniversary of Roe v. Wade. Over 40 years ago, the Supreme Court ruled that a woman could make her own personal health care decisions without interference from politicians. Yet here we are again, in 2015, debating this constitutionally protected right.

H.R. 36 would ban all abortions at 20 weeks, with extremely limited exceptions. A ban on an abortion after 20 weeks makes it harder for women who are already facing difficult circumstances. This is so bad. This is so wrong.

□ 1300

Every woman has a right to a safe medical procedure. And this decision, while difficult, is hers to make, not yours and not mine. This is her decision.

This bill is part of a broader effort to chip away at abortion access, a right that has already been decided by the Supreme Court and is the law of the land. Yet Republicans once again are focused on dictating what women can do with their bodies, denying their rights and endangering their health.

Mr. Speaker, this radical GOP bill undermines women's constitutional rights under Roe v. Wade. This is a dangerous assault on women's health freedoms. Women should not have to justify their personal medical decisions.

Abortions later in a pregnancy can involve rare, severe fetal abnormalities or pose serious risks to the health of women, but these procedures may be medically necessary to save the woman's life.

This is an agonizing decision that a woman should make with her doctor,

her family, or whomever, but not her congressional Representatives. We have seen what happens when politicians interfere in these deeply personal medical decisions and tie doctors' hands.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Let me just say that the AMA has stated very clearly that this bill compromises a doctor's ability to provide medical treatment in the best interest of the patient.

Members of Congress have no right to interfere in health care decisions of women. This is a private matter. And the last time I looked, I thought we do have a right to privacy in this country.

So we have got to continue to fight against these attacks on women's health, on our constitutional rights, and on the right to privacy. I hope you vote ''no'' on this rule and ''no'' on this bill.

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

The gentleman from Massachusetts knows very well that the number of closed rules last Congress was a procedural effect of Republicans' efforts to reopen the government. America tires of this debate. Let's return to real issues with an impact on Americans' lives.

Mr. Speaker, we go to extraordinary lengths in this country to save the lives of born human beings because we value life so much. However, there are many who do not hold the unborn in the same esteem, and that is tragic for the more than 1 million unborn babies who lose their lives every year. There is nothing more important than protecting voiceless unborn children and their families from the travesty of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, over these next 2 days, you will hear many of my colleagues rise in support of H.R. 36, as well they should. This bill protects pain-capable, pre-born children from being subjected to violent, dismembering abortions, also known as D&E abortions.

One former abortionist, Dr. Anthony Levatino, testified in May 2013 before the House Judiciary Committee and described the procedure by saying:

> A second-trimester D&E abortion is a blind procedure. Picture yourself reaching in with a Sopher clamp and grasping anything you can. Once you have grasped something inside, squeeze on the clamp to set the jaws and pull hard—really hard.

This is from a former abortionist describing the procedure:

> You feel something let go and out pops a fully formed leg about 6 inches long. Reach in again and again with that clamp and tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs.

How disgusting. How repugnant. How wrong. Any nation, any party, any person that claims to respect human rights and accepts basic science must reject this pain-filled act of barbarism.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and, most important, in supporting H.R. 36.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill. This bill is just as unconstitutional as it was when it was introduced in the last Congress. It poses just as serious a risk to the health and civil liberties of American women. And this time around, it comes with an additional slap in the face to women because, if this rule passes, the bill will come to a vote on the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade.

By attempting to outlaw almost all abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, this bill would clearly violate the constitutional principles the Court laid down in that decision a generation ago. Women must be allowed to decide their health care decisions. They need to do it in consultation with their doctors, with their families, and with their clergy and not have those decisions made for them by Washington politicians.

The Republican majority always claims to be against government overreach and for science. Well, they should take a look at the legislation they bring to the floor. This bill would extend the Federal Government's reach all the way into the doctor's office. And it denies medical science. It threatens providers with jail for performing a procedure that is constitutionally protected and often medically necessary. It places obstacles in the way of rape victims who seek help. It would put thousands of women at risk.

In short, this is another Republican ideological assault on women. We should reject it wholeheartedly. Our priority should be to help American workers with jobs, with increased wages—including women—and not turning the clock back to the 1950s with this kind of unconstitutional posturing.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and the underlying bill and truly vote for women in the United States today.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is important to respond to the charge that this legislation is unconstitutional. In 2007, the Supreme Court upheld the Federal Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act as an appropriate use of Congress' powers under the Commerce Clause. This legislation follows that act's model by asserting Congress' authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Commerce, Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the 14th Amendment.

It is sad that opponents of this legislation are attempting to use the Constitution as a roadblock to prevent life-saving legislation, but the Supreme Court's position is clear.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, a great shadow looms over America, the home of the brave.

More than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States today.

Almost every other major civilized nation on Earth protects pain-capable babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting them. And yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary painful cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that today the winds of change have begun to blow and the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America because today we take up the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber.

It is not perfect, Mr. Speaker. Each one of us would have written it a little differently if we could have done so. However, no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisting of words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, it is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand, and, ultimately, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing to these babies is real—and we all know it—and it is time to change and protect them.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), a champion for women's rights.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Instead of prioritizing the needs of women and families, we are once again discussing a bill that attacks women's rights.

When I ask women in my district what they need, they talk about not being able to find quality, affordable child care. But here in Congress we are talking about a bill that tells women they don't have a right to plan their own family.

Women in my district talk about making sure they receive equal pay for equal work. What are we talking about? A bill that tells women that politicians are better able to make their health decisions than they are.

Women in my district talk about making sure victims and survivors of domestic violence have the resources they need to build a better life. But we are talking about a bill that tells women that if they become pregnant because they were raped, they better have a police report to prove it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. American women pay taxes, raise their families, contribute to our economy, and are over half of the electorate. Yet rather than helping these women succeed and grow our economy, we give them this bill that forces backward ideological beliefs into women's private medical decisions.

I urge my colleagues to get back to work for women and families of this country and reject this dangerous bill.

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

It is disappointing to hear my colleagues criticize this legislation in this way. We consider many weighty issues in this body with great implications for our future, but few of those issues command our attention as much as those that impact children, as this legislation does. This is right and appropriate.

I fear for both our future and our present if we continue to tolerate the death of innocent children in the womb. Every life matters. It is my hope that a culture of life will take hold and all children will be protected in law in the near future, but today we have an opportunity to come together and find consensus that nearly fully developed, viable children should be protected, particularly as individuals capable of experiencing great pain.

The necessity of that protection is made even clearer when considering the type of abortion these growing children are subjected to.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the American people understand exactly what happens when they hear the word ''abortion.'' According to Planned Parenthood, the largest abortion provider in America, babies aborted at 14 weeks or later are often subjected to dismemberment abortions, which are incredibly gruesome and painful.

What follows is heart-wrenching to describe, Mr. Speaker, but we must face the truth of what we are currently permitting. As if in a horror movie, the abortionist begins by suctioning out the amniotic fluid, then rips the limbs from the infant's body with a steel tool and finishes by crushing the skull of the infant he has dismembered.

Take a moment to consider that. This is the most common abortion performed in the second trimester, not a rare tragedy.

As a Nation, we rightfully give the safety of our children the highest importance. In spite of that, we continue to allow these horrific procedures that an overwhelming majority of nations in the world have sworn off. As I mentioned before, only seven nations allow elective abortions after 20 weeks' gestation.

□ 1315

How can America continue to be one of them? We must leave this practice behind.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the underlying legislation to prohibit elective abortions in the United States past 20 weeks. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a commonsense reform to our American principles of protecting life as the most fundamental constitutional right.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. After all the talk by our Republican friends about focusing their efforts on jobs and growing the economy, so far their rhetoric does not match their record.

Last week, we took up a pipeline bill that, according to the State Department, would only create 34 jobs, and the bill that we have on the pipeline today probably won't create one single job, but what it will do, it will make it easier to damage the environment.

The majority has also introduced six antichoice bills in the past 7 days, and what all these bills have in common is that they will not create one single American job.

Instead of a jobs agenda, the majority seems bound and determined to attack women's rights, to take away a woman's constitutional right to make for herself the most private and personal and intimate decisions.

Now, we are taking up this bill, H.R. 36, which is based on the insulting belief that women are incapable and unprepared to make decisions about their own bodies and their own health care.

Forty-two years ago this week, the Supreme Court, in Roe v. Wade, made it clear that a woman has a constitutional right to decide for herself these private issues concerning her own health and well-being.

This is not only insulting to the women of this country, it is just another pointless exercise in political posturing. It will never become law. It is a waste of Congress' time. What we should be doing instead is focusing on any idea or measure that can help create greater economic opportunity for all Americans.

The President pointed out last night that our economy is on the rise. Under his leadership, we are experiencing the strongest private sector job growth we have had in 17 years, over 11 million new jobs.

Let's not squander this opportunity. Let's work together to create real jobs, not political posturing for the American people.

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

Thankfully, the American people recognize that we are speaking about protecting vulnerable lives here. A March 2013 poll conducted by The Polling Company found that 64 percent of the public supports a law like the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act prohibiting an abortion after 20 weeks, when an unborn baby can feel pain, unless the life of the mother is in danger.

Supporters include 47 percent of those who identified themselves as ''pro-choice'' in the poll. The poll also found that 63 percent of women believe that abortion should not be permitted after the point where substantial medical evidence says that the unborn child can feel pain. That finding was not an unusual outlier. It is representative of the true beliefs of the American people.

According to a 2013 Gallup Poll, 64 percent of Americans support prohibiting second trimester abortions, and 80 percent support prohibiting third trimester abortions. Even The Huffington Post found in 2013 that 59 percent of Americans support limiting abortions after 20 weeks.

Let no one believe that our concern is only for the child. A study in the Obstetrics and Gynecology journal found that a woman seeking an abortion after 20 weeks' gestation is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she would have been from an abortion in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die. Abortion is a danger to both lives, the mother and the child.

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot sit idly by while this grotesque and brutal procedure, which rips the tiny baby apart, limb from limb in the womb, and threatens the life of the mother, is performed in our country. This is why it is necessary for Congress to pass H.R. 36 and protect the lives of these unborn children from excruciating pain.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), somebody who believes in protecting women's rights.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that pain is a subterfuge. This bill is not about pain to the fetus. This bill is about outlawing abortion and repealing Roe v. Wade.

The other side knows that the Supreme Court has set out in Roe v. Wade the conditions of viability, and viability is 22–24 weeks. Well, they couldn't get past that in the Court, they knew

they couldn't, so they created this new class of when the baby, the child, can feel pain.

They found a doctor that said he assumes they can feel pain, and they base their whole premise on that, an argument to try to repeal Roe v. Wade and to not give the women of this country the opportunity to exercise choice on their own lives and when they produce children.

This has been the law in this country since 1973. I consider it the right law. I was in law school when the Supreme Court brought down Roe v. Wade. It was progress, and we continue to march forward, but the other side wants to stop progress. If they could outlaw all abortions, they would do it, and this is the first step toward doing it.

They don't provide for the life of the mother in the bill. They don't provide for exceptions for rape and incest, and they didn't allow any amendments because they knew if they had amendments they would carry, and the full rape and incest exceptions which are in the law today would be put on this bill, and that would be difficult for them to swallow.

This is a sham on pain. This is an attempt to take women's rights away and to repeal Roe v. Wade. I would ask that when the bill comes up that we vote ''no'' and vote women first and progress.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time at this time until the gentleman from Massachusetts is ready to close.

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

Sadly, we have seen all too well how money has polluted our politics and is undermining our democracy, so I am going to urge people to vote against the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of a sensible constitutional amendment, H.J. Res. 22, a measure that I have sponsored with my friends, TED DEUTCH of Florida, DONNA EDWARDS of Maryland, and JOHN SARBANES of Maryland, to overturn these decisions and make clear that Congress and States have the authority to regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money to influence elections.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts, a leader in the fight to get money out of politics.

Last night, in his State of the Union Address, President Obama called on Republicans and Democrats in Congress to embrace a better politics where we spend less time fundraising and spewing sound bites and more time debating issues in good faith to find common ground.

A better politics, that is something all Americans want to see, and there is no better way to restore their faith in Congress than by getting Big Money out of politics.

Today, my friends, is the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's 5–4 ruling in Citizens United v. FEC, which granted corporations and megamillionaires a First Amendment right to buy unlimited influence in our elections. The results of Citizens United has been elections dominated by super-PACs and unaccountable outside groups, backed by a small group of the wealthiest Americans.

Indeed, during the 2012 Presidential election cycle, 93 percent of super-PAC funding came from just over 3,000 donors, amounting to less than .01 percent of the American population; likewise, the 2014 midterm election cycle was the most expensive in history, with recordbreaking spending by outside groups.

That is why, today, I ask the majority to join me and more than 80 of my colleagues in support of H.J. Res. 22, the Democracy for All amendment. This amendment will restore what the Supreme Court took away in Citizens United: the right of Congress and the States to pass laws limiting the influence of Big Money in our elections.

Seniors on Social Security don't have millions to funnel into super-PACs.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEUTCH. And low-income children are not among the wealthy donors who hit the limits struck down in last year's McCutcheon ruling.

The sad truth is that, for most Americans, their influence in Washington has shrunk each time the Supreme Court has invited more money into our elections and allowed special interests to set the agenda.

Let's build a better politics by bringing H.J. Res. 22, the Democracy for All amendment, up for a vote today. Together, we can ensure that every American's voice, once again, is heard in America's democracy.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on ordering the previous question, so that we can consider the constitutional amendment, the Democracy for All amendment, that would rein in the excesses that have been unleashed by Big Money on our political system. That occurred 5 years ago in the Citizens United decision.

We have an opportunity, acting on behalf of the millions of Americans who feel their voices are drowned out, to push back on the influence of Big Money in this town and on this Chamber.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that every week we get another example of how Big Money is influencing policy here in Washington. Last week, it was the influence of Wall Street leaning on the institution to pass legislation that would get them out from reasonable regulation. This week, it is the energy industry leaning on the institution with respect to this Keystone bill that we are going to see—example after example of how Big Money has undue influence here in Washington.

It is time that we fought on behalf of the American people and made sure that their voices are the ones being heard, not the voice and the megaphone of Big Money.

Let's vote against ordering the previous question. Let's consider the amendment to the Constitution that would allow us to push back on the undue influence of Big Money here in Washington.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. FOXX. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. How much time do I have left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I will offer if we defeat the previous question in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Let me just recap for my colleagues here. First of all, vote ''no'' on this rule. This continues a trend that has nothing but contempt for regular order. These bills had no hearings in this Congress. There was no markup, and now, they are brought to the floor with no amendments—two closed rules.

Notwithstanding the pledge of the Speaker for a more open and transparent process, people who have other ideas on ways to improve or change these bills are denied that opportunity.

I would say, with all due respect to my colleague from North Carolina, we can't use the excuse that we have got to keep the government running. We are in the beginning of the session. We are not doing much of anything. Clearly, the bills that we are debating in their current form are going to be vetoed anyway.

□ 1330

Secondly, I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule because of the bills that are being brought up: this bill that is clearly an attack on women's health and reproductive rights,

which does not belong on this floor; and the other bill is a bill that basically allows there to be a process for pipelines to be approved without necessarily going through all the proper oversight.

And I am going to urge Members to vote against the previous question so we can bring up this bill that I talked about earlier on campaign finance reform.

Look, the legislative agenda in this Congress is about rewarding the highest donors. I think to any objective observer, when you see what is coming on the floor, including this pipeline bill which is not in the interest of the American people, we are not out there trying to protect their safety and well-being. It is a big kiss to the energy industry. And I would argue that the reason why bills like that—or some of the tax bills that are brought to this floor that reward big corporations and the wealthiest individuals—are brought to the floor is because those people who represent those wealthy interests have the most sway in this Congress. They are the biggest donors to political parties. They are the biggest donors to Members of Congress.

And while that is happening every day here, average people who can't contribute tens of thousands of dollars to political parties, who can't contribute millions of dollars, are increasingly becoming marginalized. The issues that matter most to working people, those struggling in the working class, those struggling to get into the middle class, we don't even get a chance to debate those issues on the House floor.

I will say to my Republican friends: I have had many conversations with you over the years about how you hate raising money as much as I hate raising money. Too much of our attention in this Congress, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, is about raising money for the next election, and it is getting worse and worse every election cycle. It is time to do something about that. It is time to give Congress the authority to regulate or put a cap on how much campaigns cost. I mean, we are going to spend billions of dollars in the next Presidential election. It is obscene. With all the problems that we have in this country, we ought to be spending more time debating those problems and not worrying about raising money.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can bring up this commonsense campaign finance proposal, and I also urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

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

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

As I said at the opening of this debate, this rule will provide for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. That legislation, which passed the House on a bipartisan basis last Congress, will reduce red tape and ensure that Americans in all parts of the country will be able to benefit from the energy revolution that has occurred on our Nation's private lands.

It is the coldest season of the year. It is my strong hope that we will be able to enact this legislation soon, to ensure that in winters to come residents of the northeast and other high-cost areas of the country are able to heat their homes affordably.

Before we consider our budgets or the foolishness of red tape, though, we must return to our founding principles. We must remember that life is the most fundamental of all rights. It is sacred and God-given.

Even the President said in last night's speech: ''I want our actions to tell every child, in every neighborhood: Your life matters, and we are committed to improving your life chances, as committed as we are to working on behalf of our own kids.''

But, Mr. Speaker, millions of babies have been robbed of that right in this, the freest country in the world. That is a tragedy beyond words and a betrayal of what we, as a nation, stand for.

Before liberty, equality, free speech, freedom of conscience, the pursuit of happiness, and justice for all, there has to be life; and yet for millions of aborted infants, life is exactly what they have been denied. An affront to life for some is an affront to life for every one of us.

One day, we hope it will be different. We hope life will cease to be valued on a sliding scale. We hope the era of elective abortions, ushered in by an unelected Court, will be closed and collectively deemed one of the darkest chapters in American history. But until that day, it remains a solemn duty to stand up for life.

Regardless of the length of this journey, we will continue to speak for those who cannot, and we will continue to pray to the One who can change the hearts of those in desperation and those in power who equally hold the lives of the innocent in their hands.

May we, in love, defend the unborn; may we, in humility, confront this national sin; and may we mourn what abortion reveals about the conscience of our Nation. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for life by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my frustration in the process by which this bill was brought to the floor and my disappointment that the process has yielded a bill that I cannot support.

This bill did not go through regular order. The Judiciary Committee did not hold any hearings or markups on the bill. And now under a Closed Rule, Members do not have the opportunity to offer amendments, let alone debate the merits of specific sections they wish to change.

I submitted an amendment to H.R. 36 that would have extended the exception for all incest victims. Under a Closed Rule, this amendment was rejected.

Incest victims are victims regardless of their age. What some people call ''consensual incest'' often begins as child sexual abuse. Even if the relationship continues into adulthood, there is still a perpetrator and still a victim. In addition, it is hugely unfair to require an incest victim to report a relative to the police.

In the future, should the House again consider legislation railing to abortion, I urge my colleagues to bring the bill through regular order so that all Members can participate in the debate over this sensitive issue.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 38 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 22) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the joint resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 22.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated

the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—238

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

NAYS—182

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

NOT VOTING—13

Brady (TX)
Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Edwards
Fincher
Forbes
Harris
Hastings
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
Nunnelee
Perlmutter

□ 1404

Messrs. REED and SALMON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 181, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

AYES—238

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

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

NOES—181

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

NOT VOTING—14

Brady (TX)
Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Edwards
Fincher
Forbes
Harris
Hastings
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Walters, Mimi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1413

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 38, I call up the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 38, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act''.

SEC. 2. REGULATORY APPROVAL OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS.

Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i)(1) The Commission shall approve or deny an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a prefiled project not later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed, as defined by the Commission by regulation.

''(2) The agency responsible for issuing any license, permit, or approval required under Federal law in connection with a prefiled project for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity is sought under this Act shall approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval not later than 90 days after the Commission issues its final environmental document relating to the project.

''(3) The Commission may extend the time period under paragraph (2) by 30 days if an agency demonstrates that it cannot otherwise complete the process required to approve or deny the license, permit, or approval, and therefor will be compelled to deny the license, permit, or approval. In granting an extension under this paragraph, the Commission may offer technical assistance to the agency as necessary to address conditions preventing the completion of the review of the application for the license, permit, or approval.

''(4) If an agency described in paragraph (2) does not approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval within the time period specified under paragraph (2) or (3), as applicable, such license, permit, or approval shall take effect upon the expiration of 30 days after the end of such period. The Commission shall incorporate into the terms of such license, permit, or approval any conditions proffered by the agency described in paragraph (2) that the Commission does not find are inconsistent with the final environmental document.

''(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'prefiled project' means a project for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a natural gas pipeline with respect to which a prefiling docket number has been assigned by the Commission pursuant to a prefiling process established by the Commission for the purpose of facilitating the formal application process for obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. 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 H.R. 161.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to natural gas production, we are number one. What was once a pipe dream is now a global reality, thanks to American ingenuity and technology. An impressive accomplishment, especially considering where we were only a decade ago—fearful of running out of supplies.

With this new wealth of natural gas, folks in Michigan and across the country should no longer worry about access to affordable energy. But budget-busting power bills are still hitting too many Americans.

The New York Times recently reported that customers in New England could expect electricity rates to spike

close to 40 percent higher this winter. Why? Well, we may have fixed our supply problems, but now we have a serious distribution problem. Our archaic energy infrastructure and outdated regulatory system is blocking American consumers from reaping the benefits of our energy abundance. We have the gas, but we don't have the pipelines to get cheap energy directly to families and businesses that need it most.

This legislation seeks to fix the problem, inserting accountability into the permitting process for natural gas pipelines and establishing firm deadlines for agency reviews. It does not exempt any environmental laws. It just makes sure pipeline projects get sited and built without unnecessary delay.

Last night, the President here made the case for more Federal funding of transportation infrastructure projects like roads and bridges as one way to create jobs while modernizing our economy. But the energy infrastructure projects unleashed by this pipeline bill are every bit as necessary, with all of the economic benefits, and the best part is, since they will be paid for by the private sector, it won't cost taxpayers a dime.

We voted on this legislation last Congress, and it passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. With the President's comments last night about wanting to work with Congress, I hope the President can join us in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense energy and jobs solution. Now that we are the leader in energy production, there is no reason America shouldn't be number one in energy affordability as well.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, when he said that the likelihood is that we are going to have more and more pipelines constructed, pipelines that have to go through the FERC process, and that is certainly true, but all the more reason why we shouldn't be voting or supporting this bill.

I have to say I am talking not just in general in the abstract but from personal experience. In my district a few years ago, when I was a Congressman, in Edison, New Jersey, we had a natural gas pipeline explosion. Fortunately, no one was killed or seriously injured, but a whole apartment complex was wiped out, not just one building but a series of them. There was a real danger of loss of life.

It scares me, Mr. Speaker, to think that we would want to change the process whereby FERC has the opportunity to look at the safety of these pipelines when they are proposed for permitting and somehow short-circuit that process because of my own experience in my congressional district in Edison, New Jersey. Durham Woods was the name of the complex.

So many of these pipelines, as a lot more pipelines are being built, a lot of them are in densely populated areas. So it is a major concern that FERC has to look at when reviewing these pipelines and deciding whether to issue a permit. It is not as if they are in places with no people. They are often in densely populated areas, like in my State of New Jersey.

In addition, this bill is unnecessary. The nonpartisan Government Accountability Office concluded that the FERC pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent and gets pipelines built. In fact, over 90 percent are approved or at least decided within the 12-month cycle limitation that this bill is proposing.

The pipeline companies actually testified before the GAO that the process for permitting through FERC ''is generally very good'' and that the sector ''enjoys a favorable legal and regulatory framework for the approval of new infrastructure.''

So if the process is fine, why are we now trying to move ahead and endanger safety by coming up with limitations on the process that actually is very good?

I would also say that if you have a 12-month limit, which is what this bill proposes on FERC's ability to issue a permit, it is very possible that the process of permitting could be slowed down because if FERC decides that they don't have enough time within 12 months to decide whether a pipeline should be built and it is safe, they may just decide to not grant the permit and deny it for fear that they haven't had enough time to deal with it over the 12 months. I think it is not only unnecessary, but it may actually even be counterproductive to what the sponsors are trying to accomplish.

I would also point out that we are wasting our time because the President has issued a Statement of Administration Policy saying that if H.R. 161 were to reach his desk, that he would actually veto it. I am not going to get into all the specifics of why because I think they are a lot of the same reasons I am mentioning myself.

Now, let me say what happens. When faced with this 12-month deadline, not only FERC but also other agencies that deal with the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act or the Endangered Species Act, other agencies that have the authority to review this and permit this under the bill, would actually only have 3 months, 90 days. So after the 12-month period ends for FERC, then there is a 90-day period for the other agencies to act. And if they don't act within 90 days, then FERC is required under this legislation to issue a permit and say that those other regulatory concerns are met.

So now you are going to have FERC not only limited in its 12-month review but also then issuing permits under the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and these other environmental regulations, which it has nothing to do with. Essentially you are saying the other agencies have no role anymore because if they don't decide within 90 days, FERC has to approve those permits as well. FERC doesn't normally deal with these other issues.

Another thing which I think is important is the eminent domain issue. If the permit is approved by FERC, then that means the company that is building the pipeline has the right to use eminent domain for the land where the pipeline is going to go through. I have a lot of concern about whether or not eminent domain should be used in those circumstances, particularly if the permit process has been short-circuited.

So I think that sometimes my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't understand that these permits are very detailed documents. They include emission limits, technology operating requirements, conditions to protect the environment. FERC doesn't have the expertise or the resources to issue the permits for these other statutes like the Clean Air Act and the Endangered Species Act.

So I am just saying that I think that this legislation from a practical point of view is entirely unworkable. It just doesn't work. It doesn't work. The GAO has said that the process that we have now is fine. And for those of us who have had these accidents where we have had explosions and danger, the last thing that we want is these pipelines going through densely populated areas that haven't had the proper review to protect the safety and the health of our residents. For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) who is the author of H.R. 161.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in support of H.R. 161.

We are tens of thousands of miles of pipeline capacity short of the necessary pipelines to carry natural gas to consumers who need it and businesses who demand it today in America. You don't have to take my word for it—prices will tell you.

The gentleman from New Jersey just said he opposes this bill. Allow him to explain to his constituents why they pay six or seven or eight times as much for natural gas as someone else in the Midwest, or in places where there is adequate pipeline capacity today. It is unnecessary; it is unconscionable. America now has the resources to provide this gas to all Americans so they can heat their homes and cool their homes, so businesses can use natural gas to build products here in America. We no longer live in a world with energy scarcity here in America. We have an opportunity to get this product from where it is found to the consumers and businesses that are demanding it.

The other side of the aisle may tell you we don't have a problem, but I will

tell you that as you talk to your constituents, as one who does this all the time, constituents say: I am paying too much for my product. This is a solution that will work.

We don't make in this legislation a single change to the Clean Water Act, not one change to the Clean Air Act, not a single change to any legislation that has to do with pipeline safety. Not one. All those laws remain in effect. All we ask the government to do is its job. We give them a timeline. We give them ample time. If 12 months is not enough, I am happy to give them 13. We will change the legislation.

But, in fact, the opposition isn't because this is being rushed but because in fact this will speed the process. That is why folks are opposed. They know this will produce this gas in a way that is safe and reasonable, and we will have great outcomes. And yet they want to keep this product in the ground. That is the real reason for opposition to this bill.

So those of us who want to get this energy to the consumers, to where it needs to go, I urge them to support this.

Frankly, when you read the articles about the challenges of pipeline capacity in America, the place it impacts the most isn't the place from which I hail. It is not Kansas; it is not the Midwest. It is, in fact, the densely populated areas of the Northeast. They are the places that need this energy the most and the soonest and the safest, and we can get it for them. I urge those who live in those places to talk to their constituents and to do the work to make sure that they understand what H.R. 161 can accomplish for the people in the areas that they represent.

You know, this administration has taken a lot of efforts to reduce the capacity of coal to provide energy for businesses and consumers. I regret that. I am doing my best to push back in every place that we can, as I know our chairman is as well. But as coal-fired power plants become more difficult to build, the need for natural gas will become even more increased.

□ 1430

This legislation is aimed directly at making sure that we don't have shortages and outages and catastrophes in energy production and energy delivery that America cannot afford.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 161.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 161, the so-called Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

My home State of Massachusetts, like many areas around the country, faces serious energy challenges. We need careful and strategic long-term planning in order to lower energy prices and increase reliability. Increasing access to additional sources of natural gas could help address some of New England's energy challenges, including energy prices, which have historically been above the national average.

However, this legislation would move us in the wrong direction. This bill would force FERC to rush decision-making, including environmental reviews and assessments of the need for natural gas, while also hobbling decisions regarding the appropriate size of the proposed pipeline. It would turn FERC into a superpermitting agency, an authority that FERC neither wants nor has the expertise to carry out.

In my home district, we are currently navigating the FERC process that this bill purports to improve. The company is proposing to build a new 250-mile natural gas pipeline that crosses three States, including seven communities that I represent. I have heard from hundreds of my constituents expressing their concerns with this project.

Construction of the pipeline could jeopardize local wildlife and will impact both State and federally designated conservation lands, as well as Massachusetts' scarce farmland.

Thanks to extensive public review and input, the pipeline route has already been adjusted to minimize some of the environmental impacts, but there are still many outstanding concerns that deserve careful scrutiny. The proposed route still passes through local farmland, parks, wildlife management areas, wetlands, near schools, and across drinking water supplies.

My constituents have been grateful for a process that has given them the time to provide input. This bill would short-circuit that process and short-change my constituents' right to be heard.

I proposed an amendment to this legislation with my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN that would exempt any pipeline from the arbitrary timelines established in the bill if the proposed route crosses Federal, State, or local land designated for conservation or recreation. However, the majority blocked this simple amendment from coming to the floor and receiving an up-or-down vote.

In Massachusetts, we have a long-standing history of preserving national habitats and protecting open spaces for the public benefit, and we have invested significant public resources towards these goals. Members should have been given the opportunity to vote on whether or not we should allow for a thorough review process to protect State investments.

On behalf of my constituents, I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

Increased production of American natural gas has led to lower prices and more demand for this energy source all across the Nation. That is especially true in cold, energy-dependent regions like upstate New York and the Northeast. We need new infrastructure, specifically pipelines, to safely transport fuels to markets where they are needed.

Unfortunately, the Government Accountability Office reported that an average processing time for interstate natural gas pipeline projects was 558 days. This bill would expedite the government's review process for pipeline applications, to make sure that we are doing all we can to build infrastructure in a timely and responsible manner.

More access to affordable American natural gas will help fuel farms, heat homes, and power small businesses in upstate New York and throughout this country. Building pipelines will create good-paying jobs, as well as boost revenues and development in communities across the Nation.

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

Some of my Republican colleagues just suggested that this bill would not waive any environmental requirements. For instance, yesterday, at the Rules Committee, the sponsor of the legislation indicated that H.R. 161 did not waive or alter any applicable environmental requirements under the Clean Air Act or NEPA.

While it is true that this legislation does not actually amend any provisions of the Clean Air Act or other environmental statutes, the bill would require automatic issuance of a pipeline-related permit under statutes like the Clean Air Act, if the responsible agency, such as EPA, has failed to act within the 90 days. This is the 90 days beyond the 1 year that I mentioned before.

Basically, that makes FERC the agency that would issue the Clean Air Act permit. Under this bill, FERC would decide how to create a BLM right-of-way permit or a Clean Water Act discharge permit. As a result, the legislation would effectively override the permitting decisions of agencies like EPA or DOI and turn FERC into a superpermitting agency.

I just want to point out, while it is true that the text of the actual Clean Air Act might remain unchanged under this bill, the effect of the bill would be that the Clean Air Act permits would be automatically issued by FERC if EPA fails to act within 90 days.

That is a major and substantive change from the way these laws work and, in effect, amounts to a waiver of environmental requirements for all practical purposes, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 24 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 19 minutes remaining.

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

I would just like to clarify that H.R. 161 is certainly not any drastic piece of legislation.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 designated the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the lead agency charged with coordinating and reviewing natural gas pipeline project applications; therefore, FERC conducts the environmental review of each project as required under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and is given authority to set deadlines for other agencies to issue an approval or denial of an associated permit.

When these applications are filed at FERC, the application also is given to other agencies that may have jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act, maybe like the Corps of Engineers, the Clean Air Act, the EPA perhaps, or Endangered Species; so it is not like they just have 90 days to look at this. They get the application the same time as FERC does.

The problem that FERC has had—and they have had both Democrat and Republican Commissioners come to Congress and say that they need more authority over these other agencies, so this bill does precisely that.

Once FERC has made a final determination and completed its process, it gives the other agencies another 90 days—even though they have been working on it for a year in advance of that—another 90 days to complete it, and if they want another 30 days, then they can do that as well.

I would just say that this is not rushing the process; it is simply completing the 2005 Energy Policy Act that gives FERC authority. We give them authority, but we don't give them any enforcement mechanism, and so this is precisely what this legislation does.

I might also add that having deadlines for agencies to act when doing environmental reviews or issuing permits is not really that strange or unique of an idea. Canada, Australia, and most European Union nations have deadlines for their environmental regulatory agencies to act.

Any person that is doing any kind of business in America knows the bureaucracy that we all run into, and it is easy to criticize bureaucracies. We know that they are dedicated, committed citizens trying to protect the environment, protect the American people, and we commend them for doing that, but we also know that they frequently let things slide.

It is easy to lose the process. We hear common complaints—nonstop—about delay, delay, delay. We know from hearings on this—this bill has already passed the House once—but we know from hearings that the Northeastern United States is really vulnerable to not having sufficient natural gas to meet their needs.

They are closing nuclear power plants. The President is making sure you can't build a new coal plant in America. Existing coal plants, many of them are going to be going out of business because of extreme regulations of this climate-driven administration. We have heard testimony about the escalating prices of electricity for people.

This is designed to provide the infrastructure to get the natural gas where it needs to be, and the Northeast is one of those areas. That is really what this bill is about. It is about giving FERC some real authority, setting in statute that these agencies must act within a certain amount of time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I really don't understand. I respect my colleague from Kentucky a great deal, but he seems to be arguing that we need the deadlines in this bill to hold Federal agencies accountable and ensure that they don't just somehow sit on the applications.

As I have already noted, since 2009, FERC has completed action on 91 percent of natural gas pipeline applications within 12 months, so a 12-month deadline isn't needed for more than 90 percent of the applicants.

My colleagues have asked: Well, what is the problem with holding the remaining 9 percent to a 12-month deadline? Well, the problem is it becomes a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to consider a wide range of applications that FERC has to review.

Some of the applications are for new projects—again, a small number—which span hundreds of miles, cross waterways and wetlands, and pass through neighborhoods and habitats of threatened wildlife; and questions of eminent domain need to be considered. In these cases, there can be unresolved safety, environmental, and legal issues at the local or State level.

Again, as I said, the President has said that he would veto this bill. In the Statement of Administration Policy, they specifically say:

> The small percentage of decisions that have taken longer than 1 year involve complex proposals that merit additional review and consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a complex project or there is some unaddressed risk to safety or the environment, we need to allow FERC or other Federal agencies the time to ensure that the pipeline is safe, so we don't have an accident like what occurred in Edison, New Jersey, in my district.

The last thing anyone needs, including the pipeline owner, is a pipeline explosion or other dangerous pipeline malfunction, and these things have occurred. I witnessed it myself in my district.

I am just saying don't put a hard deadline on the most complex projects that raise the possibility that FERC will be forced to approve a pipeline that is not safe or to reject an application solely because the Commission lacks sufficient time for an adequate review that will hinder rather than help us get more natural gas where it needs to go.

Now, my colleague also mentioned the issue about the Northeast electricity supply or prices, and I just wanted to address that concern. New England is using more natural gas to generate electricity and more natural gas for heating homes than in the past, and on the coldest winter days, when natural gas is needed for heating or electricity, there is more demand, but this bill doesn't do anything to solve that problem.

The problem in New England isn't caused by pipeline applications that take too long to get approved by FERC; the problem is that the pipeline companies aren't even submitting the applications because they haven't figured out who is going to pay for these new pipelines. The pipeline companies haven't been satisfied there is a sufficient year-round demand to justify and finance the pipelines.

That is an issue that FERC is looking at and has been holding stakeholder conferences about, but this has nothing to do with Mr. POMPEO's bill.

□ 1445

Cutting corners on the permitting process isn't going to help additional pipeline capacity built for the Northeast. I don't think we ought to be blaming the government for every problem, which is what I hear my colleagues on the Republican side doing. The reality is that FERC and the government didn't create this problem. It is a problem of economics, and the faster we understand that the faster we can try to find a solution, but let's not act as if FERC's inability to act is the problem here. That is not the case.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

When we had hearings on this bill, the natural gas pipeline industry estimated that by the year 2035 an estimated $8 billion each year would need to be spent to keep pace with the anticipated need for more pipeline infrastructure.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is absolutely correct in that Congress can't make these decisions. Private companies have to make the decision if they are going to invest the dollars to build these pipelines, but they have talked to us—the FERC Commissioners have talked to us—about the fact that some of these agencies are just delaying for no apparent reason. As I said earlier, when the application is filed at FERC, the other agencies receive those applications, and they have the same amount of time to work on it. This legislation simply sets some guidelines for these Federal agencies so that, when FERC completes its chore—and it is the quarterback in the decision of approving these pipelines—these agencies must also step up to the plate.

This legislation is not radical in any way. It is certainly not rushing the

process. It is not doing that. Pursuant to the 2005 Energy Policy Act, it is simply making it a more efficient, speedy process while, at the same time, protecting the environment and the best interests of the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey have additional speakers?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am not going to read the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, but I did just want to make reference to some part of the Statement of Administration Policy's saying that the President would veto the bill:

> The administration recognizes the need for additional energy infrastructure and supports the timely consideration of project applications. The administration, however, strongly opposes the bill because it would allow the automatic approval of natural gas pipeline projects if the FERC or other Federal agencies do not issue the required permit, license, or approval within rigid, unworkable timeframes.
>
> H.R. 161 could create conflicts with existing statutory and regulatory requirements and practices and preclude opportunities for engaging the public and potentially impacted communities, thereby causing confusion and the risk of increased litigation. The bill's requirements could force agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available, including potential environmental and community impacts of the proposed pipelines, within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved but for the lack of sufficient review time. For these reasons, the bill may actually delay projects or lead to more project denials, undermining the intent of the legislation.

I stress to my colleagues on the other side that we understand there is a need for more pipelines, and we understand that these pipelines have to be approved in a timely fashion, but there is no reason to believe that that is not happening now. The danger here is that, in a case when these do have to have a more intensive review because of safety or health or environmental concerns, we may actually do the opposite. Either they are going to be denied because the agencies don't have enough time, or, God forbid, they get approved when they shouldn't be.

Again, I just don't quite understand what this is all about. It seems like the Republicans have a bill that they think is going to accomplish their goal and won't but that has a danger of really risking the safety of residents, and I have already witnessed that in the case of a pipeline explosion in my district.

I just think that what the Republicans are doing is blaming FERC and that they are trying to come up with a solution for a problem that doesn't exist; but in the process of all of that, they are going to jeopardize the possibility of the fact that some of these pipelines might be approved without enough safety or environmental or health concerns. It seems to me that it makes no sense at all to put FERC in the position of deciding issues with regard to statutes like the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act, which they really have nothing to do with.

We considered this bill in the last Congress, Mr. Speaker, and FERC made it clear that it was not necessary or helpful, and the administration threatened to veto the bill. Nothing has changed. The administration has again threatened to veto this bill. It is very early in this new Congress. I remain committed to developing sound energy policy with my Republican colleagues. If they want to have some hearings on this bill and go through the regular order of the committee process, that is fine as there will be more opportunity to review it.

I don't think this bill will help anyone, but I think it may hurt a lot of people, including those who want to build the pipeline. Instead of spending our time debating a bill that will never become law, I hope we can begin soon to have some serious discussion about sound and sustainable energy policy. In the meantime, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this particular piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in summation, I urge the passage of H.R. 161, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would note once again that, during the hearings on this legislation, Commissioners at FERC—both Republican and Democrat—said that more accountability was needed for agencies that issue permits that are necessary to construct natural gas pipelines.

Many people have raised the issue that the President has said he would veto this bill. That is his job, that is his responsibility, and that is the type of government we have. We have a legislative branch, we have an executive branch, and we have a judiciary branch. The legislative branch's responsibility is to pass legislation that it deems necessary. If the President wants to veto it, let him veto it and give his reasons. Then the American people can listen to both sides and decide what they think is the right direction to go.

I would stress once more that the Energy Information Agency data from last year's winter cold snap during the month of January showed that residential natural gas prices in Pennsylvania were 14 percent above the national average; in New Jersey, 18 percent higher; in New York, 24 percent higher; in Vermont, 60 percent higher. One of the reasons given is the lack of infrastructure to get natural gas to where it needs to go in the Northeast.

This is a commonsense bill that is being presented to help solve this problem of energy needs in America. If we are going to be competitive in the global marketplace, yes, we need good, low-cost residential electricity prices, but we also need low-cost manufacturing and heavy industry electricity prices in order to compete in the global marketplace. That is what H.R. 161 is about, and I would urge Members to support this legislation that was drafted by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 161, a bill that claims to expedite applications for construction of natural gas pipelines in the United States.

First, let me say as a native Houstonian and as a Democrat, I support American energy development.

The energy revolution that has taken place over the last decade is unlike anything I've seen in my lifetime.

The natural gas plays currently developed in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas are solely responsible for the recovery the U.S. has seen.

Low natural gas prices have given our industries an advantage over international competitors.

Low natural gas prices have given our homeowners cheaper electric bills.

Low natural gas prices have resulted in lower emissions and smaller contributions to climate change.

To reap those benefits, however, we need pipelines to move that product from the field to market.

I can confidently say, I am a big supporter of pipelines.

The stacks of raw materials and finished pipe in my district are probably unlike any other district in the country.

Pipelines are the most economically efficient and environmentally sound method of moving oil and natural.

I am an advocate of building more pipelines.

I have co-sponsored legislation to build domestic and international pipelines to facilitate energy development.

I have advocated for expediting the application process, so that our federal agencies provide private investors certainty.

Unfortunately, I cannot support H.R. 161.

While I am an advocate of all things natural gas, I am not in favor of completely circumventing the permitting process.

About a decade ago, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), which has jurisdiction over pipeline approvals, had some issues.

We worked closely with the industry and the agency to improve the processes and timelines so that we could get pipe built in this country quickly.

FERC has done an admirable job working with industry and other key stakeholders to improve the process.

Currently, FERC approves the majority of permits in less than 18-to-24 months.

Where there are problems and delays with other permits, namely at the local and state level and FERC is working to resolve those issues.

Unfortunately, this bill does nothing to address those issues.

This bill sets a timeline for FERC and if that timeline expires, then any permit is approved.

Our federal agencies have an oversight role to play and allowing permit applications to essentially "run out the clock" when issues arise is a way to circumvent our federal process.

In Energy and Commerce, we put a lot of work into this bill and I want to thank my colleagues for working closely with our side.

But, I cannot support H.R. 161 and I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill as well.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 38, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pallone moves to recommit the bill H.R. 161 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

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

SEC. 3. PIPELINE OWNER RESPONSIBILITY IN THE EVENT OF AN EXPLOSION.

The provisions of this Act shall not take effect unless the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies, determines that in the implementation of this Act—

(1) taxpayers will not be held liable for any repair or environmental cleanup from a natural gas pipeline explosion; and

(2) pipeline owners will bear full responsibility for damages in any community resulting from a natural gas pipeline explosion, including for loss of life.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

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

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned during the general debate, I and my constituents witnessed and went through a few years ago, when I was in Congress, a natural gas pipeline explosion. It was devastating to the community. We had many people who lost their homes. It was, actually, several apartment buildings. Even to this day, the memory of that is very much ingrained in the minds of the residents of Durham Woods, which is the largest municipality that I represent in Edison, New Jersey.

Basically, what we are saying in this motion to recommit is that the provisions of this act will not take effect unless the FERC determines that taxpayers will not be held liable for any repair or environmental cleanup from a gas pipeline explosion and that the pipeline owners will bear full responsibility for the damage to the community resulting from a natural gas pipeline explosion, including loss of life. It seems to me that that is the minimum we should expect when there is such an explosion.

Believe me. At the time that that explosion occurred in Durham Woods in my district, there were many instances when we had to have environmental cleanups and when the community was exposed to tremendous damage. It seems to me that, under the circumstances, this motion to recommit makes perfect sense.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that there have been many pipeline explosions, but I am not going to go through the entire list. In fact, the one in my district is one that is mentioned here. Beginning in just the last 10 or 15 years, there have been numerous explosions, so we are not talking about something that doesn't happen.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, natural gas pipeline explosions do happen.

Last week, a pipeline exploded in Mississippi. Last year, pipelines exploded in Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Kentucky. In 2013, a pipeline south of Dallas exploded. Reports described the massive explosion as ''shooting flames high in the air and prompting evacuations from nearby homes and a school district,'' with black smoke visible for some 20 miles. In 2010, a natural gas pipeline exploded in San Bruno, California, in my home State, causing an explosion that killed eight people and destroyed 38 homes. Even as technology has improved, pipelines have failed.

We should make clear with this legislation that, in the event of the catastrophic failure of a pipeline, taxpayers are not liable for the hundreds of millions or billions of dollars in damages that these explosions can cause. Companies are responsible for the safety and reliability of their pipelines, and we should ensure that they are also liable for the damages caused by those pipelines.

□ 1500

Last year, when this very bill came before the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the president of the Pipeline Safety Trust testified. This group is a national, independent, nonprofit watchdog organization created using funds from a settlement reached in the aftermath of a pipeline explosion in Washington State that killed three people. The Trust's president testified that ''rushed, or worse, incomplete reviews resulting in automatic approvals pose a threat to public safety.''

To be clear, this is not an organization that opposes new pipelines. They only focus on pipeline safety, and they have serious problems with this bill and its effects on public safety for new pipelines. Their president pointed out that this bill treats a ''10-mile pipeline across a barren desert the same as a 1,400-mile pipeline that crosses multiple ecosystems and through dense population areas where it could pose a threat to the life or property of citizens living nearby.''

Mr. Speaker, pipelines can fail. And those failures can have disastrous effects on communities and the environment. This commonsense amendment would protect taxpayers from ever having to pay the costs of a pipeline explosion. I hope we never see another natural gas pipeline explosion, but that would require that history not repeat itself.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit and to vote against the underlying bill because of the danger it poses to the communities and the environment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, once again, I listened to my colleague from California talk about the dangers from pipelines. These dangers are real. We have had many explosions over the years, including in my own district. I think this bill really puts at risk the possibility of another pipeline explosion. It doesn't provide for enough safety or environmental review.

I urge that Members support the motion to recommit because, at a minimum, it would provide some liability in some way to effectuate a cleanup and pay for the damages that come from an explosion that might take place.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from New York for raising this safety issue because, obviously, safety is of paramount importance to all of us. That is why we do have the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA, which has the responsibility of making sure that these pipelines operate in as safe a manner as possible. We also recognize that we never get to a point where it is absolutely safe.

Really, H.R. 161 does not have anything to do with PHMSA. Our committee does have jurisdiction over PHMSA. We have had a lot of hearings on it. We are going to continue to have hearings because we want to maximize pipeline safety.

This legislation is not about anything except perfecting the 2005 Energy Policy Act that gave FERC the quarterbacking authority for approving these natural gas pipelines from the aspect of their impact on clean water, clean air, and endangered species.

And so this legislation simply gives FERC the authority that many of its Commissioners asked for, and that is that they have some authority to convince these agencies to start looking at the impacts of the applications earlier in the process rather than at the end. And so even after the 1-year process is over, they still have 90 days. They may ask for another 30 days.

Because of that reason—that this is not a pipeline safety bill, it is a process

bill—I would respectfully request that we defeat this motion to recommit. And I look forward to working with the gentleman from New Jersey and others on pipeline safety as we have hearings and legislation about PHMSA.

With that, 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 241, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—182

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

NAYS—241

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

NOT VOTING—10

Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Farr
Forbes
Hastings
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Wilson (FL)

□ 1532

Messrs. GROTHMAN, BARLETTA, CLAWSON of Florida, BURGESS, MOOLENAAR, HUELSKAMP, and YODER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER, JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CUELLAR changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 169, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—253

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—169

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Brat
Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Forbes
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Lamborn
Nunnelee
Perlmutter

□ 1542

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 40

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Ms. Adams, Ms. Graham, and Mr. Ashford.

(2) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Yarmuth (to rank immediately after Mr. Van Hollen), Mr. Norcross, and Mr. Moulton.

(3) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Ms. Lofgren and Mr. Vargas.

(4) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mrs. Torres, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Takai, and Mr. Gallego.

(5) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Lieu of California, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Plaskett, Mr. DeSaulnier, and Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania.

(6) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Beyer.

(7) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mrs. Lawrence.

(8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Miss Rice of New York.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–5)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2015.

The crisis with respect to grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 21, 2015*.

MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe every life is a gift. Our Nation was built on the right to life. Our Founding Fathers wrote that all men are created equal and that we are endowed by the Creator with certain undeniable rights: the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our government was instituted to secure these rights, not take them away.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with hundreds of thousands of people from across the country who have traveled to our Nation's Capital to tell lawmakers that we must protect the innocent and that we must fight for those who cannot defend themselves. I am proud of the many young people who are in Washington, D.C., this week to defend life. You are a voice for the voiceless, and you are the future.

I am proud to join so many of my colleagues in this Chamber today to defend life and spread this message that every life is a gift.

PAYCHECK PROGRESS

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, as the President noted in his State of the Union address last evening, we should be proud of the progress we have made since the Great Recession. But there is too much to do still on growth, especially on the issue of paycheck progress.

For most Americans, especially in the San Francisco Bay Area, here is our reality: costs all around us are

going up, and wages are staying flat. That is a right angle that is taking American families in the wrong direction.

For paycheck progress we must invest in infrastructure, reform our Tax Code so that it is fairer for all Americans, and, finally, ensure equal pay for equal work.

Mr. Speaker, instead of addressing these issues, many House Republicans are calling for giveaways to special interests, rolling back critical women's health protections, and holding Homeland Security funding hostage to win political points. Let's be real. In the nineties it was: It is the economy, stupid. You ask any American family today: It is my paycheck, stupid.

If we focus on one thing this Congress, let's make sure that it is the paycheck of working-class Americans. The American people deserve better than what is being served up. Let's work together on paycheck progress, not partisanship.

42ND ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, 3,288 per day, 137 per hour, one every 26 seconds—that is how many children are denied their God-given right to life each and every day. As we mark the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we should remember each of those children and the potential each had.

Mr. Speaker, I am unapologetically pro-life and have been a longtime supporter of efforts to protect the unborn. Because every human life is precious, we must continue to fight for those who cannot fight for themselves.

Today I stand on behalf of those children and of future children who may never have a chance. We must stand together and never forget until the battle for life is won.

THE GRAND JURY REFORM ACT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Grand Jury Reform Act, which requires the appointment of a special prosecutor to conduct an investigation and present the results to a judge in an open courtroom proceeding whenever a police officer kills an individual while on duty.

After police officers killed two unarmed black men in 2014 and secret grand juries failed to indict these officers, I am honoring Dr. King's legacy by offering legislation that restores trust in our justice system while ensuring a fair process for all.

Mr. Speaker, we are the beneficiaries of Dr. King's legacy, and we must face our challenges with the same resolve as he did. I urge my fellow colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

MARCH FOR LIFE

(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 the thousands of students from across the country who are participating in tomorrow's March for Life event. I am praying for safe travels for all the groups from my district, including St. Thomas More High School, St. Louis Parish—the parish I attended Mass at this weekend—Holy Trinity in Stonington, Illinois, and the Illinois Life Caravan as they drive through the night and travel almost 800 miles to come to Washington to stand up for what they believe in.

Mr. Speaker, I have renewed hope and faith in our Nation's young people as I see students from high school to elementary school age showing their commitment to life. I am proud to be pro-life. I believe it is my duty and part of my faith to stand up for those who cannot speak for themselves, and I will continue to do so as I serve in this great Congress.

In the words of Pope Francis:

> All life has inestimable value. Even the weakest and most vulnerable, the sick, the old, the unborn, and the poor are masterpieces of God's creation, made in His own image, destined to live forever and deserving of the utmost reverence and respect.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of those who are standing here for life with us.

AMERICA STANDS AT THE CROSSROADS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, last night President Obama addressed the Nation and reminded us of the crossroads at which we stand: Do we continue on the path we are on where only a select few prosper while so many families struggle? Or will we instead work to rebuild our middle class, grow our economy, and create new opportunities for success?

But here today, Mr. Speaker, listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it is clear that the priorities of this body's majority are not in line with the majority of Americans.

The American people don't want more of the same. They want better access to education, better infrastructure, and an honest chance at the American Dream. They want a fair college loan system, and they want the relief of knowing that their retirement and their parents' retirement is safe and sound, not left to the whims of Wall Street. As President Obama made clear, they want a tax system that rewards work, not wealth.

I am proud to support many of the priorities laid out in last night's speech because they put practicality above partisan politics. Let's hope for the sake of the American people that this Congress does the same.

THE 42ND ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, on the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, I stand with my colleagues in defense of innocent human life. My wife and I were blessed with seven beautiful children, each with their own unique gifts. Since Roe v. Wade, more than 56 million unborn babies have been robbed of the chance to reach their true potential.

Our Nation's role as a defender of the rights to life and liberty erode with each innocent life that is taken. This is not a partisan issue or a judgment of others. But we must never stop defending the rights of those who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in an era where common ground can be hard to find, I am honored to serve with the men and women dedicated to the protection of these most basic of liberties.

THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this House tomorrow will consider H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and I will support that bill because it protects most of the children in these circumstances. But I will do so with a heavy heart because it does not protect all children. Every child at 20 weeks and older deserves protection from the violence perpetrated on them in the womb by late-term abortions.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not protect all children because it gives an exception for children conceived in rape and incest. No child 20 weeks and older should be subjected to that, regardless of the circumstances in which they are conceived.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to work to try to correct that injustice as well, and I hope efforts are afoot to make this bill perfect in the sense that it would protect every single child 20 weeks and older because none of them deserve less.

MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and respect of the thousands of people who will come to our

city to rally to give support to the life of the unborn. Twenty-five years ago while in London I saw a video that depicted the life, as they described it, of the baby. It wasn't anything less than a baby.

Mr. Speaker, I am a father, and I am a grandfather. I have got nine grandchildren. Every life is precious. Who is to know, Mr. Speaker, that that unborn baby might be the curer for cancer or might be the curer for Alzheimer's? Only God knows.

I thank the leadership for bringing forth this legislation tomorrow. I respect them for doing it. We need to rally in support to show our commitment to the life of the unborn.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of our Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO SERVE AS THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 4(d) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individuals to serve as the Governing Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics:

Nominated by the Speaker with the concurrence of the Minority Leader:

Mr. Porter J. Goss, Florida, Chairman

Mr. James M. Eagan, III, Colorado

Ms. Allison R. Hayward, Virginia

Ms. Judy Biggert, Illinois, alternate

Nominated by the Minority Leader with the concurrence of the Speaker:

Mr. David Skaggs, Colorado, Co-Chairman

Brigadier General (retired) Belinda Pinckney, Virginia

Ms. Karan English, Arizona

Mr. Mike Barnes, Maryland, alternate

□ 1600

PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the distinguished gentlelady from Missouri, ANN WAGNER.

Ms. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and thank the gentleman for yielding and for hosting this very important Special Order today and for his lifetime of service in protecting the rights of the unborn, those who have no voice.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the sanctity of life. Sadly, tomorrow is the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, and hundreds of thousands of people, including pro-life advocates from my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, will gather in our Nation's capital in honor of the over 56 million precious angels we have lost since that infamous Supreme Court decision, not to mention the millions of women who have been adversely affected in the aftermath of their abortion, both physically and emotionally.

I first participated in the March for Life 25 years ago this week, in 1990. I was 28 years old with a real bad hairdo, and I was 12 weeks pregnant with my son Stephen. At that point, at 12 weeks in my pregnancy, Stephen was able to suck his thumb. A few weeks later, at 15 weeks, he could make facial expressions and he had taste buds. By 17 weeks, Stephen began to kick. By week 18, his ears had developed and he could hear. By week 20, not only was Stephen able to recognize my voice as his mother, but he was capable of feeling pain.

While killing an unborn child is unconscionable at anytime, it is especially abhorrent at the 20-week mark when a child is able to feel the pain of an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, the theme of this year's march is ''Every Life is a Gift,'' and I truly believe that life at all stages, from conception to natural death, is, indeed, a gift. I am for the life of the baby. I am also for the life of the mother and oftentimes the victim.

I will continue to work and to pray for the day when abortion is not only illegal, but abortion is unthinkable.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank Ms. Wagner for her very eloquent statement and for her long service on behalf of the unborn and equally for their mothers as well.

I yield to TIM WALBERG.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for putting this Special Order together on the 42nd anniversary of an infamous decision, Roe v. Wade, Mr. Speaker, where I believe the Supreme Court stepped out of their role and unconstitutionally set up the course that has gone on to this day, the murder of innocents and, ultimately, murder of innocence of our country as well that in its inception was established on a principle that was well known, well understood, and put into our Declaration of Independence that said:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, among them the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It all begins with life. I will never forget 8 years ago as I stood in a maternity ward at Northwestern University Hospital and waited for word from the room where my daughter-in-law was giving birth to our first two grandchildren, twins John Timothy and Micah Todd.

Micah Todd is now 8 years old, happy, healthy, moving forward. John Timothy we look forward to seeing him again some day in heaven. For 8 days he lived on this Earth. He fought after being born with his twin brother at 26 weeks. I watched them as they fought for life. I watched them at less than 12 inches long, one pound, 12 ounces, fighting for life, understanding in their own way that this is what they were supposed to do. They were capable of pain. They were capable of doing what nature's God had enabled them to do.

That changed my life more than ever before, though back in 1982 I ran for the State house on the issue of life itself. That is what brought me out of the pulpit as a pastor and brought me into the arena to try to promote life and go away from that terrible decision that the Supreme Court put upon us.

Now I think 42 years later we have seen gains in this country, as we will see millennials come out of Metro tubes tomorrow, as we will see young people standing in front of us speaking for life, declaring their desire to see abortion ended, and I am hopeful that in our day we will see that take place not because of religion, not even because of politics, but because of people understanding the sanctity of life, understood by the prophet Jeremiah when he said after the words of God himself:

> Before I was formed in my mother's womb, you knew me and declared the days of my life.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New Jersey, all of my colleagues who will stand in defense of life, I say thank you. Let's not give up, because we are on the right side.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana, MARLIN STUTZMAN.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his tireless work on this, such an important issue for our day and age.

Mr. Speaker, on this 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we must remember the innocent lives who were never given a chance to live the American Dream. Since 1973, tens of millions of innocent unborn children have been denied an opportunity to grow and to be successful.

In America, we are always espousing the belief that anything is possible,

that anyone can achieve their dreams if they set their minds to it, and yet it is here in this country where we deny those dreams to so many.

Mr. Speaker, I was born in 1976, and I am so thankful that my mother, at the age of 17, chose life and gave me the gift of life, because my Federal Government at the time 3 years earlier said it was okay for her to end it if she so chose.

Most of us have very strong feelings about the value of life. We must continue to seek opportunities to promote a culture of life that protects the innocent.

Tomorrow, tens of thousands of people from all across the country will descend on The National Mall to champion the belief that every life is a gift, and Congress will have an opportunity to act and show that we are listening through the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, a bill that I urge my colleagues to support.

We may meet some obstacles, but the pro-life movement will not be shaken. We will continue to fight to protect the unborn. We will continue to fight and provide a voice for those who do not have one. We will continue to fight because we believe that America should be a place where everyone is protected by law and welcomed to life. This is our goal, and I pray that together we will achieve it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank my friend for his, again, very fine statement and for his leadership as well.

I yield to CHRIS STEWART from Utah.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in thanking my friend Mr. SMITH for giving us this opportunity to address such an important and a deeply personal issue.

I am the proud father of six children, and nothing in the world means more to me. My life changed forever the first time I held my first son. I look at my sons and daughters, and I am humbled by the responsibility it is to be their parent, and I am touched always by the power and the blessing of life.

Now I am a grandfather, and that fact alone makes my life very good. This week we commemorate the anniversary of one of the most significant Supreme Court cases in the history of the United States, of course, Roe v. Wade.

We also welcome thousands of pro-life activists who came to our Nation's Capital to participate in the March for Life. Think about that title for a moment, the March for Life. It is extremely important as Members of Congress to stand up for those who do not have a voice to stand up for themselves, our precious unborn children.

Tomorrow the House will vote on H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which protects the lives of unborn by banning abortions at or after 20 weeks of pregnancy. With medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain by at least 20 weeks, if not earlier, I will support this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well. Think of what we would be saying if we were to reject this bill.

Now, I understand that there are exceptions, and I recognize the woman's health is just as important as her child. Thus, we made reasonable medical judgment exceptions, which would be made in the case of rape, incest, or an endangerment of the mother's life.

As I conclude, I would like to reiterate my opening remarks. Each life is sacred. Each life has a right to protection. I urge my colleagues to help to defend the innocent lives of America's unborn children and represent those who cannot represent themselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. STEWART, thank you very much for your statement and your leadership as well.

I now yield to Mr. YOHO, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my dear colleague, Mr. SMITH, for holding this important pro-life Special Order that gives a life to the unborn.

I stand here today in defense of the thousands of unborn children whose lives were ended through no fault of their own. These children are precious gifts and cannot defend themselves. They do not have the luxury to debate whether or not society should recognize them as living beings.

As a Christian and the proud father also of three children, I strongly believe in the sanctity of life and that it begins at conception. My heart aches for the thousands of unborn children who will never have that chance to experience the wonder of life.

Life is truly a miracle granted through the grace of nature's God, and I am here today to say every life is a gift and every life does matter.

It has been 42 years since the Supreme Court made their ruling in Roe v. Wade. Since that ruling, an estimated—and I want to repeat this, an estimated—55 million lives have been lost. That is more than the total population of the northeast States. That is more than the population of the State of California.

Future generations will look back and judge us. They will judge us on our failure to protect the most innocent among us. They will judge us for allowing infanticide, human genocide of our next generation yet to come.

This week, the defenders of life in the thousands have and will come to Washington, D.C., to support the sanctity of life. This has grown into the largest pro-life event in the world. I want them to know we will keep fighting to defend the silent, unborn child.

How can we as a nation—how can we as a nation—have laws that protect the embryo of a sea turtle or bald eagle but yet refuse to protect the same of our own species? Shouldn't the lives of the unborn children matter as much as these in the eyes of the law?

These lives, these gifts, these human beings deserve to be protected and defended.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to DOUG LAMALFA from California.

□ 1615

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for leading this Special Order today, and also for the comments started out by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), very heartfelt, that reflect the importance of this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the sanctity of human life and to recognize those who will be in Washington, D.C., tomorrow for the March for Life. I am pleased to join my colleagues and individuals who have traveled from near and far to be in solidarity to protect the rights of the unborn. I applaud those marchers who come here year after year despite snow, rainy conditions, and cold conditions to stand up for such a vital cause. It is their efforts and determination which gives substance and meaning to this year's theme, ''Every Life is a Gift''—and to march for the truth.

As a parent, I wish all parents would understand what the gift is that the Lord has bestowed with one of these young lives upon you. That is part of our mission, to help them understand, to educate. That is part of the mission of the March for Life, to appreciate that these are gifts, even through the hard times. We have struggles in all matters of our lives, and that is an important one we have to get through as well. To understand these blessings that these lives are.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you to convey to these marchers that their voice will be heard and will continue to be heard as we fight for the dignity of human life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his incisive comments and for welcoming the marchers tomorrow, which will be a great celebration of life but also a restatement of the determination we have in defending life.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. What a privilege it is to be here with the gentleman from New Jersey, who has been fighting this fight for a very long time. I remember back to my college days in the 1980s seeing you standing for life.

I rise today to commemorate the 2015 March for Life, appropriately themed ''Every Life is a Gift.'' Life begins at conception and must be defended at every stage. Whether for the unborn, the disabled, the elderly, we must promote a culture of life. This can and must be done through our public policy that is made here in Washington, D.C., just as it is being done throughout the country in our communities.

Across the country there are many places, thousands of pro-life pregnancy centers, places like Choices Pregnancy Services in western Pennsylvania,

which does important work helping families say ''yes'' to life by offering free medical and counseling services and helping women in need.

As we prepare to march tomorrow on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, a decision that the late Justice Byron White described as an exercise in raw judicial power, I urge my colleagues to join me in committing to defend the sanctity of life. I also ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mr. ROTHFUS for his statement today. He has been a true rising star and a leader in defending the sanctity of life.

I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a physician who has delivered over 5,000 babies.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Before I start, I want to say a few things about my good friend CHRIS SMITH. Of the 435 of us who serve here in the House of Representatives, no one in this body has been a stronger voice for life than CHRIS. CHRIS, thank you. Hopefully one day we will see this egregious law overturned. Your perseverance over now four decades is exemplary. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, as an OB–GYN, I have personally delivered over 5,000 babies, and I strongly support the sanctity of life. Using technology like the 3–D ultrasound has given us a window into the womb that shows the unborn child as a living, breathing, feeling human being. I have looked through that window with my own eyes literally thousands of times, and I have seen human development occur from the earliest stages of conception. When you see a heartbeat at 26 days post-conception, already dreams are being developed by that mother and father about what this baby will be in their lifetime. I have been fortunate enough to experience that three times, and it is a wonderful feeling to know that this little person is going to be your child and grow up to be who knows what. All of the way through birth we see this, which strengthens my conviction in the right to life.

Life is a precious miracle from God that begins at conception. It is our responsibility and privilege as legislators to protect those who do not have a voice. I will always fight for life because it is my conviction that we are all unique creations of a God who knows us and loves us before we are born.

Tonight we mark one of the most tragic, misguided Supreme Court cases in our Nation's history: Roe v. Wade. Since 1973, more than 50 million babies, as has been stated here numerous times, have been denied the most basic right in this country, protected by our Constitution, which is the right to life. We must make our laws consistent with our science now and restore full legal protections to all those who are waiting to be born. If government has any legitimate function at all, it is to protect those, the most innocent among us.

For over 30 years Congress has prevented taxpayer-funded abortions. Unfortunately, this door has been reopened with the passage of ObamaCare, the largest expansion since the pivotal Roe v. Wade decision was made 42 years ago. Members who stand here before you today pledge themselves to protect those without a voice, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure this promise is kept. It is only by making good on this oath that we can expect to restore the trust that the American people have in their own government, and in doing so, ensure that the door to taxpayer-funded abortions remains closed.

Let me just tell a brief story I was telling Congressman SMITH before we came onto the House floor. Over 25 years ago, my partner delivered a baby, and I will just say ''Smith'' for privacy purposes. Baby Smith weighed about 1 pound 6 ounces over 25 years ago. Well, the chances of that baby surviving were minimal. Baby Smith got down to less than one pound. I went by the intensive care nursery and saw this tiny baby that I thought would never make it. Well, Baby Smith did make it, and I was on a trip to Walmart with my kids one day, and there was this youngster there with a pair of glasses on, just like his doctor had. He was 2 years old, and he was doing like any other 2 year old—he was knocking everything off the shelf at Walmart. Wouldn't it have been a shame—and we are aborting babies much larger than Baby Smith—and Baby Smith is alive and well today, thriving in our country and being a productive citizen in this country.

As a father and a grandfather, I am privileged to be here on the House floor tonight with other legislators fighting for the rights of the unborn.

CHRIS, thank you, and I thank my colleagues. God bless each and every one of you.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much for your kind statement, and also for your leadership both as a physician, a obstetrician, and also as a lawmaker. It has made a huge difference. I want to say that publicly. You provide insight and guidance that all of us benefit from.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Congressman. I know we probably sound like a broken record—and for the marchers coming in tomorrow, that is something that they used before there were CDs. Isn't that great—we have all of these marchers coming in who don't even know what a record is because they are so young. In the battle for life, we are winning with this generation. They understand the reality of when life begins. I am so thankful for that, and I am so thankful for CHRIS SMITH's leadership.

Like one of my earlier colleagues, I remember being on the other side of the rally watching the Congressman and saying: Gosh darnit, I wish I could be like him. What can I do?

That is what I would like to talk about tonight: What can we do to make a difference? Of course, as we will see tomorrow, a tremendous level of political involvement with tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of folks showing up here from all over the country. Generally you have people from Kansas to lead the march, and it is great to see some kids from Benedictine College and throughout my district as well getting involved, making a difference, both here in Washington and in their State capital, coming here for the March for Life, which we hashtagged ''Why We March.''

What else can we do? Very quickly, we can help and assist women and families in crisis pregnancies. There are hundreds and hundreds of facilities across the country that offer free help and free care, outreach for those in very difficult situations. We can do that.

The second thing we can do is encourage families, current families, encourage marriage. Marriage is a founding block of our society, of our civilization. The more we can encourage marriage, the more we can encourage families and the more we can help our unborn.

We can also consider adoption. For those who are listening today who are wondering, maybe that should be for me—sometimes it might be one spouse. Sometimes it might be another. I was with a couple of friends this weekend just talking about that, saying, think about it, pray about it, consider it, because there are literally tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of young folks who are looking for homes. So please consider that.

And lastly, I ask, please pray for the unborn, please pray for birth families, and please pray for those who are considering adoption.

Lastly, I want to briefly thank the four birth families who blessed our family with children. Some of them I know, some of them I do not. Two of them are in foreign countries and two of those families are here in this country. But that is a tough decision. I am so thankful for the men and women of this country that chose life and offered up their children for adoption.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much for sharing that very personal story, which is very touching.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate my friend from New Jersey yielding me this time, and I rise today to join my colleagues and thousands of Americans who will be marching on Washington, D.C., tomorrow because every life truly is a gift, which is this year's Right to Life march theme. It has been talked about, the millions of young lives that have been tragically cut short.

But I, like my colleague and our friend from Kansas, who was just talking about his personal experience with adoption, I come from a place in western Michigan that has really embraced the notion of adoption. We have a number of friends and neighbors who have done both domestic and international adoption. In fact, one family is now on their third adoption from Africa, and this time they are coming home with a brother and sister for four kids, adding to their own natural five that they have. And I must add that, a little jokingly, we are not Catholic typically in western Michigan, we are just passionate Protestants. We are wanting to share that gift of life and opportunity for those children who have that potential that their parents see and go through a difficult decision to put them up, and whether it is domestically or internationally, we are so pleased that they have done that.

It is also why, because life being so precious, why my wife, Natalie, and I have been active through our church and Michigan Right to Life, and my wife particularly through the Lakeshore Pregnancy Center, a crisis pregnancy center that she has been on the board of for a number of years that is helping young men and women make those difficult choices in those difficult life circumstances.

I understand, and I know my colleagues know this as well. This is very difficult. It is very emotional. These are issues that have affected so many of us. As we deal with difficult circumstances where these pregnancies have arisen, whether it is through rape or through mistakes that have been made to have these unplanned pregnancies, I think we need to show that love and that mercy that we have been shown at various times in our life.

I do want to encourage my colleagues in the House, though, to take a close look at a loophole, an issue that I became aware of a couple of years ago. Over the previous two Congresses, I introduced something called the Homeland Security Respect For Life Act and worked with my friend and Appropriations member, Representative ADERHOLT, to attach language to the annual Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

This commonsense bill simply prevents hardworking taxpayer dollars from paying for abortions through the DHS programs that currently would fund abortions for detainees who lack lawful status here in the United States. In fact, this bill codifies pro-life language that is already found in the ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, manual on detention standards. But since this manual lacks a basis in law and the weight of law, it can be changed at any time by unelected bureaucrats.

Well, I think it is time for us to put the DHS in line with other departments of the government and codify this and make sure that this is crystal clear. Our current policy prohibits Federal taxpayer funding for abortions for law-abiding citizens on Medicaid, as well as citizens who are in Federal prison, why not the DHS and why not in these detention areas? It only makes sense to apply those same life-affirming standards to immigration detainees as well.

□ 1630

This is an easy fix, Mr. Chairman, and I am hopeful that this year the Senate and the President will agree to our bill language and follow the precedent as consistent with current administration policy in the other Federal agencies. I, too, want to say thank you for your leadership in this area and appreciate the opportunity to spend some time on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. HUIZENGA. I want to thank you, BILL, for your leadership on pro-life issues in general, but especially for your legislation that deals with the detainees issue because that could quickly emerge as a trouble spot if we are paying for abortions of people who make it across the border. That would be unconscionable to think that we would be enabling the killing of those precious children, so thank you.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and also, I want to extend my thanks for all your many, many years of work and leadership to protect the life and lives of the unborn. We really appreciate everything you have done, and I know, across the country, it is appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today to voice my support for the right to life of unborn children. During my time in the Ohio General Assembly and, now, as a Member of Congress, I have always been a strong supporter of pro-life legislation. I firmly believe we must be vigilant in protecting the sanctity of human life.

As previously mentioned by other Members, it is heartbreaking to know that, since 1973, there have been more than 55 million abortions in the United States. Fortunately, a report released in February 2014 found abortion rates and ratios are continuing to decline in the United States and the rate of abortion has dropped to its lowest since its legalization; however, there is still more work to be done. That is why I continually support legislation to protect the unborn.

Tomorrow, tens of thousands of our fellow citizens will be in Washington to participate in the March for Life, and I salute them for their steadfastness in our cause for life. They will be here to let their voices be heard.

I can speak that, in our church, I know that we sponsor a couple of buses that will be coming down from Bowling Green State University, my alma mater. There will be high schoolers from across my district that will be here, and we salute them, again, for making sure that they are here to have their voices heard.

I also want to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to those who have tirelessly worked for years to defend the right to life; and, again, I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. LATTA.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. SMITH, for yielding, and thank you also for calling this Special Order, particularly as Congress, tomorrow, will take up an important issue relating to the unborn.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, of all the responsibilities given to Congress under our Constitution, none is more important than to protect and preserve life.

Throughout the history of governments, through the entire course of the world as we know it, governments have had the power to decide who dies and who lives. Our Founding Fathers established the United States to ensure the protection of first life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all of our citizens.

As the people's Congress, we pass laws that define life. We pass laws that define life for all Americans, including the unborn. No matter that comes before this Congress or our society is more important than the matter of protecting the lives of our citizens; and, my colleagues, no citizen is more vulnerable or helpless than the unborn.

Our Nation, in respect for life and the unborn, must not waver. Protecting human life at every opportunity must be our only option and certainly our moral responsibility.

As thousands of pro-life Americans express their support for the unborn at our Nation's Capital this week, I welcome them, and I also hope and pray that their voice is heard.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Chairman MICA.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOE PITTS, and just before I do, I note that Mr. PITTS not only chairs the Subcommittee on Health for the Energy and Commerce Committee, but prior to coming to Washington, he was one of the prime authors of a sweeping pro-life law in Pennsylvania that has saved countless lives.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank CHRIS SMITH for his leadership over the years. He is one of the people, along with Henry Hyde, that I admired from afar, and when I was elected 18 years ago, I told him I want to come and hold up his arms in this fight for life. He has been a real champion and just a terrific leader here in the Congress. I want to thank him for that.

I heard in a congressional life forum a few years ago a lady by the name of Frederica Mathewes-Green—she was president of the Feminists for Life—and she said something I will never forget. She said:

> Abortion is the most violent form of death known to mankind. It is death by dismemberment, decapitation, and poisoning.

She said:

Abortion breaks a mother's heart.

She said:

There are always two victims in an abortion. One is the baby, and one is the mother; one is dead, one is wounded.

I never forgot those statements of this great feminist leader. I think her focus is right. We need to keep that focus where it is, where she had it: on the mother, on the baby.

We are talking here about babies who are in their 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th month of pregnancy. For the first 5 months, a woman could have an abortion, but after that, it bans abortion, and I want to say this: I was first elected in 1972, inaugurated 3 weeks before Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton, so I have been involved in these battles for the whole time.

This is the first time in my memory that our leadership has moved substantive legislation on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade on the day of the march. They should be applauded for that. This is significant.

In 2 years, if things go the way we hope, with a new Republican President and a House and a Senate, 2 years from tomorrow, we could very well see this legislation signed into law. That is how important this is. It moves the bar back on Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton, those two infamous decisions that have resulted in 55 million unborn children and women being affected by abortion.

As CHRIS said, I was involved in authoring the Pennsylvania Abortion Control Act, but I also was involved in the Medicaid funding cutoff bill that passed in Pennsylvania—I think that was about 1978—and we had a reporting requirement in that bill, so that the abortions that were due to rape and incest had to be reported to the appropriate law enforcement or social service agencies.

The year before our bill was passed into law, there were some 740 abortions, Medicaid-funded abortions, due to so-called rape. The year after our bill was signed into law, there were 38. This shows the importance of that provision into law of reporting to the appropriate authorities.

If you remove that provision from the law—and some people want to do that—that would create a loophole for late-term abortions. As I said, for the first 5 months, a woman could have an abortion, but in the later term, they could not without the appropriate reporting to appropriate authorities. It would, I think, be a mistake, as some would like to do, to remove those requirements.

I just might conclude by saying that we are one of only seven countries that allow abortion at any point of pregnancy. Some countries are appalled that the United States would permit these late-term abortions. We had a famous case in Pennsylvania, the Kermit Gosnell clinic, which was outrageous when people find out what happened in those late-term abortions.

Scientific studies tell us that children feel pain in the womb. These are the children at this age who smile in the womb, who suck their thumb, who hiccup, who have dream patterns on the brainwaves, who react to light if it is intrauterine or a pinprick.

These are very tiny but knowing, learning individuals. They have no one to speak for them. They are voiceless, so we have an obligation to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, who can't run away, who face this horrific type of death, and the mothers who carry them.

I would urge Members, just like as shown in the public polls, the majority of Americans support the legislation. I would like to thank the leadership for moving the legislation and like to say that we are admonished in the scriptures that if we see someone drawn to death and we do not speak up, we do nothing, that we will be held responsible because, really, nothing is doing something, silence is consent.

With the other pro-life people, Members, and our great champion, I urge the Members to support this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. PITTS. Again, I want to thank you for your leadership both at the State and, now, Federal level, especially as chairman of the committee that deals with health. Thank you so much.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), who has also been an outspoken champion of the right to life.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42nd anniversary of the infamous Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision, which legalized elective abortion in the U.S.

Elective abortion is an abhorrent practice that tragically remains a common medical procedure performed in the U.S. Every year, over 1 million abortions are performed here.

Since 1973, when Roe v. Wade was decided, 57 million babies have been lost to abortion—57 million, Mr. Speaker. To put this in perspective, according to the last census numbers, 57 million is about 18 percent of the U.S. population. This staggering loss of children's lives is unconscionable.

My wife, Jeanie, and I have been blessed with five children and two grandchildren, with one more on the way. I firmly believe that every life is a precious gift from God, and I am wholly committed to protecting the sanctity of life.

One critically important step towards protecting life is the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act that we will be voting on tomorrow. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill that will prohibit anyone from performing an abortion on an unborn child that is 20 weeks or older.

Medical research has shown that at least by the 20th week of a pregnancy, unborn babies can feel pain. Polls have consistently shown that a majority of Americans support banning abortions after 20 weeks. Abortions after the 20th week are painful, violent, and harmful, even to the mothers. It is time to end this horrible procedure.

This week, we will continue to mourn the lives cut short in the inhuman wake of Roe v. Wade. We pray for God's continued comfort, grace, and mercy to those touched by abortion.

Every life has value, and we have a duty to protect the lives of those who are the most innocent among us. I will continue to be among those fighting to do just that.

□ 1645

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Doug.

I would like to now close, and I want to thank my distinguished colleagues for their eloquent statements in defense of life.

Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago tomorrow marks the U.S. Supreme Court's infamous, reckless, and inhumane abandonment of women and babies to the abortionists—42 years of victims, dead babies, wounded women, shattered families; 42 years of government-sanctioned violence against women and children. Since 1973, more than 56 million—maybe 57 million—children have been killed by abortion—a staggering loss of children's lives, a death toll that equates to the entire population of England.

The passage of time has not changed the fact that abortion is a serious, lethal violation of fundamental human rights. Rather than gull our consciences to the unmitigated violence of abortion, however, the passage of time has only enabled us to see better and to understand better the innate cruelty of abortion and its horrific legacy—victims—while making us more determined than ever to protect the weakest and most vulnerable.

In his inaugural speech, President Obama said in pertinent part:

Together, we resolve that a great nation must care for the vulnerable, that all are created equal, and our journey is not complete until all our children are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.

Yes, Mr. President. We must care for the vulnerable, but that also includes unborn children and their mothers. No one gets left out or left behind. All people are created equal, and our journey is not complete until all of our children, including the child in the womb, are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.

Last night, right here in this Chamber, the President said to tell every child in every neighborhood, ''Your life matters.'' Again, Mr. Speaker, the President is leaving out a whole class of human beings, who because of the fact they are in utero—the fact that they are yet to be born—they are construed to be excluded from humanity and, therefore, from their basic human rights. It is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker. It is unconscionable.

Let me also say, in talking about victims, a couple of years ago, I met a woman named Linda Shrewsbury—an

academic, an African American, with a degree from Harvard, who had an abortion. She said:

> The lies that brought me to that day and to its sorrowful aftermath are crystal clear in my mind—falsehoods and deceptions that concealed the truth about abortion. Lies planted in my thinking by clever marketing and media campaigns and endless repetition led to a tragic, irreversible decision—the death of my first child.

Ms. Shrewsbury went on to say:

> I really didn't understand back then. At age 20, I had no inkling of the mental and emotional darkness I was about to enter. I couldn't have grasped the immense psychological toll it would take for years into the future—unrelenting tears, guilt, shame, and depression. After spending many years in denial, I did eventually find healing.

Linda goes on to say:

> When I understood and rejected distortions about fetal development, doublespeak about choice, rights, and planned and wanted children, I understood the reality and victimhood of my aborted child.

She went on and concluded:

> I understood the absence of moral basis for choosing to disentitle an innocent human being of life. When I embraced the truth, the truth set me free, and I, finally, gained inner peace.

Some of my colleagues have mentioned the historic vote that we will take tomorrow on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, as you know, is a modest but necessary attempt to at least protect babies who are 20 weeks old and who are pain capable from having to suffer and die from abortion.

I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I, like, I think, most people, avoid pain at almost all costs. When I have surgeries—when anyone has surgeries—I am put locally or generally under anesthesia so that I do not have to feel the pain. The unborn child, when he or she is getting an intervention to help cure a disability or to deal with disease or illness, gets anesthesia because we now know beyond any reasonable doubt that unborn children who are at least at 20-weeks' gestation feel that pain.

When the abortionist commits a D&E abortion or one of the other abortions—D&E is literally a way of dismembering the child—they feel this pain—''they'' being the children—and it is excruciating. Children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

I would point out to my colleagues the expert testimony of Dr. Anthony Levatino's before the House Judiciary Committee. He is a former abortionist who has performed hundreds of dismemberment abortions. He described D&E. He said:

> The baby can be in any position inside the uterus. Just reach in with a Sopher clamp, and grasp whatever you can.

The former abortionist went on to say:

> Pull really hard, and out pops an arm. Reach in again and again, and tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs.

Pull out a severed arm. Tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs. This is child abuse, Mr. Speaker. Not only is this assault on a child inhumane, it is extremely painful as the child experiences that dismemberment. Again, I say that children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

Again, tomorrow is the March for Life, and there will be tens of thousands of people there who are speaking out for the unborn and equally for their mothers. There will be numbers of women there from the Silent No More Awareness Campaign—all women who have had abortions and who now speak out eloquently and with great compassion to say to women who are post-abortive that there is hope, that there is reconciliation. Face the truth, and that is the beginning to that reconciliation.

We will be there tomorrow, praying, working, of course—even fasting—for that day when every life is cherished as a gift, every life loved despite one's disability, race, sex, color, religion, or condition of dependency, when every life is welcomed no matter the inconvenience.

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

CONTRASTING VIEWS OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GROTHMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and to address the country this afternoon and to do so with colleagues of mine from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) to draw a contrast between the view of government represented by our side of the aisle and of that which we heard last night from our President, a President who seemingly ignored the will of the people as expressed by the ballot box in November and who, instead, doubled down on an agenda that we believe on our side of the aisle is the wrong view of government and the wrong direction for our Nation. So I rise with my colleagues today to talk about just a few of the very substantive points and to do so very constructively and to present why we have a different view of government and why we think that is important.

I would start by suggesting this. If we think about what the President said last night, in his words, the President declared from the rostrum that no challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change. Now, I understand the sympathetic position on climate change. I am from a coastal State, and, frankly, I am a member of the Republican Party who believes that, indeed, the climate is changing, but I do not believe that the greatest challenge facing our future generations is that of climate change.

In fact, you can harken back to the words of Thomas Jefferson. He had a very different opinion than our President had last night. He said that public debt is the greatest of dangers for our Nation to fear. I would suggest that Jefferson was right, that the greatest threat to our future generations is actually economic security and domestic security. I would like to speak for just a couple of moments about that and allow my colleagues to talk about other portions of the President's remarks.

Let's first talk about the long-term threat to our economic security—our national debt—a topic that was completely ignored in the President's address to the Nation last night.

Understand the significance of where we sit historically when it comes to the national debt. When this President took office, our national debt was just over $10 trillion, meaning it had taken 220 years for our Republic—220 years—to accumulate just over $10 trillion in debt, a number already far too high. In the 8 years of this administration, an additional $10 trillion will be added under this President's watch. When he leaves his office, our debt will be over $20 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, that is a threat to our national security. The greatest threat, perhaps, to our national security, arguably, could be unwatched, out-of-control spending and debt that ultimately collapses our economic system and ensures that we are no longer the world's greatest superpower. In fact, George Washington, himself, admonished that we have a moral obligation to pay off our debts during the life of the majority, during our lifetimes.

Rather than hearing from a President who doubled down on a very progressive agenda and who suggested with the rare audacity, as he did, that our Nation is fine in that conflicts and wars are over, in that our economy has returned, in that we have faster job growth than European nations—and yet the President suggested last night that he wants to grow our government in the very same manner that these European nations have today—and rather than tell us how to grow a government we already can't afford, I would ask the President to present a plan to pay for the government we already have.

The greatest threat to future generations is not climate change. It is our economic security, and it is also our homeland security. Many on this side of the aisle have grave reservations about the President's current plan to combat the war against ISIS, or ISIL—against radical extremists-terrorists who intend to bring harm to the United States. That is a threat. That is a real threat.

The President called for something last night that I strongly agree with. I think this body should have a robust debate about an authorization to use military force. We owe it to the American people, who sent us here, to represent them on this very critical issue

of what is our national policy to protect our homeland, to protect American lives.

In fact, what is the current plan to arm Syrian rebels, and what is the likelihood that that will actually be successful when we have seen a lack of success in areas like Iraq?

Despite the declarations of last night, I would challenge that we are not as safe as, perhaps, the President suggested. From the Middle East, to Africa, to Paris, to Yemen, to our very own border, what is that plan?

House Republicans passed a border security bill that reflected the will of the people last July, yet we heard nothing last night—not a single comment—about how to secure our border. It is a sharp contrast. We heard about negotiating with Iran. We heard about releasing prisoners from GTMO. We heard nothing about securing our borders and securing our homeland, so we have taken this time today to present a constructive contrast between the President's view of government and our view of government and what we believe are the right priorities of our government.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues today, and I would yield now to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend and colleague from Florida, and thank you to my good friend and colleague from Alabama for joining us, Mr. BYRNE.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity to talk about what we heard in this Chamber, just slightly less than 24 hours ago, from this President, who is from my home State of Illinois. We heard a lot of ideas and a lot of talk and a lot of promises, but if it is anything like the State of the Union Addresses that I have had an opportunity to sit on in this Chamber over the last 2 years, we are not going to see a lot of action.

There was a lot of talk about the economy. The economy is getting better. Frankly, it can't have gotten much worse when you compare it to a few years ago. Of course, it is going to get better, but the reality is there are still 8.7 million Americans who are out of work, and 7 million Americans are in part-time jobs but are looking for full-time jobs.

□ 1700

The President's solution to many of the issues that were brought up was to tax more American families—to tax American families who have been saving for their children's college education to pay for a grandiose idea he has yet to give us the details on.

The President also talked about helping our heroes: our veterans. This one is personal to me because just a few weeks ago, the day we got sworn in for the 114th Congress, Mr. Speaker, we were able to unanimously pass a bill called the Hire More Heroes Act, which I sponsored. This wasn't an idea that came from Washington. It was an idea that came from Illinois. Brad Lavite, the superintendent of the Madison County, Illinois, Veterans Assistance Commission, came to me during the last Congress and said, Why is it that veterans who are getting their health care through TRICARE and through the Department of Defense count towards the ObamaCare 50-employee limit in the employer mandate?

I came here, took his idea, and garnered hundreds of cosponsors to put this on the floor of the House. It passed in the last Congress, but it got held up in the Senate. It passed unanimously in this Congress on day one, and that bill should go through the Senate and get to the President's desk. If he wants to help veterans get jobs, I hope the President signs that immediately when it hits his desk, hopefully, in no more than a few weeks.

These are the types of solutions that are bipartisan solutions that the President told us he wanted to put forth, but he talked to us in a manner that I didn't think was bipartisan at all. Most of his speech talked about what he was going to do. I would have rather heard the President talk about what we are going to do together because, frankly, that is what my constituents in Illinois want us to do. They want us to come here and govern together.

That is why I am so glad to be here and be a part of this Special Order with my good friend, Mr. JOLLY. Hopefully, we can begin a good banter about discussing what our thoughts are on where America needs to go to move forward and work with this President but do it in a way that is a lot less confrontational than what we heard last night.

Mr. JOLLY. With that, I yield to a real leader in this institution, a colleague of ours from the great State of Alabama, Mr. BRADLEY BYRNE.

Mr. BYRNE. I thank the gentlemen from Florida and Illinois. Those were eloquent words spoken from the heart, because I know both of these gentleman mean everything they just said.

Last night was an interesting moment for me. One of the President's big plays is this proposal regarding community colleges.

Let me tell you a little bit about myself. I am the first person in my family to go to college. Both of my parents grew up during the Depression. There wasn't any money for college, but I was privileged to go to college. During the time that I went, my parents were not doing well financially. Like very many other people, I was a financial aid student.

We didn't have Pell grants back then. You got Federal student loans and maybe a Federal student work-study job. Lots and lots of people in my generation did that. I don't ever complain about that because that is the best money I ever borrowed and the best work I ever did because it gave me the opportunity to do what I have done in life. But it also taught me how important it is to give people an opportunity for a real education so that they can move up in their lives.

This May, the last of my four children will finish college. We have had somebody in college in my family since 2003. I have been writing those tuition checks, fees, et cetera. So I look at this also from the point of view of someone who has had to be there writing those checks, sending their young people to college. But I am also the former chancellor of post-secondary education for the State of Alabama. It was my job to be the CEO of Alabama's 2-year college system, the community colleges for the State of Alabama. And so I bring a certain level of experience and expertise to this issue that may be a little different from others in this body.

When the President first proposed this, his office just gave us a heads up. It didn't check and say, Do you think this is a good idea? Given your background, do you think this is something we can do? He said, This is what we're going to do.

Our first question we asked was, How much will it cost? The initial answer we got from the White House was, We don't know how much it's going to cost. Now that should cause us all to ask a question about how serious this proposal is when, in the very first instance that they decide that they are going to propose it, they can't even tell us how much it costs. Even after they decided how much they think it is going to cost—$60 billion—they couldn't tell us how they were going to pay for it.

So it led me to ask this question: Is this a serious idea? Because, you see, over a third of our community college students in America are already on Federal Pell grants, which cover all—or virtually all—of their tuition and fee costs when they go to community college. And for the people that don't have the eligibility to get Pell grants, there are a combination of other things that they can get.

My experience as somebody who ran a community college system was that covering tuition and fees was usually not the real problem most community college students face. Most of them face a more difficult problem, and that is they are not adequately academically prepared or they have other problems in their lives, whether it is from their homes or jobs or whatever. It is hard for them to stay in college and stay up with the work that they have got to do. And so they need a lot of extra help. And the President doesn't talk about that.

Now here is the worst thing about this proposal. We heard a lot last night from the President of the United States that he was all about the middle class. Let me tell you one of the taxes that he is going to raise that is going to pay for these proposals. He is going to tax 529 plans.

For people that don't know what those are, 529 plans are savings accounts, essentially, that moms and

dads and grandmoms and granddads put money in over time and they use that money that they saved over time to put their young people through college. And the good thing about that is while they pay taxes on the money that they make before they put it into the plans, if, when they take the money out of those plans, there has been some appreciation—it has gone from being this much money to that much money—they don't have to pay taxes on it.

It is an incentive for them. It is a way for middle class people to save for college for their young people. It is the only way middle class people in this country have a real savings plan for the young people. And this President, who stood up right behind me last night and talked about being for the middle class, wants to tax those middle class savings plans and take them away from people. Twelve million people use those plans in this country, 12 million people like my parents, like my wife and me, and like many, many other people in America. They shouldn't have their plans taxed.

So I say to my colleagues from Florida and Illinois, if you look at just that one part of what he proposed, it is hard to say he was serious. Because if he really cares about higher education in America, he would think about the other needs of these community college students. But most importantly, he would think about those 12 million parents that are saving for their young people, middle class people whom he is trying to take money away from with this proposed tax.

I think that sort of gives you a flavor of my appreciation of that one part of what he said last night.

Mr. JOLLY. You bring much education experience as a layperson but also somebody with very specific political convictions. The President talked about free community college. And as an example, he used two local areas that now provide it. Well, I think that is the point of departure for our view of government.

If a local community decides that they want to provide education through whatever tax levy that the residents there might support, that is a great opportunity. But to suggest that somehow Washington, which so often fails in orchestrating through the heavy hand of government a new type of education economics, is going to work better than those two communities that he cited last night is exactly where the view of government between our side of the aisle and his begins to depart.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to know how many community colleges the administration contacted to talk about whether or not this was a good idea. The example that I have heard since this idea was put forth was that Tennessee is going to do it. Well, great for Tennessee, because they are probably going to use their lottery funds, from what I have read, to pay for it.

Let me give you an example in Illinois, where I live, the President's home State. Unless we are going to get a brand new crop of lotto players, if the lotto is going to fund it, then you know what? That money would be robbed from our K through 12 system to create what is tantamount to grades 13 and 14 in our community colleges, which may not have the faculty or may not have the facilities to handle the influx—and then to top it off by taxing savings plans that many middle class Americans have been using to be able to send their children to college at a time when the cost to go to any college is rising exponentially much faster than the inflation rate.

I don't know if this is a conflict of interest or not because this is just a proposal from the White House, but I have a 529 plan. We have been saving for my three kids to go to college. And to be taxed now, after investing since they were very young—my daughter is now 17—I can tell you from the standpoint as a dad that I can empathize with many families who aren't in the financial position that we are able to be in because we are blessed enough to serve our districts in this institution.

It is flabbergasting to me to be able to hear the President talk about these great ideas. Frankly, I just don't know how many of us sat in this room last night and believed that it was going to get beyond the idea stage. And I don't know how much effort he is going to put in to try and pass this plan, but I would urge our colleagues to take a good, hard look at this and also never forget the possible impact it is going to have on our 4-year institutions, both private and public. I serve nine of those in my district in Illinois. What kind of impact is it going to have on those institutions when you take a good percentage of students that will now go, if his plan is implemented, to the community colleges, which provide a great education?

I would love to hear more about what you think and the impact it might have on the community college systems that you are so familiar with, Mr. BYRNE.

Mr. BYRNE. That is an important point because when you look at education, there are different parts of it. Each part serves its own special need. The 4-year colleges are different from the 2-year colleges, and they are different from high schools, et cetera. So there is a role that each of them play, but sometimes we start fuzzing them together and we miss the importance of each one of them.

I think there will be some negative effects on 4-year colleges. I already heard from some 4-year college people about that. They don't want to pick on the 2-year colleges because they don't want to be seen to do that, but they understand there could be some negative effects.

But the point you and the gentleman from Florida were making that is even more important to this, these are mainly local and State decisions. The Federal Government is inserting itself in things that traditionally, under our Federal understanding of government, the Federal Government didn't get involved in.

I talked to our colleagues in this House from the State of Tennessee, Democrat and Republican, and said, What do you think about us taking your Tennessee plan and nationalizing it? They said, We think it's a bad idea. We are proud of our Tennessee plan. We think it's a good plan. We're proud that our State is doing it.

It is one thing to talk about it from a State level—I understand they have one in Chicago at the local level—but it is different when you blow it up to be a national thing.

So the President wants to take this good idea from a single State or a single city and blow it up into a national thing, and we are not really stoked here to do that. We don't really understand how to do that.

Here is what happens now: we send the money out. And what happens after we send the money? Rules and regulations and mandates come flowing down after it, and Washington starts telling Tennessee and Illinois and Florida and Alabama how to run our colleges. And that, my friends, is a very bad idea. I don't think anybody in higher education wants the heavy hand of the Federal Government telling us how to run our institutions of higher education.

Let me end on this one point. America is known as having the best institutions of higher education in the world. And the reason we do is because each one of our institutions is different from one another. They specialize in who they are and they focus on quality. And if we start robbing that from them by trying to stamp some one-size-fits-all concept of higher education, which the President is trying to do right now with this rating system he wants to put on higher education, then we may start losing in an area in which we are the preeminent leader in the world. And I don't think the people of Alabama sent me here to let the Federal Government do that to the fine institutions of higher education we have in the State of Alabama.

Mr. JOLLY. In our remaining time, I would like to revisit another topic—it is one on which I think the solutions on our side of the aisle reflect the will of the people that we saw at the ballot box in November—and that is border security.

□ 1715

We need to reclaim this issue, as conservatives. We need to redefine this national conversation. The President likes to continually say that if Congress would just send him a bill, then all would be okay, and it is usually followed by suggesting that if we send a

bill that we pass, he will veto it. What he means is we have to send him his bill.

I just want to point out something because we do have solutions on this side of this aisle, and we have acted responsibly on behalf of that. In July, we passed a border security bill that put facilities closer to the border to keep those who enter illegally closer to the border.

We changed the policy to ''last in, first out,'' so if you get in, you don't get to linger for years before you are returned if you don't have a humanitarian claim that merits staying.

We also increased funding for judges, created tele-courtrooms so that we could more expeditiously process those who come here illegally—and rightfully so—and we should do so very responsibly. We are a loving nation made better for immigration, but we should show everybody the rule of law and how you responsibly immigrate here.

Mind you, we also passed a bill that provided for the health care of those who come here and while they are detained here, but I want to point out something very specific. In the coming weeks, this Congress is going to offer another bill—because that one was never accepted by the Senate or went to the President—to require operational control of our border.

That is a great urgency, to have operational control of our border, not to just address the traditional border security issue, but to address what we know is a growing concern about our domestic and homeland security.

We have seen the threats around the globe. Most certainly, that has to be an area where we can reach agreement with the White House, and I hope we can take up the President on his offer to put a bill on his desk and ask him to sign it, just as he has pledged to do so.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentleman for yielding, and you bring up a great point. This isn't just a border security issue because of an immigration issue. This is a border security issue because of a homeland security issue.

We have to make our border secure. We are going to have what our vision for border security is in this institution pass now to the Senate, and the President will get his wish. We will put a bill on his desk. It may not be the bill he wants, but my message to the administration—to the White House—is: come work with us.

In my first 2 years here, I just haven't seen that happen on a wide variety of issues. It seems like every idea that we come up with in this institution, even some that passed by huge bipartisan majorities, they threaten a veto. Well, that is okay, but that is not conducive to working together to find solutions, and that is what I think we are here for.

I think we, on this side, there are many of us who are out here to find solutions to the Nation's problems, not to create more problems, and that is exactly the message I hope to send to the American people tonight, that we are willing to work with the President on border security, on education, on a wide variety of issues, but we also have to have some response back, and that is what I think we are lacking.

Mr. BYRNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. I am on the Armed Services Committee, and I look at border security as national security.

Let me give you a story from a trip that several of us on the Armed Services Committee took to the Middle East back in August and September. We visited several countries over there. As you know, it is a very dangerous part of the world, clearly.

One of the countries we went to is Morocco. Morocco, if you think about where it is, should have lots of problems, but you don't really hear much about Morocco having terrorist incidents. When we were over there, we asked a lot of questions. How is that so?

It is because they take their border security very seriously. They use a lot of the military aid that America provides to Morocco for their border security, and they keep the bad guys out, and so you don't hear in this country that is in some of the most troubled parts of the world, you don't hear about the problems there because they control their borders. They understand that their internal and national security is dependent upon that.

We had two brothers, the Tsarnaev brothers, who grew up in Boston. One of them was allowed to go back to where they were from and one of the satellite countries from Russia—obviously was trained by terrorists.

We allowed him to come back into this country, after we were warned by the Russians where he had gone, and he and his brother tragically ignited those bombs at the Boston Marathon, seriously wounding a lot of people and killing some.

Well, what sort of a security situation do we have that we allowed him back into this country? What sort of security situation do we have today?

This is not just about the southern border; it is about the northern border. It is about our security of the entire Nation, and if we will start looking at border security as national security, which is the way we on this side of the aisle understand this issue, then we can protect the American people.

It definitely does take us working with the President because he runs the Department of Homeland Security through his appointee to that Secretary's position, and it is his policies through that Department that determine whether or not we are going to be protected, and protecting our borders is a part of protecting Americans from international terrorism, including international Islamic terrorism.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. DAVIS, any more comments this evening?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. If the gentleman would inquire how much time we have left.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am just excited to be able to talk about what happened at the State of the Union last night, our perspective. In closing, it kind of frustrates me that we didn't see real solutions to the exploding cost of higher education.

If the solution is what the President laid out, which is going to actually put more of a burden on middle class families by taxing their savings plans that they have been saving for—for sometimes decades—that is a wrong approach to bringing down the cost of higher education to making Pell grants go further.

The President also mentioned another point last night about equal pay. Well, it would have been nice to have the President and the White House actually do that in the White House, where women make an average of 18 percent less than men, so it is not just enough to talk about it here in this Chamber. Do it when you have control over the opportunity to make things happen.

That is why I hope it is not just rhetoric on many issues, but I want to see action.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time. I hope what the American people have seen and our colleagues have seen is a Congress with solutions.

We will be passing through this House border security solutions, a homeland security solution. Frankly, addressing the constitutional overreach we saw from the President, we will be passing energy independence solutions, education solutions, tax reform solutions. We are committed to doing that on behalf of the American people.

I look forward to working with our colleagues, and frankly, we remain hopeful that we will have the opportunity to work with the President on this as well.

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

WHY WE ARE REALLY HERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is January 22, 2015. It

marks exactly 42 years to the day since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down from the United States Supreme Court. Since then, every foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of more than 55 million of its own unborn children. Incomprehensibly, those who have profited from it most have hailed it as freedom.

We should all remember the words of President Abraham Lincoln when he said:

> Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under a just God, cannot long retain it.

Mr. Lincoln called upon all of us to remember America's Founding Fathers, and ''their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows.''

He reminded those he called posterity that when, in the distant future, some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that ''their posterity''—that is us, Mr. Speaker—that ''their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their Fathers began.''

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of all of those who founded this Nation and dreamed of what America could someday be and for the sake of all of those since then who have died in darkness so America could walk in the light of freedom, it is so very important that those of us who are privileged to be Members of the United States Congress pause from time to time and remind ourselves of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation said, ''The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.''

The phrase in the Fifth Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says that no person shall be ''deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.''

The 14th Amendment says no State shall deny ''to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.''

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here; yet, today, a great shadow looms over America. When authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

According to the grand jury report:

> Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies. He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it ''ensuring fetal demise.'' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it ''snipping.'' Over the years, there were hundreds of ''snippings.''

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she defined one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth but, in her words, was making like this ''screeching'' noise, and it ''sounded like a little alien.''

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, is this who we truly are? Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent children like the one I just described; yet, if he had killed these babies only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in much of the United States of America.

If there is one thing that we must not miss about this unspeakably evil episode, it is that Kermit Gosnell is not an anomaly; he is just the visible face of this lucrative enterprise of murdering pain-capable unborn children in America.

Mr. Speaker, more than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the greatest atrocity in the United States.

According to the Bartlett study, a woman seeking an abortion at 20 weeks is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she was in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die than she was in the first trimester.

Regardless of how supporters of abortion on demand might try to suppress it, it is undisputed and universally accepted by every credible expert that the risk to a mother's health from abortion increases as gestation increases.

There is no valid debate on that incontrovertible reality; yet supporters of abortion on demand try to suppress that.

□ 1730

They also have tried for decades, Mr. Speaker, to deny that unborn babies ever feel pain, even those at the beginning of the sixth month of pregnancy, as if somehow the ability to feel pain magically develops the very second the child is born.

Mr. Speaker, almost every other major civilized nation on this Earth protects pain-capable unborn babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting these children. Yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary pain and cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that beggars my ability to articulate.

But I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the winds of change are beginning to blow and that the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America. Because tomorrow we will vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber, and it will be a vote that every one of us will always remember and for which we shall be held accountable.

And no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisted words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, it remains a deeply sincere effort, beginning at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand; and ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, not long ago, I heard Barack Obama speak very noble and poignant words that, whether he realizes it or not, apply so profoundly to this subject. Let me quote, if you will, excerpted portions of his comments. He said: ''This is our first task, caring for our children. It's our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That's how, as a society, we will be judged.''

The President asked: ''Are we really prepared to say that we're powerless in the face of such carnage, that the politics are too hard? Are we prepared to say that such violence visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of our freedom?''

The President also said: ''Our journey is not complete until all our children are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.''

''That is our generation's task—to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American.''

Mr. Speaker, never have I so deeply agreed with any words ever spoken by President Obama as those I have just quoted. How I wish that somehow we could all open our hearts and our ears to these incontrovertible words and ask ourselves in the core of our souls why these words that should apply to all children cannot include the most helpless and vulnerable of all children. How does any child become more vulnerable than these little pain-capable unborn babies?

Mr. Speaker, it seems that we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the crimes of a past generation, and we are never quite so staggeringly blind as when we assess an atrocity in our own time.

What we are doing to these babies is real, and all of us here know that in our hearts. Medical science regarding the development of unborn babies beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy now demonstrates irrefutably that they do, in fact, feel pain. Many of them cry and scream as they die, but because it is amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we can't hear them. It is, Mr. Speaker, the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States of America today.

I began and I close with the wise counsel from Abraham Lincoln to all of

us. He said: ''Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation.''

Mr. Speaker, it is time to open our eyes and our souls and recognize that protecting pain-capable unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. It is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family. It is time to open our eyes and allow our consciences to catch up with our technology. It is time for Members of the United States Congress to open our eyes and recognize that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are all here. And, Mr. Speaker, it is time for all Americans to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little unborn children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

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

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 416

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove all cosponsors from H.R. 416.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2150

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–4) on the resolution (H. Res. 42) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and January 22.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, as required by clause 2(a) of House rule XI, I respectfully submit for the RECORD the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which were adopted earlier today at a public meeting of the Committee.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives, and in particular, the committee rules enumerated in clause 2 of rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (hereafter referred to as the ''Committee''), to the extent applicable.

(b) A motion to recess and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged non-debatable motions in Committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall consult the Ranking Minority Member to the extent possible with respect to the business of the Committee. Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules, to the extent applicable.

2. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House of Representatives is in session pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as the Chairman may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the Members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairman subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no business to be considered.

3. QUORUM

For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two Members shall constitute a quorum, and the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall make every effort to ensure that the relevant Ranking Minority Member or another Minority Member is present at the time a hearing is convened. One-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, except: (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings and hearings to the public; (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas; and (4) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the full Committee by a subcommittee unless half of the subcommittee is actually present. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the Members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

4. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Meetings

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public, because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise violate any labor rule of the House of Representatives. No person other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or subcommittee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This subsection does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by subsection (b) of this rule.

(2) The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter, or adopting an amendment. The relevant Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. When exercising postponement authority, the relevant Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(b) Hearings

(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day should be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony—

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or violate paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) Whenever it is asserted by a Member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness—

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or

testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(3) No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee unless the House of Representatives has by majority vote authorized the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings, on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public.

(4) A Member of the House of Representatives who is not a Member of the Committee may not be recognized to participate in a Committee or Subcommittee hearing except by the unanimous consent of Committee Members present at such hearing. Participatory recognition of a non-Committee Member shall occur only after all Committee Members seeking recognition, both majority and minority, have had their opportunity to participate and question any witnesses.

(5) The Committee or a subcommittee may by the procedure designated in this subsection vote to close one (1) subsequent day of hearing.

(6) No congressional staff shall be present at any meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee that has been closed to the public, and at which classified information will be involved, unless such person is authorized access to such classified information in accordance with rule XX of the House of Representatives.

5. CONVENING HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

(a) Hearings. Public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the relevant Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the Committee for the taking of action, the Chairman of the full Committee, if concurring, shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Markups and Other Meetings to Transact Business

(1) Convening. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may call or convene, as the relevant Chairman considers necessary, meetings of the Committee or subcommittee for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, or for the conduct of other Committee or subcommittee business.

(2) Notice. Public announcement shall be made by the Chairman of the full Committee of the date, place, and subject matter of any markup or other meeting to conduct business at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of such markup or meeting, unless the relevant Chairman determines, in consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member, that there is good cause to begin such a markup or meeting on an earlier date. If such determination is made, the Chairman of the full Committee, if concurring in that determination, shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(3) Agenda and Texts. The relevant Chairman shall provide to all Committee or subcommittee Members an agenda for each Committee and subcommittee markup or other meeting to transact business, setting out all items of business to be considered, including whenever possible a copy of any measure scheduled for markup, at least 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before the meeting.

Bills on subjects not listed on such agenda shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or subcommittee, or by the Chairman of the full Committee with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member. The text of any measure to be marked up shall be made publicly available in electronic form at least 24 hours prior to the commencement of the markup meeting, or at the time of an announcement under subparagraph (b)(2) made within 24 hours before such meeting.

(c) Publication. Public announcement of all hearings and markups shall be published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record and made publicly available in electronic form. Members shall be notified by the Staff Director of all meetings (including markups and hearings) and briefings of subcommittees and of the full Committee.

(d) Member Seating. During Committee and subcommittee hearings and markups, chairs on the dais are for Members. No staff member other than a Committee or subcommittee staff director, counsel, or professional staff member may occupy a chair on the dais, unless authorized by the Chairman of the full Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Full Committee. Only one staff member each from the majority and the minority may occupy chairs on the dais at any time during a hearing or markup.

6. WITNESSES

(a) Interrogation of Witnesses

(1) In so far as practicable, witnesses shall be permitted to present their oral statements without interruption subject to reasonable time constraints imposed by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, with questioning by the Committee Members taking place afterward. Members should refrain from questions until such statements are completed.

(2) In recognizing Members, the relevant Chairman shall, to the extent practicable, give preference to the Members on the basis of their arrival at the hearing, taking into consideration the majority and minority ratio of the Members actually present. A Member desiring to speak or ask a question shall address the relevant Chairman and not the witness.

(3) Subject to paragraph (4), each Member may interrogate the witness for 5 minutes, the reply of the witness being included in the 5–minute period. After all Members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

(4) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the relevant Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, may permit one (1) or more majority Members of the Committee designated by the relevant Chairman to question a witness for a specified period of not longer than 30 minutes. On such occasions, an equal number of minority Members of the Committee designated by the Ranking Minority Member shall be permitted to question the same witness for the same period of time. Committee staff may be permitted to question a witness for equal specified periods either with the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee or by motion. However, in no case may questioning by Committee staff proceed before each Member of the Committee who wishes to speak under the 5-minute rule has had one opportunity to do so.

(b) Testimony of Witnesses

(1) Advance Filing Requirement. Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee is required to file testimony with the Committee or subcommittee at least two (2) business days in advance of that appearance. For purposes of this subsection, testimony includes the written statement of a witness, as well as any video, photographs, audio-visual matter, posters, or other supporting materials that the witness intends to present or display before the Committee. Such testimony should be provided in electronic form to the extent practicable. The Committee or subcommittee shall notify Members at least two business days in advance of a hearing of the availability of testimony submitted by witnesses. In addition, each witness shall provide sufficient copies, as determined by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, of his or her proposed written statement to be provided to Members and staff of the Committee or subcommittee, the news media, and the general public. The text of the written statement provided pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered final, and may not be revised by the witness after the Committee meeting at which the witness appears.

(2) Witness Preclusion and Waiver. The requirements of paragraph (1) or any part thereof may be waived by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, or the presiding Member, or the Ranking Member of the Committee or subcommittee as it relates to witnesses who are called by the minority to testify, provided that the witness or the relevant Chairman or Ranking Minority Member has submitted, prior to the witness's appearance, a written explanation to the reasons testimony has not been made available to the Committee or subcommittee. If a witness who is not an official of the U.S. Government has not submitted testimony as required by paragraph (1) and no such written explanation has been submitted, the witness shall be released from testifying unless a majority of the Committee or subcommittee votes to accept his or her testimony.

(3) Remote Witness Participation. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall promptly, and not later than 48 hours beforehand if possible, notify the relevant Ranking Member of any witness who is likely to present testimony other than in person, such as by videoconference. A witness may not testify via telephone or other audio-only medium without the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee or subcommittee. The relevant Chairman shall make reasonable efforts to verify the identity of any witness participating remotely.

(4) 'Truth In Testimony' Disclosure. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall, to the extent practicable, include: a curriculum vitae; a disclosure of the amount and source of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), or of any contract or payment originating with a foreign government, received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness, to the extent that such information is relevant to the subject matter of, and the witness' representational capacity at, the hearing; and a disclosure of whether the witness is an active registrant under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA).

Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy, safety, or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(5) Witness Presentation. A witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of his or her written statement.

(6) Translation. A witness requiring an interpreter or translator should include in the testimony provided pursuant to paragraph (1) the identity of the interpreter or translator that the witness intends to use. Unless properly noticed as a separate witness, an interpreter or translator appearing before the Committee should not present views or statements other than those expressed by the witness.

(c) Oaths. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, or any Member of the Committee designated by the relevant Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness appearing before the Committee.

7. PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

An accurate stenographic record shall be made of all hearings and markup sessions. Members of the Committee and any witness may examine the transcript of his or her own remarks and may make any grammatical or technical changes that do not substantively alter the record. Any such Member or witness shall return the transcript to the Committee offices within seven (7) calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after receipt of the transcript, or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

Any information supplied for the record at the request of a Member of the Committee shall be provided to the Member when received by the Committee.

Transcripts of hearings and markup sessions (except for the record of a meeting or hearing which is closed to the public) shall be printed as soon as is practicable after receipt of the corrected versions, except that the Chairman may order the transcript of a hearing to be printed without the corrections of a Member or witness if the Chairman determines that such Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time to correct such transcript and such transcript has not been returned within such time.

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form.

8. EXTRANEOUS MATERIALS IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS PRINTS

No extraneous material shall be printed in either the body or appendices of any Committee or subcommittee hearing, except matter which has been accepted for inclusion in the record during the hearing or by agreement of the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee within five (5) calendar days of the hearing. Copies of bills and other legislation under consideration and responses to written questions submitted by Members shall not be considered extraneous material.

Extraneous material in either the body or appendices of any hearing to be printed which would be in excess of eight (8) printed pages (for any one submission) shall be accompanied by a written request to the relevant Chairman. Such written request shall contain an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing such material.

9. INFORMATION ON COMMITTEE ACTION

(a) Record Votes. The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee outside of executive session shall be made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. Such result shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each Member voting for and against, and the Members present but not voting.

(b) Adopted Amendments. Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the text of each such amendment shall be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) Hearing and Markup Attendance. Member attendance at each Committee hearing and markup shall be recorded and included in the Committee print of the transcript of that hearing or markup.

10. PROXIES

Proxy voting is not permitted in the Committee or in subcommittees.

11. REPORTS

(a) Reports on Bills and Resolutions. To the extent practicable, not later than 24 hours before a report is to be filed with the Clerk of the House on a measure that has been ordered reported by the Committee, the Chairman shall make available for inspection by all Members of the Committee a copy of the draft Committee report in order to afford Members adequate information and the opportunity to draft and file any supplemental, minority or additional views which they may deem appropriate.

With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in any Committee report on the measure or matter.

(b) Prior Approval of Certain Reports. No Committee, subcommittee, or staff report, study, or other document which purports to express publicly the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or a subcommittee may be released to the public or filed with the Clerk of the House unless approved by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to Members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day). In any case in which clause 2(l) of rule XI and clause 3(a)(1) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives does not apply, each Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall be given an opportunity to have views or a disclaimer included as part of the material filed or released, as the case may be.

(c) Foreign Travel Reports. At the same time that the report required by clause 8(b)(3) of rule X of the House of Representatives, regarding foreign travel reports, is submitted to the Chairman, Members and employees of the Committee shall provide a report to the Chairman listing all official meetings, interviews, inspection tours and other official functions in which the individual participated, by country and date. Under extraordinary circumstances, the Chairman may waive the listing in such report of an official meeting, interview, inspection tour, or other official function. The report shall be maintained in the Committee offices and shall be available for public inspection during normal business hours. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no Member or employee of the Committee will be authorized for additional Committee travel until the reports described in this subsection have been submitted to the Chairman for that person's prior Committee travel.

12. REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Except in extraordinary circumstances, bills and resolutions will not be considered by the Committee unless and until the appropriate subcommittee has recommended the bill or resolution for Committee action, and will not be taken to the House of Representatives for action unless and until the Committee or a relevant subcommittee has ordered reported such bill or resolution, a quorum being present.

Except in extraordinary circumstances, a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that contains exclusively findings and policy declarations or expressions of the sense of the House of Representatives or the sense of the Congress shall not be considered by the Committee or a subcommittee unless such bill or resolution has at least 25 House co-sponsors, at least 10 of whom are Members of the Committee.

For purposes of this rule, extraordinary circumstances will be determined by the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member and such other Members of the Committee as the Chairman deems appropriate.

The Committee or a subcommittee shall not consider a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that expresses appreciation, commends, congratulates, celebrates, recognizes the accomplishments of, or celebrates the anniversary of, an entity, event, group, individual, institution, team, or government program, or that acknowledges or recognizes a period of time for such purposes, except in circumstances determined by the Chairman with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

13. STAFF SERVICES

The Committee staff shall be selected and organized so that it can provide a comprehensive range of professional services in the field of foreign affairs to the Committee, the subcommittees, and all its Members. The staff shall include persons with training and experience in foreign affairs, making available to the Committee individuals with knowledge of major countries, areas, and U.S. overseas programs and operations.

Subject to clause 9 of rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee, except as provided in paragraph (c), shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chairman with the approval of the majority of the Members in the majority party of the Committee. Their remuneration shall be fixed by the Chairman, and they shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman. Staff assignments are to be authorized by the Chairman or by the Staff Director under the direction of the Chairman.

Subject to clause 9 of rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee assigned to the minority shall be appointed, their remuneration determined, and may be removed, by the Ranking Minority Member with the approval of the majority of the minority party Members of the Committee. Such staff shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member with the approval or

consultation of the minority Members of the Committee.

The Chairman shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee. The Chairman shall ensure that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

14. NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Full Committee. The full Committee will be responsible for oversight and legislation relating to: foreign assistance (including development assistance, Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Millennium Challenge Account, HIV/AIDS in foreign countries, security assistance, and Public Law 480 programs abroad); national security developments affecting foreign policy; strategic planning and agreements; war powers, treaties, executive agreements, and the deployment and use of United States Armed Forces; peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions; arms control and disarmament issues; the United States Agency for International Development; activities and policies of the State, Commerce, and Defense Departments and other agencies related to the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act, including export and licensing policy for munitions items and technology and dual-use equipment and technology; international law; promotion of democracy; international law enforcement issues, including narcotics control programs and activities; Broadcasting Board of Governors; embassy security; international broadcasting; public diplomacy, including international communication and information policy, and international education and exchange programs; and all other matters not specifically assigned to a subcommittee. The full Committee will have jurisdiction over legislation with respect to the administration of the Export Administration Act, including the export and licensing of dual-use equipment and technology and other matters related to international economic policy and trade not otherwise assigned to a subcommittee, and with respect to the United Nations, its affiliated agencies, and other international organizations, including assessed and voluntary contributions to such organizations. The full Committee may conduct oversight and investigations with respect to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee as defined in the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Subcommittees. There shall be six (6) standing subcommittees. The names and jurisdiction of those subcommittees shall be as follows:

(1) Functional Subcommittee. There shall be one subcommittee with functional jurisdiction:

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade: Oversight and legislative responsibilities over the United States' efforts to manage and coordinate international programs to combat terrorism as coordinated by the Department of State and other agencies, and efforts to bring international terrorists to justice. With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, oversight of, and legislation pertaining to, nonproliferation matters involving nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction, except for legislation involving the Foreign Assistance Act, the Arms Export Control Act, the Export Administration Act, and sanctions laws pertaining to individual countries and the provision of foreign assistance (which is reserved to the full Committee). Oversight of matters relating to international economic and trade policy; commerce with foreign countries; international investment policy; the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Trade and Development Agency; commodity agreements; and special oversight of international financial and monetary institutions; the Export-Import Bank, and customs. With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, legislative jurisdiction over measures related to export promotion and measures related to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Trade and Development Agency.

(2) Regional Subcommittees. There shall be five subcommittees with regional jurisdiction: the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations; the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific; the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats; the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa; and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere. As detailed below, two of the regional subcommittees also shall have functional jurisdiction.

The regional subcommittees shall have jurisdiction over the following within their respective regions:

(1) Matters affecting the political relations between the United States and other countries and regions, including resolutions or other legislative measures directed to such relations.

(2) Legislation with respect to disaster assistance outside the Foreign Assistance Act, boundary issues, and international claims.

(3) Legislation with respect to region- or country-specific loans or other financial relations outside the Foreign Assistance Act.

(4) Legislation and oversight regarding human rights practices in particular countries.

(5) Oversight of regional lending institutions.

(6) Oversight of matters related to the regional activities of the United Nations, of its affiliated agencies, and of other multilateral institutions.

(7) Identification and development of options for meeting future problems and issues relating to U.S. interests in the region.

(8) Oversight of base rights and other facilities access agreements and regional security pacts.

(9) Concurrent oversight jurisdiction with respect to matters assigned to the functional subcommittees insofar as they may affect the region.

(10) Oversight of foreign assistance activities affecting the region, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee.

(11) Such other matters as the Chairman of the full Committee may determine.

The Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, oversight of: international health issues, including transboundary infectious diseases, maternal health and child survival, and programs related to the global ability to address health issues; population issues; the United Nations and its affiliated agencies (excluding peacekeeping and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions); the American Red Cross; and the Peace Corps. In addition, legislation and oversight pertaining to: implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; other matters relating to internationally-recognized human rights, including legislation aimed at the promotion of human rights and democracy generally; and the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, and related issues.

The Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, oversight related to emerging foreign threats to the national security and interests of the United States.

15. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) In General. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it.

(b) Scheduling. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee chairmen, the relevant Ranking Minority Member and other appropriate Members, with a view toward minimizing scheduling conflicts. Subcommittee meetings shall not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full Committee. Hearings shall not be scheduled to occur prior to the first vote or subsequent to the last vote of a legislative week, or outside of Washington, D.C., without prior consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member. In order to ensure orderly administration and fair assignment of hearing and meeting rooms, the subject, time, and location of hearings and meetings shall be arranged in advance with the Chairman through the Staff Director of the Committee.

(c) Vice Chairmen. The Chairman of the Full Committee shall designate a Member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chairman.

(d) Participation. The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may attend the meetings and participate in the activities of all subcommittees of which they are not Members, except that they may not vote or be counted for a quorum in such subcommittees.

(e) Required Oversight Hearings. During each 180-day period following organization of the Committee, each subcommittee shall hold at least one hearing on oversight of U.S. Government activities.

16. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

In accordance with rule 14 of the Committee and to the extent practicable, all legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks. In accordance with rule 14 of the Committee, legislation may also be referred to additional subcommittees for consideration. Unless otherwise directed by the Chairman, such subcommittees shall act on or be discharged from consideration of legislation that has been approved by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks of such action. In referring any legislation to a subcommittee, the Chairman may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the full Committee.

Subcommittees with regional jurisdiction shall have joint jurisdiction with the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations over legislation regarding human rights practices in particular countries within their regions.

The Chairman may designate a subcommittee Chairman or other Member to take responsibility as manager of a bill or resolution during its consideration in the House of Representatives.

17. PARTY RATIOS ON SUBCOMMITTEES AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

The majority party caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party Members for each subcommittee. Party representation on each subcommittee or conference committee shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full Committee. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member are authorized to negotiate matters

affecting such ratios including the size of subcommittees and conference committees.

18. SUBCOMMITTEE FUNDING AND RECORDS

Each subcommittee shall have adequate funds to discharge its responsibility for legislation and oversight.

In order to facilitate Committee compliance with clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall keep a complete record of all subcommittee actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The result of each record vote shall be promptly made available to the full Committee for inspection by the public in accordance with rule 9 of the Committee.

All subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as Chairman of the subcommittee. Subcommittee records shall be coordinated with the records of the full Committee, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

19. MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

The Chairman shall call a meeting of the subcommittee chairmen on a regular basis not less frequently than once a month. Such a meeting need not be held if there is no business to conduct. It shall be the practice at such meetings to review the current agenda and activities of each of the subcommittees.

20. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

(a) Authorized Persons. In accordance with the stipulations of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all Members of the House who have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives shall be authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee.

Members of the Committee staff shall be considered authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee when they have the proper security clearances, when they have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives, and when they have a demonstrable need to know. The decision on whether a given staff member has a need to know will be made on the following basis:

(1) In the case of the full Committee majority staff, by the Chairman, acting through the Staff Director;

(2) In the case of the full Committee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, acting through the Minority Staff Director;

(3) In the case of subcommittee majority staff, by the chairman of the subcommittee;

(4) In the case of the subcommittee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee.

No other individuals shall be considered authorized persons, unless so designated by the Chairman of the full Committee.

(b) Designated Persons. Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to information classified Confidential. Such designated persons must have the proper security clearance, have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives, and have a need to know as determined by his or her principal. Upon request of a Committee Member in specific instances, a designated person also shall be permitted access to information classified Secret which has been furnished to the Committee pursuant to section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended. Upon the written request of a Committee Member and with the approval of the Chairman in specific instances, a designated person may be permitted access to other classified materials. Designation of a staff person shall be by letter from the Committee Member to the Chairman.

(c) Location. Classified information will be stored in secure safes in the Office of the Security Officer and in the Office of the Minority Staff Director. All materials classified Top Secret or higher must be stored in a Secure Compartmentalized Information Facility (SCIF).

(d) Handling. Materials classified Confidential or Secret may be taken from Committee offices to other Committee offices and hearing rooms by Members of the Committee and authorized Committee staff in connection with hearings and briefings of the Committee or its subcommittees for which such information is deemed to be essential. Removal of such information from the Committee offices shall be only with the permission of the Chairman under procedures designed to ensure the safe handling and storage of such information at all times. Except as provided in this paragraph, Top Secret materials may not be taken from approved storage areas for any purpose, except that such materials may be taken to hearings and other meetings that are being conducted at the Top Secret level when necessary. Materials classified Top Secret may otherwise be used under conditions approved by the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(e) Notice. Appropriate notice of the receipt of classified documents received by the Committee from the Executive Branch will be sent promptly to Committee Members through the Survey of Activities or by other means.

(f) Access. Except as provided for above, access to materials classified Top Secret or otherwise restricted held by the Committee will be in approved Committee spaces. The following procedures will be observed:

(1) Authorized persons will be permitted access to classified documents after inquiring of the Staff Director or an assigned staff member. Access to the SCIF will be afforded during regular Committee hours.

(2) Authorized persons will be required to identify themselves, to identify the documents or information they wish to view, and to sign the Classified Materials Log, which is kept with the classified information.

(3) The assigned staff member will be responsible for maintaining a log which identifies:

(1) authorized persons seeking access, (2) the classified information requested, and (3) the time of arrival and departure of such persons. The assigned staff member will also assure that the classified materials are returned to the proper location.

(g) Divulgence. Classified information provided to the Committee by the Executive Branch shall be handled in accordance with the procedures that apply within the Executive Branch for the protection of such information. Any classified information to which access has been gained through the Committee may not be divulged to any unauthorized person. Classified material shall not be photocopied or otherwise reproduced. In no event shall classified information be discussed in a non-secure environment. Apparent violations of this rule should be reported as promptly as possible to the Chairman for appropriate action.

(h) Other Regulations. The Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such additional regulations and procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the Committee. Members of the Committee will be given notice of any such regulations and procedures promptly. They may be modified or waived in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

21. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

All Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings which are open to the public may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any such methods of coverage in accordance with the provisions of clause 3 of House rule XI.

The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall determine, in his or her discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room, but shall not limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two (2) representatives from each medium.

Such coverage shall be in accordance with the following requirements contained in section 116(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, and clause 4 of XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

(a) If the television, Internet or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(b) No witness served with a subpoena by the Committee shall be required against his will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, Internet or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(c) The allocation among cameras permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee in a hearing room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(d) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and Member of the Committee or its subcommittees or the visibility of that witness and that Member to each other.

(e) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(f) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee or subcommittee is in session.

(g) Floodlights, spotlights, strobe lights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the current state-of-the-art level of television coverage.

(h) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos, United Press International News pictures, and Reuters. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee for coverage of the

hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(i) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the Members of the Committee or its subcommittees.

(j) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(k) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(l) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery Committee of Press Photographers.

(m) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

22. SUBPOENA POWERS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee, following consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

In addition, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of the Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, when authorized by a majority of the Members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present.

Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

23. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever the Speaker is to appoint a conference committee, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees those Members of the Committee who are primarily responsible for the legislation (including to the full extent practicable the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House), who have actively participated in the Committee or subcommittee consideration of the legislation, and who agree to attend the meetings of the conference. With regard to the appointment of minority Members, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member.

24. GENERAL OVERSIGHT

Not later than February 15th of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of rule X of the House of Representatives.

In accordance with the provisions of clause 2(n) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, the Committee or a subcommittee thereof shall hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following its establishment on the topic of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in programs within its jurisdiction, as documented in reports received from a Federal Office of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General of the United States that have been provided to the Ranking Minority Member prior to the notice of the hearing pursuant to Committee rule 5.

25. OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Any additional procedures or regulations may be modified or rescinded in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 22, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

91. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention [Docket No.: OCC-2013-0010] (RIN: 1557-AD40) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

92. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention [Docket No.: OCC-2013-0010] (RIN: 1557-AD40) received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

93. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

94. A letter from the Delegate of the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Education, transmitting notification that, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270), OMB Circular A-76, and OMB Memo M-12-09, dated March 26, 2012, the Department's report for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 is now available online; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

95. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report entitled ''The Impact of Recruitment Strategy on Fair and Open Competition for Federal Jobs'', pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

96. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a copy of the charter for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights state advisory committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

97. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Kent Narrows Draw Bridge Repairs, Kent Island Narrows; Queen Anne's County, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0898] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

98. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Harmonization of Airworthiness Standards —-Gust and Maneuver Load Requirements [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0142; Amdt. No.: 25-141] (RIN: 2120-AK12) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

99. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Damascus (OSTT) Flight Information Region (FIR) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0708; Amendment No.: 91-334; SFAR No.: 114] (RIN: 2120-AK61) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 42. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions (Rept. 114–4). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PITTS, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 7. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY,

Mr. FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BERA, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 20. A bill to reform the financing of Congressional elections by broadening participation by small dollar donors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 423. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to newborn children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, to establish a system of public financing for Congressional elections, to promote the disclosure of disbursements made in coordination with campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 425. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the treatment of coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.R. 426. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to begin with fertilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. JONES, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STEWART, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YOHO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BLUM, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LONG, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COLE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BARR, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YODER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HARDY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MARINO, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 427. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 428. A bill to provide for the expedited approval by the Secretary of Energy of liquefied natural gas exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 429. A bill to provide that in the case of a law enforcement officer who uses deadly force against a person, and thereby causes the death of that person, a hearing shall be conducted before a judge to determine whether there is probable cause for the State to bring criminal charges against the law enforcement officer relating to the death of the person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 430. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 431. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 432. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 433. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 523 East Railroad Street in Knox, Pennsylvania, as the ''Specialist Ross A. McGinnis Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 434. A bill to repeal certain amendments to the Clean Air Act relating to the expansion of the renewable fuel program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 435. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain Federal lands in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, previously identified as suitable for disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 436. A bill to amend the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide a definition of recreational vessel for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 437. A bill to provide for the retention of the name of Mount McKinley; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 438. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Joanne King Herring and posthumously to each of Charles ''Charlie'' Wilson and Gustav Lascaris ''Gust'' Avrakotos, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service to the country; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 439. A bill to suspend foreign assistance to certain countries related to unlawful migration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 440. A bill to ensure that long-term unemployed individuals are not taken into account for purposes of the employer health care coverage mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 441. A bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 442. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the coverage of the Federal prohibition against hate crimes in order to provide greater protections to persons who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 443. A bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 444. A bill to expand the research and education on and delivery of complementary and alternative medicine to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 445. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that scientific studies used in a rule making be published, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MENG, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 446. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 447. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce the limit on the amount of certain contributions which may be made to a candidate with respect to an election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ESTY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BERA, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 448. A bill to protect a woman's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 449. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make student loans dischargeable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 450. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit criminal corporations from making disbursements of funds in connection with a campaign for election for Federal, State, or local office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 451. A bill to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. UPTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 452. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to clarify when certain academic assessments shall be administered; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SALMON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 453. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to award grants on a competitive basis to public and private entities to provide qualified sexual risk avoidance education to youth and their parents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 454. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for forgiveness of certain overpayments of retired pay paid to deceased retired members of the Armed Forces following their death; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 455. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a northern border threat analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr.

FATTAH, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. YOHO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JONES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 456. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include the cost of applying to an institution of higher learning as part of the benefits provided under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 457. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to exclude the State of New Jersey from the prohibition on professional and amateur sports gambling to the extent approved by the legislature of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 458. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to permit multiemployer plans in critical status to modify plan rules relating to withdrawal liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 459. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish goals for an all-of-the-above energy production plan strategy on a 4-year basis on all onshore Federal lands managed by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 460. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. HANNA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JONES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COLE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the donation of wild game meat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.J. Res. 23. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations, limited liability companies or other corporate entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of Congress and the States to regulate political campaign contributions and expenditures, including independent expenditures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BASS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HONDA):

H.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of No Name-Calling Week in bringing attention to name-calling of all kinds and providing schools with the tools and inspiration to launch an on-going dialogue about ways to eliminate name-calling and bullying in their communities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FOXX:

H. Res. 39. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 40. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. Res. 41. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should not bail out State and local government employee pension plans or other plans that provide post-employment benefits to State and local government retirees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H. Res. 43. A resolution expressing the sense of the sense of the House recognizing and honoring the Fire Department of New York; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. KING of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 462) for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress's Power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 20.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of our Land and Naval Forces.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congressional power to provide for public financing of campaigns arises under the General Welfare Clause, Art. I, Sec. 8, of the Constitution.

In Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 91 (1976), the Supreme Court upheld the congressional power to enact public financing of presidential elections under this Clause. The Supreme Court stated with regard to the provisions in the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 establishing a presidential public financing system, ''In this case, Congress was legislating for the 'general welfare'—to reduce the deleterious influence of large contributions on our political process, to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate, and to free candidates from the rigors of fundraising.''

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 that states that Congress shall have the Power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary 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.''

Additionally, Section 1 of the XIV Amendment states, ''. . . nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. . .'' and under Section 5 of the XIV Amendment, ''The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution, and the power granted to each House of Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill is Section 4 of Article I, which gives Congress the power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power ''To establish Post Offices and post Roads.''

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached legislation falls under Congress' enumerated constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and to regulate commerce as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.''

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 1 and Article 1, Section 9.

''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Clause 8, Section 18.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper to carry into execution the preceding enumerated powers. It is necessary and proper for Congress to eliminate the National Technical Information Service in the Department of Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec. 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 18 in section 7 of section of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which states: The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into exeution the foregoing powers, and all other powers bested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which states the Congress shall have the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof''

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8—to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution.

Article I, Sec. 9—no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution (relating to Congress' power to regulate commerce . . . among the several states . . .). The United States Congress initially enacted ERISA under the Commerce Clause in order to stabilize employee pension plans that employees carry with them across state lines. This bill modifies ERISA and is thus a regulation of commerce—specifically pension plans—among more than one state.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIII Section 1, ''Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.'' Section 2, ''Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.J. Res. 23.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 24.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution: ''The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.''

By Mr. POCAN:

H.J. Res. 25.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which states:

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 38: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 90: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 114: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 131: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 132: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 139: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 143: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 146: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 148: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 153: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 154: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 159: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 167: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 169: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 173: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 187: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 197: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 199: Mr. WALZ and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 204: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 210: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 217: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 223: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 243: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 247: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 270: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 275: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 283: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 284: Mr. FORBES and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 285: Mr. ROSKAM and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 290: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 291: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 333: Mr. AMODEI, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 344: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 350: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LATTA, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 351: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 353: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUGENT, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 357: Mr. KLINE and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 367: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 383: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 386: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 388: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 393: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 399: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 401: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COOK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 402: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 403: Ms. MOORE, Mr. FARR, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 414: Mr. KING of New York.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. YOHO.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. WALZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 34: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 35: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 36: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 416: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2015 No. 10

Senate

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we love You. You are our rock, fortress, and deliverer. You have provided protection for our Nation, surrounding it with the shield of Your favor. How worthy You are of our praise.

Strengthen our lawmakers for today's journey. Give them strong hearts, sound minds, and diligent hands. May they do their ethical best to represent You, joining their plans to Your will in order to accomplish Your purposes. Incline their hearts to Your wisdom and love as You keep them on the path of integrity.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate is continuing to consider S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and there are six amendments pending, three from each side. We will begin voting on those amendments as soon as Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL work out an orderly schedule. Senators should expect votes throughout the day in relation to these amendments and any others in the queue.

POSITIVE CHANGES FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last night, the American people heard two very different addresses. One was focused on the middle class and how Washington can work together in a serious way for better jobs, higher wages, and more opportunity. It was a call for constructive cooperation. It was a call for new ideas.

I wish to commend Senator ERNST for her thoughtful address. She understands the needs of working people in a way those of a particular mindset in Washington simply don't understand. She knows that the middle class is looking for Washington to function again and that hard-working Americans want DC to focus on their needs instead of the demands of powerful special interests. That is just what they told us in November when they sent this new Republican Congress here on their behalf.

I was hoping for something similar from President Obama—not identical, of course. We don't agree on all the issues; that is clear enough. But there are enough areas of common ground where we should be able to work together. It would have been most constructive if he had put the focus of his address on those areas of potential agreement. The moment of high purpose called for the leader of the free world to show America what could be accomplished through constructive, bipartisan engagement.

The State of the Union can be about more than veto threats or strident partisanship. This kind of partisanship is what we have become accustomed to from the President. We know the President may not be wild about the people's choice of a Congress, but he owes it to the American people to find a serious way to work with the representatives they elected.

On some issues, such as cyber security, he sent a positive sign. He also began what I hope will be a sustained effort to move his own party forward to encourage them to work with us to help create more jobs by breaking down foreign trade barriers and allowing America to sell more of what it makes and grows.

Those were the good signs. But that was only part of the speech. There is not a lot serious lawmakers can do with talking points designed specifically not to pass. Members in both parties would have welcomed serious ideas about how to save and strengthen Medicare, how to protect Social Security for future generations, and how to balance the budget without tired tax hikes.

We listened closely for specific details on how he would work with both parties to achieve comprehensive tax simplification that focuses not on growing the government but on creating jobs.

The President has expressed some support for ideas such as this previously. He should have expanded on it last night. There is still time for him to do it. But whatever he chooses, the new Congress will continue working to send good ideas to his desk.

One of those good ideas is a bipartisan infrastructure project the Senate will resume working on today—the Keystone jobs bill. It is heartening to see a real debate and an amendment process on the floor of the Senate again. It is a result of a new spirit of reform that is being brought to Congress. It aims to give Members of both parties a stake in positive solutions so we can get Washington functioning again on behalf of our people.

We are looking to the President to join us in our positive mission for the middle class. It is what the American people just voted for last November. It

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

Printed on recycled paper.

is what Senator ERNST articulated so well last night. And if the President is willing to put the veto threats away and the designed-to-fail talking points aside, we can still cooperate to get some smart things done for the people we represent.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

PROGRESS FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last night the President talked about the economy and the progress we have made. The United States grew 2.6 percent last year, and in the third quarter alone our economy grew by 5 percent. Nearly 3 million jobs were created—the best year for the U.S. labor market since the height of the economic boom under President Bill Clinton. Lower gasoline prices are providing relief to many families and consumer confidence is up. The deficit has been cut in half.

Yet we know that while the economy is growing and unemployment is declining, sadly, much of the benefit is going to those at the very top of the ladder. The top 1 percent of American wage earners saw 49 percent of the decline in incomes during the recession, but they have seen 95 percent of the income gained since the recovery started. Let me repeat that. The top 1 percent of wage earners have seen 95 percent of the gains since our economy has recovered.

The gap between wages for low-income and middle-income families and those at the top is staggering. Forty-seven people in America own more than 160 million Americans combined. That has to change.

This isn't just a Democratic observation. Even Republicans have publicly agreed with us that working families are falling behind. Let me quote a few. Former Florida Governor Jeb Bush, a potential candidate for President, said: ''Here's reality: If you're fortunate enough to count yourself among the privileged, much of the rest of the Nation is drowning.'' Jeb Bush said that.

Mitt Romney, a former Republican candidate for President and perhaps a Republican candidate for President again—here is what he said last week as he has rekindled his dream for the Presidency: ''. . . the rich have gotten richer, income inequality has gotten worse, and there are more people in poverty than ever before.''

Even Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said this in an interview:

> The top third of America are doing pretty good. The bottom two-thirds are really being squeezed.

So how do we address these challenges? Our parties look at it differently.

The Republican majority in this Chamber had to pick the first bill they would bring to the floor of the Senate once they reached the majority. There were a lot of initiatives they could have considered. We know what they chose—the Keystone XL Pipeline—a pipeline owned by a Canadian company. That is the No. 1 priority of the Republicans in the Senate, bar none. When they wanted to respond to President Obama's State of the Union Address with Senator ERNST of Iowa, they focused on the Keystone XL Pipeline. What a limited vision of the future—one pipeline.

Then we took two votes yesterday on this pipeline, and it started to become clear what this pipeline is all about. It is moving Canadian tar sands from Canada, through the United States, and to a refinery in Texas. We learned yesterday the Republicans will not even support the proposition that the refined oil products coming out of this refinery will help America.

We had a simple amendment Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts offered which said that at the end of the pipeline, the refinery's oil products will be sold in America. The Republicans defeated that amendment. So all this argument about how this oil out of this pipeline is going to help our economy in the future? Nope, don't expect it to happen. Yesterday's overwhelming Republican vote made it clear.

There was a second part that was considered yesterday. This bill—the No. 1 priority of the Senate Republican majority—is going to build a pipeline, that is for sure. We said, good, if it is going to be built, use American steel in building the pipeline. That is not an outrageous suggestion. If this is such a priority for the Republicans, wouldn't they want to put Americans to work to make the steel to build the pipeline? We offered that as an amendment yesterday. Senator FRANKEN offered that amendment and the Republicans rejected it. The Republicans rejected the premise that the steel that goes into the most important pipeline in the history of America, from their point of view, should actually come from America. That is the second amendment we considered.

This special interest project, the Keystone XL Canadian-owned pipeline, is going to continue to be the No. 1 dominant issue in the Senate for days to come.

Republicans plan to do everything they can to help build a pipeline, but they want to deny millions of Americans access to health care. That is what the House Republicans have come up with. They want to come up with a plan that will literally take away the coverage of health care from Americans. Is there anyone in this country who thinks that is the right thing for our future? We are trying to reduce the number of uninsured. The Republican changes to the Affordable Care Act would increase the number of uninsured and increase the number of Americans dependent on government-sponsored health care. It doesn't sound like a Republican idea to me, but it is. That is what is coming from the House of Representatives.

There are pretty clear differences in how we help working families. For the Senate Republicans, it is to build a Canadian pipeline. Don't use American steel, don't keep the oil in America, but build this pipeline—No. 1 priority. The House Republicans take away health insurance coverage for hundreds of thousands of Americans at a time when we know that leaves people in a precarious position.

Here is what the President said last night: We want to make certain we focus on projects and programs and new ideas that can leave our children a better world and our grandchildren as well. Do we want an economy where everyone has an opportunity to climb that economic ladder or do we want a world where those who are born into lives of luxury set the rules and always come out ahead? Do we want an economy that rewards those who work hard and play by the rules or an economy where corporations rig the game so it is tails you lose, heads I win?

We know that an economy with a strong middle class is key to growing America. Yet it is becoming harder and harder for families to even reach the middle class. Working families aren't looking for a handout—not in my State. They just want a chance for a better life for their kids.

There is a way we can do this. It is called the earned-income tax credit. This is an idea supported by Republican Presidents in the past. Historically both parties have supported it. The earned-income tax credit is designed to encourage work by providing a tax credit to working families.

The President's proposal, similar to one that SHERROD BROWN and I have introduced, would expand the credit to help the only group that our Tax Code pushes into poverty: childless workers. What a difference this would make for millions of working families, the difference between paying a heating bill or putting it off, the difference between getting a prescription filled or waiting. A small refundable tax credit for these workers can make a bigger difference than many U.S. Senators would ever realize.

The President also proposed making 2 years of community college free for responsible students and giving motivated students a path to a solid educational foundation without debt. This is not a Democratic idea. The President acknowledged last night that this idea came from a Republican Governor in Tennessee. I might add that a Democratic mayor, Rahm Emanuel of Chicago, has a similar program, but the President went to Tennessee to acknowledge that the Republican legislature and the Republican Governor had come up with a good idea. So to argue this is somehow a partisan idea, it sure isn't in Tennessee. If it is partisan, it is a Republican partisan idea.

The President understands that in the 20th century, maybe K–12 was just enough to make it. In the 21st century it is not enough. K–14, most of us understand, is the ticket to a good-paying job.

I called in to some of the media this morning from Illinois, and they said, oh, this community college free tuition idea—another Federal mandate. Well, let me disabuse you of this idea. This is voluntary. It is original. States decide if they want to be part of it, but I think those States that want to be part of free community college tuition for good, achieving, hard-working students are on the right track, and those who ignore it may fall behind.

The jobs of this century will require more training and education than ever. I think this notion is a good one. Have we ever gone wrong in the history of the United States by investing in education, investing in our students, investing in our future? That is what the President's proposal does. It has been dismissed out of hand by the Republicans, even though it had a Republican origin. That is a mistake. We should count on our community colleges, the affordable alternative for higher education for 40 percent of America's college students. And thank goodness it steers these kids away from these Godforsaken for-profit colleges and universities which too often exploit these young people, these young men and women, sink them deep in debt and, if they are lucky, hand them a worthless diploma at the end of the day. Community colleges are the affordable ticket in Kentucky, in Illinois, and across America.

The President reminded us last night that we live in a great country and our economy is recovering. But while the wealthiest Americans are doing fine, more American families are spending hours at the kitchen table trying to figure out how to make ends meet. Let's help those families. Let's agree to help those families. One Canadian-owned pipeline is not the answer. We need to think about education, we need to think about a Federal transportation bill, and we need to think about investing in America and its future.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the recent terror attacks in France, it is tough to know what the House of Representatives is thinking. Last week, the U.S. House of Representatives threatened to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. That is the government agency responsible for protecting America from the threat of terrorism.

Why are we debating full funding for the Department of Homeland Security? Every other government agency, I might add, has been properly funded through the omnibus bill. But the Republicans insisted on not funding the Department of Homeland Security, which fights terrorism in the regular orderly appropriations process. They insisted this Department be funded only through the end of February. Does that mean that America is safe from terrorism? I wish it were true. But we know that we are only one terrorist away from a terrible incident in America.

One of the Departments with the major responsibility of protecting us is the Department of Homeland Security. So why did the Republicans decide they wanted to make the funding of this Department uncertain and contingent?

Well, the reason was they are so angry with President Obama's Executive order on immigration that they are putting America at risk by failing to properly fund the Department of Homeland Security. Then last week, the bill the House passed made the appropriation for this Department contingent on five riders. A rider is an addition. It is language that doesn't relate to a budget or appropriation, and it relates to the Executive orders that were established by the President.

The House bill passed last week would defund President Obama's immigration policies, including the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA, which has been in place for over 2 years.

What does DACA do? By the President's Executive order, it puts on hold the deportations of immigrant students who grew up in America. It allows these young people to continue to live and work in this country on a temporary basis. They are known, in shorthand, as the DREAMers.

I know a little bit about this because I introduced the first DREAM Act 14 years ago in the U.S. Senate. It has become a very familiar term, but when I first started, no one had ever heard of it. What I found was there were young people brought to the United States by their parents at a very early age who had, obviously, no voice in the decision, raised in America, undocumented, went through our schools, were successful, had no criminal problems, and wanted a future.

They couldn't get a future under American law. The DREAM Act would give them that opportunity to move to legal status. We have already invested in these young people, in their education, so why would we want to give up on their talents by deporting them after they are educated? That is exactly what the U.S. House of Representatives has proposed.

In 2010, I joined with Republican Senator Richard Lugar. We wrote a letter to President Obama. It said: Why would we deport these young DREAMers? They offer so much potential for America.

A year later, 22 Senators joined me in sending a followup letter to the President, and he issued his Executive order called DACA.

Six hundred thousand eligible DREAMers have signed up for DACA, which means for these 600,000, they can live and work in America without the fear of deportation. It makes a big difference. Thirty thousand of them live in Illinois. We estimate there are another 1.5 million eligible.

The Center for American Progress says these young people aren't just taking up space, they are going to add to the economy because of their talents. They estimate that these DREAMers will add $329 billion to our economy and create 1.4 million new jobs by 2030. That is a pretty tall prediction to think that these young people could have that impact on our economy.

Let me tell you the story of one of the DREAMers whom the House Republicans would deport, and you may understand why this estimate of the profound, important impact of these DREAMers on our economy is realistic.

As I mentioned, I introduced the DREAM Act 14 years ago. I have come to the floor over 50 times to tell stories of these DREAMers who, frankly, make the case for passing the DREAM Act and for defeating this hate-filled provision that was passed by the U.S. House. I am going to continue to update these stories about these DREAMers so you can understand why giving up on these DREAMers is giving up on the future of this country.

I want to tell you the story about Carlos Martinez. Here is a picture of him. Carlos is holding his DACA card under the President's Executive order. Carlos and his brother were brought to the United States in 1991. Carlos was 9 years old. He came to this country and didn't speak one word of English, and his father told him, ''Estudien para que no batallen en la vida como yo.'' What it means in English is: Study so you don't have to struggle in life like I have.

Carlos took his father's advice to heart. At high school in Tucson, AZ, Carlos graduated ninth in his class. Then he enrolled at the University of Arizona. He was undocumented at the time. He had never owned a computer, but he loved math and he dreamed about being a computer engineer.

Four years later, in 2003, Carlos Martinez graduated with a bachelor of science degree in computer engineering and a minor in computer science, electrical engineering, and math. He was named the top Hispanic graduate in his class.

For the record, Carlos Martinez did not qualify for 1 penny of Federal assistance to go to college, and you can imagine in Arizona probably not 1 penny of State assistance. But he made it through, graduating as the top Hispanic in his class from the University of Arizona. But after he graduated, reality set in. He received job offers from Intel, IBM, and a host of tech companies, but then they found out he was undocumented. He couldn't be hired.

He didn't give up. He enrolled in the master's program for software systems engineering at the University of Arizona. He completed a 2½ year program in a year and a half.

Carlos Martinez was also nominated for the University of Arizona Graduate School Centennial Award, given to the school's top graduate student.

Carlos Martinez submitted his application for DACA when President Obama created this opportunity in August of 2012. The first day the forms were available, he was in line. He was one of the first to be approved. As soon as he received the notification he had been approved under this Executive order, Carlos Martinez went to a career fair at the University of Arizona and handed out his resumes to IBM, Intel, and other high-tech companies. Today Carlos Martinez is working for IBM. Out of more than 10,000 applicants for the job he filled, he was one of only 75 who were hired.

Is America a better place to have that kind of educated individual working with good ideas, creating new products, expanding employment opportunities? Of course it is.

So now the U.S. House of Representatives has decided the best thing for the future of America is to deport Carlos Martinez and deport those other young students who hold such potential for this country. That is the House Republican approach to immigration—deport Carlos Martinez.

There are so many other DREAMers around this country with the same talents as Carlos. I want the American people to understand the human cost of the proposal that has been sent to us by the House of Representatives under Republican control. The House Republicans want to end DACA. Hundreds of thousands of people such as Carlos Martinez, protected by DACA, would be deported, and 1.5 million eligible to apply for DACA would never have that chance. It is shameless, shameless to play politics with the lives of nice young people who grew up in America and want to be part of our future, and it is so shortsighted.

Will America be stronger if Carlos Martinez is gone? The House Republicans say yes, he should leave. After all of this investment, K–12, bachelor's degree at the University of Arizona, the top graduate student in his master's program at that same university, the House Republicans say, ''Deport Carlos Martinez.'' They feel so strongly about this they are willing to hold up the appropriation for the Department of Homeland Security, the agency responsible for protecting our Nation.

Let me be clear. Democrats are not going to be swayed by this blackmail. We will insist the Department of Homeland Security be properly funded to protect America and to do it now. This President made it clear he is ready to sign that bill, the sooner the better. Let's not assume that America has somehow been immunized or inoculated and never can be threatened again by terrorists. Let us properly fund the Department of Homeland of Security, and let us not pursue that shameless agenda sent to us by the House Republicans. Let's remove these riders and give Carlos Martinez and thousands of others just like him a chance to be part of America's future.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last night the President delivered the State of the Union Address. So it was interesting to hear the acting minority leader talking about homeland security, budgeting for homeland security. I know the Presiding Officer, through his service to our Nation overseas, wearing a uniform, keeping us safe, keeping us free—the Presiding Officer has concerns, as do I, about what we heard last night.

It was interesting to hear some of the commentary after the President's speech as we talk about securing the homeland and what it means for the American public. Andrea Mitchell, MSNBC, ''I think that on foreign policy his''—meaning President Obama's—''projection of success against terrorism and against ISIS, in particular, is not close to reality.'' The President of the United States, ''not close to reality.''

I have just come back from a trip to the Middle East, been to Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Israel. I concur with Andrea Mitchell; that on the specifics of the President's assessment of success against terrorism and against ISIS, this President ''is not close to reality.'' So Republicans are going to continue to bring forth the issues to the American people of what reality is like in the world, in spite of the way the President may address it, because of the specific failures of this President and his foreign policy.

It is interesting. Last night in the State of the Union Address, the President started by saying that ''the state of the Union is strong.'' The state of our Union is strong. But President Obama mistakenly took credit for that strength. He implied it was because of his policies, because of his actions. On that point this President could not have gotten it more wrong. The state of our Union is strong because of the strength of the American people.

Americans are resilient. Americans are hardworking. In the November elections, the American people showed they can act decisively. It is interesting, this morning's headline, New York Times: ''Staunchly Liberal Wish List Brushes Off G.O.P.'s Gains.'' Headline, New York Times, bright, bold, above the fold. ''Staunchly Liberal Wish List Brushes off G.O.P.'s Gains.''

So we are a resilient nation. People know what they believe. They know how they feel. They voted those beliefs. When the American people chose Republicans to lead both Houses of Congress, they said clearly they wanted change, a change from Barack Obama, a change from the direction he has been taking this country. People want Democrats to start working with Republicans to get things done.

The American people said in the November elections they are tired of the gridlock, they are tired of the dysfunction, tired of Democrats running the Senate to protect their own jobs and not caring about the jobs of middle-class Americans.

President Obama had a great opportunity last night, an opportunity to show that he understands what Americans have been telling him. Instead he went out and he gave the same speech he always gives. It was a partisan attack on Republicans and the Americans who voted to put the Republicans in charge in the House and in the Senate.

It is interesting listening to the commentary after the speech. Wolf Blitzer, CNN, said, ''I don't remember a State of the Union address where I heard a President issue so many veto threats to the opposite party in the Congress.''

So we have Andrea Mitchell, MSNBC, saying that in terms of foreign policy the President's views ''are not close to reality.'' CNN, Wolf Blitzer, ''I do not remember a State of the Union address where I heard a President issue so many veto threats to the opposite party in the United States Congress,'' especially when it is at a time, as the New York Times point out, of GOP gains in the elections, the President specifically ignoring what has happened across this country in the November elections. President Obama seems to have missed the November elections entirely.

Republicans know we have an obligation to the American people to deliver effective, efficient, and accountable government. We have an opportunity and an obligation to put Americans first. Last night President Obama showed he still wants to put Washington first. Republicans are not willing to help this President continue down the same wrong road that the American people have rejected. Let's be honest. This past election was a rejection election, rejecting the policies of this President, this administration.

We are charting a new course and a better direction. We are already making progress. The Senate is working like it has not worked in years. We are debating actual legislation, laying on the floor the Keystone Pipeline jobs

bill. We are allowing Senators to offer amendments. We actually had votes on three amendments yesterday. We are going to pass this bill. We are going to send it to the President's desk.

Then we are going to turn to more jobs bills and the important issues the American people care about. We are going to work on reforming our health care system. In his speech last night President Obama offered no solutions on the major issues facing this country. Instead, he offered the same old tired policies of higher taxes, more Washington spending, more bureaucracy, more obstruction of bipartisan solutions coming out of the new Congress.

The President said Congress should focus on areas where we agree. That is exactly what Republicans have been doing. We are moving bipartisan bills, bills that overwhelming majorities of Americans support. The President continues to threaten to veto them, things such as the Keystone XL Pipeline bill that supports 42,000 American jobs. That is not my number. That is what the State Department—the President's own State Department—said, it would support 42,000 American jobs.

In a poll last week, 65 percent of Americans said the President should sign that into law. We will pass bills to allow for more exports of American energy and to give the President trade promotion authority that he has asked for and that America needs. We will pass commonsense reforms to America's health care system, to end many of the outrageous and expensive mandates for coverage that people do not want, do not need, cannot afford.

We will pass bipartisan education reform to give all of America's 50 million students a better chance to succeed. We will push for tax simplification, to make taxes less fair, less complicated. That is what Americans need to compete in the 21st century. We do not need higher taxes, more debt to pay for spending and more IRS agents, things the American people do not believe we need.

Republicans are going to send the President bills that will help expand our economy by growing the private sector, not by growing the Washington bureaucracy. We are going to pass bills that increase how much families earn and how much of that they actually get to keep, not just how much Washington gets to take and the President gets to spend.

So the state of our Union is strong. It is also in greater agreement than it has been in years about the direction this country should take. President Obama could have taken the opportunity last night to actually talk about this. He could have offered a positive plan to work with Republicans and Democrats in Congress instead of the defiant tone he placed upon the country.

He made threats to veto bipartisan legislation. He chose to double down on more obstruction, more unaccountable Washington bureaucracy, more wasted tax dollars. The American people have rejected this course. The American people want a better path, not the same old tired speech from a President now in the final quarter of his time as President.

The speech is over. Now the President needs to decide what he is actually going to do. Is he ready to get on board with bipartisan ideas or does he want to spend the next 2 years as a lameduck. There are Democrats in this body who agree it is actually time for the Senate to get back to work. They are ready to listen to ideas, good ideas, work with Republicans to help America, to help the American people thrive.

This President should work with all of us. That is what Americans want. They want us to work together. They want us to change the direction our country has been headed for the first 6 years of President Obama's time in office. This Republican Congress is listening to the American people. The President continues to ignore them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, similar to the rest of the country, I listened with close attention to the President's State of the Union Address last night. I had a pretty good seat down front. I got to listen to the President very closely. Of course I was interested because this presented a great opportunity for the President, following a very eventful election on November 4, to state his vision for the country and most particularly to talk about his plans for working with the new Congress that was elected in November.

It was a big election for a lot of reasons but one was that we got nine new Republican Members of the Senate. I have been in the Senate in the minority and I have been in the Senate in the majority. I can tell you I like it a lot better in the majority. But the fact is that notwithstanding a very good election, from my perspective, on November 4, one that sent a real clear message, I was left to wonder whether the President got that message.

While I believe this was a referendum on Washington's dysfunction in dealing with so many of the issues that face hard-working American families, what the President seemed to promise was more dysfunction. But I for one am here to say we are not going to follow the President down this low road. We will try to find areas where we can work with the President. He did mention a few: things such as trade, things such as criminal justice reform. There are a few things the President seemed to indicate were not partisan issues. We look forward to working with him on those issues.

But the biggest problem we have and which still faces our country is the fact that notwithstanding one pretty good quarter of economic growth, our economy and our recovery are still pretty fragile. We know the number of people, the percentage of Americans in the workforce is at about a 30-year low. Some of that is because they have looked for work and they cannot find work, Americans who are seeking full-time work and have to settle for part-time work. Part of it is because of the President's own policies, things such as the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—which incentivizes employers to put people on part-time work in order to avoid some of the penalties.

But notwithstanding my optimism after this important election we had in November and the potential we have working together—the President and Congress—to try to address the challenges that face our country, my optimism was quickly tempered. Why only tempered optimism? I heard, as the Senator from Wyoming, my friend Mr. BARRASSO, mentioned, the President has issued seven veto threats since the election—seven veto threats; this from a President who in the first 6 years of his term of office has only vetoed one bill.

But the first thing he does after this election, where it should have been a wake-up call to him and others—should have been a wake-up call to all of us—he is issuing seven veto threats to bills that have not even been voted out of the Senate, that have not even made their way to his desk. To me that sends a very disturbing message that the President, instead of just being Commander in Chief, wants to be the obstructionist in chief. I do not know how else to interpret that.

Then there is the President's disquieting tendency to take credit for things other people have done, and for his own failures, to blame them on someone else. It is truly disturbing. Since this new Congress has convened, it seems to me it has been a tale of two branches of government.

While the Congress has shown a commitment to working together—and in my private conversations with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of them are eager to work with us to try to find solutions to these challenges on a bipartisan basis.

This is one reason why the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, chose the Keystone XL Pipeline legislation, because it enjoys broad, bipartisan support. We thought it was important to demonstrate, right out of the starting gates, that we actually listened to what the American people told us on November 4—that they want us to work together and they are tired of the dysfunction. But it appears the President hasn't noticed or, perhaps more accurately, he doesn't really care what the American people said on November 4.

If the President isn't going to listen to the American people and the voters who voted in a referendum on his policies—those are not my words; those are his—I wish he would at least listen to what he himself has said. He has said time and again that elections have consequences.

Well, I agree with that. Who wouldn't. But this is the same President who 22 times said he did not have the authority to issue an Executive action on immigration and then turned around and did it. Twenty-two times he said he didn't have the authority, and then he did it.

What I have learned in Washington is we can't just listen to what people say. We have to watch what they do. We have a track record of the past 6 years of what this President has done and not just what he has said.

As I say, the intransigence and the tone deafness was pretty shocking last night. Notwithstanding, the President gave a good speech. What I think the President really hadn't cracked the code on—as anybody in elected office has to understand—is that there is a difference between running for office and actually governing once the election is over. But this President seems to be in a perpetual campaign mode, making promises that sound like campaign promises rather than recognizing the reality of divided government and looking for opportunities to work together to actually solve problems.

So he is back on the campaign trail again. I think he is going to Idaho and other places around the country touting his new agenda—hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes. Of course, somebody has to pay the bills, but the President mainly talked about free stuff last night. Free stuff is always pretty popular. I am surprised he didn't offer Americans free beer and pizza while he was at it. It is very popular.

But the American people are not dumb. They understand somebody is going to have to pay the bill, and the President ignored that entirely. He also ignored that for the past 6 years this President has added $7 trillion to the national debt. It is now over $18 trillion.

Now, I know that it is impossible for the human mind to wrap itself around a figure that big. That is so big that it is incomprehensible in many ways. But we didn't hear a thing about the President adding $7 trillion to the national debt.

What he did take credit for—this is interesting because I have mentioned he takes credit for things he had nothing to do with and he blames other people for his own failures. But here is where he was half right. He did say that the deficit—the difference between the money we bring in and the money we spend—actually had gone down a little bit.

That is true, but the fact remains that we are still adding to the national debt for every dollar of deficit spending. But what the President also did not say is the main reason why the annual deficit had gone down was because he advocated one of the largest tax increases in recent history—perhaps in all of American history—during the fiscal cliff debate. Then, of course, there was the sequester, which are the caps put on discretionary spending, which the President railed against even though he was the one who thought this up during the so-called supercommittee deliberations.

I couldn't help but think, as the President kept talking about raising taxes, increasing spending, and not dealing with problems such as the looming debt, that he was turning us more into Europe, a welfare state, where everybody would look to the government to take care of them, not a country that we were left by our parents and grandparents, where we could exercise our individual freedom and seek opportunities to rise above what we had been left by previous generations.

To me that is the most important difference in what the President said last night and what he might have said, because our children do deserve more opportunities. The truth is that for most of us who are people my age, we are going to be OK. But the fact is the next generation, my children and beyond, have been bequeathed more debt.

Now the President wants to add on to that debt—more taxes, more spending, bigger government.

If there was one thing that was rejected in this last election, it was what we have had for the past 6 years. What we have had for the past 6 years was a grand experiment in government. We have always had this debate about the size and the role of the Federal Government, but we have never had such an aggressive attempt to grow the size of the government in recent memory, certainly since the New Deal, as under the past 6 years. What the American people, I believe, rejected was this experiment in big government.

Perhaps that would be understandable if there weren't examples of what actually does work, what does grow the economy, what does put more money in hard-working taxpayers' pockets, and what does provide more jobs and opportunity. One reason why it seems somewhat obvious to me is because I see what has been done in places such as my home State of Texas, and it has been done in other States where they put their trust in people and not in bigger government that somebody has to pay for.

The formula is not all that unique. Governor Perry, who just left office after 14 years, when people talked about the ''Texas miracle,'' said: No, it is not a miracle; a miracle is a supernatural event. This is the Texas model. It is a conscious effort to choose policies that actually work, that grow the economy and create jobs, lower taxes, and result in less red tape and a balanced budget.

Wouldn't that be nice? We haven't had a balanced budget in Washington since 2009. It is really malpractice.

There are other policies that would foster a better business environment and encourage businesses to invest and grow because that creates jobs, that creates rising wages and a successful middle class. So the fact is that if it works in the States, it can work here too.

Now, measures such as reforming the Tax Code to provide tax relief in a way that incentivizes people to work harder and produce more are pro-growth tax policies—not regressive policies such as the President has proposed, which would make it harder.

Improving infrastructure projects—the President talked about infrastructure last night, but he has also issued a veto threat on the Keystone XL Pipeline. We are—I agree with the Senator from Wyoming—going to approve it, put it on his desk, and then it is up to him. Then, of course, there is putting Americans back to work and repealing oppressive government overreach—such as ObamaCare.

There is a difference between governing and campaigning. The President—there is no doubt about it—is a world class campaigner. He is right that he won two elections by running very successful campaigns, but he seems absolutely disinterested, detached, and, indeed, actually an obstacle to governing, which is the job in front of us.

In closing, I would say the state of the Union is always a work in progress, but it should always be improving. It is my sincere hope the President will realize the hand he has been dealt, which is one of divided government, and that rather than campaigning perpetually, making promises for free stuff, higher taxes, and bigger government, that he would work with us to solve some of the very clear challenges that confront us, primarily ones that will help grow our economy and put Americans back to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I thought last night, as the majority whip just mentioned, that the President once again showed his sense of why the majority in the Congress and the majority of people in the country support the Keystone XL Pipeline. It is not just about the pipeline, even though he doesn't quite seem ever to get that. It is about whether we are going to truly take advantage of more American energy.

Clearly, the President suggested that was one of the great accomplishments of his administration. I think we could make the argument—and make it effectively—that his administration hasn't done much to implement the great steps we have made forward. In fact, on public lands and other measures that we were in the process of considering when he became President,

they have backed away from that rather than stepped forward.

We seem to be unwilling to step forward and embrace this great opportunity that is so much more than the jobs for just the pipeline itself.

I filed two amendments today on the pipeline bill—the topic we are talking about, the topic my good friend from North Dakota has done so much to bring attention to since the day he arrived in the Senate.

It was 4 years ago, when the Keystone XL Pipeline application was only 2 years old at the time. Now 6 years later, we are continuing to miss an opportunity. It seems that on this topic, as once was said about seeking a solution to the Middle East, we can't seem to miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity.

But the two amendments I have filed deal with a couple of critical issues that relate to our energy future and our infrastructure future. One would be a community affordability amendment where we would have to have a study to look at the impact that all of these EPA regulations have on communities. These are EPA's unfunded mandates on communities, where they tell communities they have to do things but really don't give the community any idea how to pay for it.

The Presiding Officer and I are from two States that have many small communities. Those small communities often have a water system, a sewer system, and a storm water system, and the EPA comes in and says: Here is what we want you to do—maybe not with one of those, maybe with all of those—the air quality, the water quality.

I know the EPA has one regulation on water where the solution can't cost more than 2 percent of the median income over a specific period of time.

Now, 2 percent of your income, if you haven't been paying it for your water bill, your sewer bill or your whatever bill—2 percent of your income is taken right off the top of your income. It makes a difference to most families, but at least there is a cap there. But you can have that 2 percent on increasing the cost of the water system and another 2 or 4 or 5 percent on increasing the storm water system, and somebody has to pay those bills.

What this amendment does is suggest that we figure out who is paying those bills, what is a reasonable way to pay those bills, and how those bills can be paid. We know on the Senate floor, and the President knows, and the EAP knows who pays those bills and the people who have access to those services. There is no mythical payee here. The person who pays your utility bill is you, and if there is increased cost to the utility system, that comes to you. The person who pays your water bill is you.

So I believe we need to have a coordinated effort to see how those projects impact communities, impact families, and understand how this works.

So this amendment that I filed today directs the EPA to collaborate with the National Academy of Public Administration to review existing studies of costs associated with major EPA regulations. The amendment also directs the administration to determine how different localities can effectively fund these projects. The end result would be to come up with a working definition of a phrase they use a lot—individual and community affordability—but I can't find any evidence that this phrase—individual and community affordability—really means anything.

The amendment I filed today has already been endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the chamber of commerce in my hometown, Springfield, MO.

The other amendment I am filing, submitted as a sense of the Senate, is that the President's U.S.-China greenhouse gas amendment would be looked at in a different way. This amendment is cosponsored by my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE. It talks about the agreement negotiated between the President and the People's Republic of China and, in fact, says this agreement really has no force and effect because frankly, Mr. President, it already has no force and effect in China. Of the two parties the President says have agreed to this, we are the only one who would have to do anything. We think this is a bad idea—Senator INHOFE and I—and I think others will join us. It is a bad deal for our country, it is economically unfair, it is environmentally irresponsible, and once again it produces exactly the opposite result of what we would want.

First of all, I think the Constitution is pretty clear on agreements negotiated between countries. There is a Senate role to be played. It requires the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senate should insist we do that job. Whether it is here or on any other agreements with other countries, those agreements need to be consented to by the Senate. It happens to say that in the Constitution.

These agreements, under this amendment, also would have to be accompanied by actions that may be necessary to implement the agreement, including what it costs to implement. The amendment says the United States should not sign bilateral or other international agreements on greenhouse gases that will cause serious economic harm to the United States. It also says the United States should not agree to any bilateral or international agreement imposing unequal greenhouse gas commitments on the United States.

The reason I filed this amendment is simple. The agreement the President unilaterally negotiated with China and announced last November is a bad deal for workers and a bad deal for families, whether those workers are in Missouri or Arkansas or anywhere else in the country today. The agreement requires the United States to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from 26 to 28 percent below the 2005 levels by 2025. It allows the Chinese to increase their emissions until 2030.

So last night the President said in his State of the Union Address that the United States will double the pace at which we cut carbon pollution and China committed for the first time to limiting their emissions. Well, let's be very frank about that. The President is actually right. He has agreed that we would double the pace, somewhere around 26 to 28 percent below the 2005 levels in the near term, but the Chinese have agreed actually to be allowed to increase their emissions for another 15 years and then they would consider—they would consider—reducing emissions after that. What this does is drive jobs and opportunity to China and other countries that care a lot less about what comes out of the smokestack than we do. We lose the jobs we otherwise would have had. We try to solve a global problem on our own even though we have made great strides already, some of which were cost-effective, but they get less cost-effective all the time.

I am grateful my colleagues allowed me to have a few extra minutes. I have filed these amendments, and we will be talking more about them and the Keystone XL Pipeline issue over the next few days. I look forward to having a vote on these amendments and the vote on the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are in morning business and the minority is now entitled to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in morning business on the pending issue on the floor, and I am glad my friend and colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, is on the floor as well. Perhaps we can do something unprecedented and actually have a dialogue on the issue, if the Senator is open to that suggestion. After I make some opening remarks, I will try to request that through the Chair but only if the Senator is interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I certainly would welcome that opportunity and look forward to joining the Senator from Illinois in that dialogue.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota and warn him that we are getting perilously close to a Senate debate, which almost never happens. So we want to alert all the news bureaus that this might even turn into a debate on the floor of the Senate.

This is Senate bill 1. It is the highest priority of the Senate Republican majority. It is their first bill in the majority. They decided their first bill would be the Keystone XL Pipeline bill. The Keystone XL Pipeline is not owned by an American company; it is owned by a Canadian company, is my understanding, TransCanada. What they are doing is shipping tar sands from Canada—at least it is proposed here—into the United States, across the Midwest, to be refined in Texas and then turned into refined oil products, which could include, of course, gasoline, diesel fuel, jet fuel, and other things.

Yesterday we had two votes on the floor of the Senate about this pipeline and what it is going to produce, and they were interesting votes.

In the first vote we said: Well, if we are going to have this pipeline come into the United States of America and bring Canadian tar sands to be refined, then whatever oil it produces, the products it produces, should be used in America to help Americans reduce the cost of gasoline, to make it cheaper for manufacturing concerns to use their products.

The Republicans rejected that notion that the oil and products produced by the Keystone XL Pipeline would be used in America. They rejected that. I think the vote was 57 to 42. Three or four Democrats joined them, but all of the Republicans, if I am not mistaken, voted to say the products coming out of this pipeline wouldn't be used in America.

Then we offered a second amendment. The second amendment said: Well, if we are going to build this pipeline—and a lot has been said about this being the Keystone jobs bill—shouldn't we use American steel, use American products to build it so that it truly does create jobs in the steel industry and demand for steel products?

The Republicans rejected that amendment as well. So their idea of a Keystone jobs pipeline is a pipeline that produces a product that won't be sold in America and a pipeline that is built with foreign steel. That is their idea of an American jobs bill?

There is also another aspect of this, on which I have introduced an amendment. There is a dirty little secret about this Keystone XL Pipeline which we will get to vote on today. This is what it comes down to. For the longest time nobody looked at Canadian tar sands as a viable source of a product that could be refined into gasoline or diesel fuel. The reason it was never considered viable was the price of a barrel of oil was too low. They knew that in these tar sands up in Canada, there was the potential of drawing oil after they went through a lengthy and expensive process, and they couldn't afford it until the price of oil started knocking on the door of $80, $90 and $100, and then Canadian tar sands became viable. They could afford to refine the product and make some money. And that is what happened.

The Canadian tar sands were developed in Alberta, and they were shipped to the United States and other places to be refined. In fact, the first Keystone pipeline, I would argue—although it went by a different name—actually went to Illinois. It went to Wood River, IL, to the Conoco refinery, and I have seen it. I have seen the refinery since it has been receiving these tar sands.

The reason why it is more expensive to use Canadian tar sands to produce oil products is you have to take out the tar sands. That is a viscous, nasty product that has to be dealt with with extraordinary refining capacity, which they developed at Wood River, what is now the Phillips refinery. I have seen it.

The dirty little secret about this process is that after they have taken off the worst parts of it—the parts that are not really economically valuable to most—they have to do something with it, and it turns out that in this process they generate huge amounts of what is known as petcoke. Petcoke is the byproduct of Canadian tar sands. Petcoke is what is left over after they take what is valuable out of Canadian tar sands. And there is a lot of it.

Proponents of the bill would like to tell you the pipeline won't have any harmful environmental impact, but a lot of communities across America know better—Detroit, Chicago, and Long Beach, CA, for three. These communities have seen what happens when big refineries near their homes start processing large amounts of Canadian tar sands.

Let me show an illustration. This is from the city of Chicago—the city of Chicago. This is a Chicago neighborhood. If you didn't know better, you would assume it is someplace in a remote area. It is not. This Chicago neighborhood looks an awful lot like Little Rock, AR; Fargo, North Dakota, except take a look at what is next door to these little bungalows and homes. This is a petcoke dumpsite.

The British Petroleum refinery receives Canadian tar sands in Whiting, IN, refines them, and the leftover product—this petcoke sludge—is shipped over to the city of Chicago, where it is deposited in piles that are three- and four-stories high. I have seen them.

The residents started noticing these mountain-like piles of petcoke appearing right over the train tracks from their homes and at a local baseball field after the Whiting refinery began processing tar sands. You might imagine that on windy days, giant clouds of petcoke dust swirl above these storage piles and cover the neighborhoods. I have seen them. I have visited them. So these working families, when the wind is blowing in their direction, end up with this petcoke blowing into their homes, into the lungs of their children.

Often, the dust from these petcoke piles means that people living in the southeastern part of Chicago are forced to breathe dirty air that one organization—National Nurses United—says causes severe health threats. You see, petcoke—this product from Canadian tar sands—contains heavy metals such as nickel, vanadium, and selenium. Nickel causes cancer. Chronic exposure to nickel can cause neurological and developmental defects among children. You can see this nasty petcoke on the windowsills and buildings around this neighborhood, but you can't see it in the lungs of the children until it is too late.

The National Institute For Occupational Safety and Health warns that inhaling nickel-laced dust increases your risk for lung cancer and fibrosis.

Petcoke dust also contains polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, which have been linked to cancer as well. And it is not just because the chemical composition of petcoke is toxic; the dust particles themselves are extremely dangerous. When you inhale petcoke, that dust can get trapped in your lungs, causing respiratory problems. Once in the lungs, these tiny particles can aggravate asthma, leading to premature death in people with heart or lung disease, and cause heart attacks.

Yesterday I made the point that when I visit schools across my State to ask how many students in the classroom know someone who has asthma, without fail, rural or urban schools, half the hands go up. I invite my colleagues to do the same. So anything we do to aggravate this asthma threat we face is something we ought to think about very carefully. Some safety documents even note that long-term exposure to petcoke might cause damage to the lung, liver, and kidney.

Because of petcoke dust, the city of Chicago has advised residents in this neighborhood and around it to limit the time they are outdoors. In addition, Mayor Emanuel and the city are working with residents and local environmental organizations to limit the amount of petcoke that can be stored in the city and to require that it be enclosed in facilities that would protect it from blowing around.

This isn't the first city in America to face this danger from Canadian tar sands, which will be transported, if built, by the Keystone XL Pipeline. The city of Detroit, shipping ports near Los Angeles, they have dealt with petcoke piles too. We need to do more.

Many of these cities have had to act because for years petcoke has been exempt from regulation under many Federal environmental laws, and it has not been forced to comply with Federal cleanup standards.

The Federal Government's views on the official side of the ledger—the regulatory side of the ledger is that these petcoke piles are benign, not to be worried about. The health information tells us they are wrong.

That is why I proposed an amendment to end petcoke's exemptions and require the EPA and Department of Transportation to promulgate rules on how to store and transport petcoke to protect public and ecological health. It

closes the environmental loophole for petcoke.

My amendment would require we make these changes before construction is allowed to begin on this pipeline. It is important because tar sands transported by the Keystone XL Pipeline—this Canadian company—will dramatically increase the amount of petcoke produced in this country.

In the year 2013 the United States produced a record amount of 57.5 million metric tons of petcoke.

According to the environmental impact statement for the Keystone XL Pipeline, the No. 1 priority of the Senate Republican majority, this pipeline will produce over 15,400 metric tons of petcoke every day.

Under current law all of this new petcoke would continue to be shipped to local communities for storage and disposal in the same large open piles we see in this photograph in Chicago. That isn't right. We in Congress should deal with the acres of petcoke piles that are already out there before we build a pipeline that will create 15,400 metric tons of it a day. Incidentally, the BP refinery that has created this mess is generating 6,000 tons a day. More than twice as much will come out of the Keystone XL Pipeline, the No. 1 Republican Senate majority issue, S. 1, Keystone XL Pipeline, Canadian company, 35 permanent jobs but 15,400 metric tons of petcoke every single day somewhere in America.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment to treat petcoke for what it is. It is a dangerous byproduct that shouldn't be stored in open-air piles near neighborhoods, ballparks, children, and elderly people.

End the regulatory loophole for petcoke and establish reasonable guidelines for handling this dangerous material. This would help ensure that clean air and clean water is something everyone can enjoy—even if you happen to have the bad luck of living in a neighborhood near a petcoke dump site such as this one near the city of Chicago.

I see the Senator from Minnesota is seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent for the Senator from North Dakota and myself to enter into a 3-minute dialogue so we don't hold up my friend from Minnesota.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I know the Senator is a reasonable man and has been Governor of a State and understands responsibility.

Is it too much to ask that we regulate petcoke so it is not a public health hazard to the people who happen to live next door to these dumps?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to my esteemed colleague from the State of Illinois.

Of course the answer to the question is that in fact it is a regulated substance, and it is primarily regulated at the State and local level.

In the State of Illinois, for example, petcoke would be regulated by the State of Illinois. What I understand the Senator from Illinois to be saying is that he is dissatisfied with the way the State of Illinois has chosen to regulate petcoke.

But in fact the EPA has found that petcoke has a low hazard potential. According to the Congressional Research Service, most toxicity analysis of petcoke, as referenced by EPA, finds it has low health hazard potential in humans, has no observed carcinogenic, reproductive or developmental effects. In fact, it is a byproduct of not just oil from the oil sands but also some of the oils from California, Venezuela, and other places.

So it is a byproduct that in fact is recycled. It is used in products such as aluminum, steel, paint. It is used to produce electricity.

Here is a case of a product that actually can be and is in fact recycled. I would argue that what we want to do as we produce energy is continue to invest in these new technologies that will help us produce more energy but also do it with better environmental stewardship, which means we not only work on CCS, carbon capture and storage—which is a major undertaking in the oil sands right now; and I would be willing to engage in that discussion as well—but then also work to find uses for these byproducts in things such as steel and aluminum.

For example, the President last night talked about how the auto industry is making a resurgence, and he talked about the CAFE standards. One of the things they are doing in Detroit with new automobiles is they are using more aluminum in the construction of the cars to reduce the weight to try to meet those CAFE standards.

So here is a product from the oil sands oil that is actually used in aluminum to make those vehicles lighter to achieve one of the things the President talked about in the State of the Union Address last night as a byproduct from the oil sands oil.

So I appreciate the question and look forward to further dialogue.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming for a brief followup. I want to make sure I understand the Senator's position.

The Senator's position is we should not establish any Federal standards on the safety of petcoke and leave it up to the States.

He also argues it is not a danger, it is not carcinogenic, and it is low hazard, in his words. I don't know if the Senator has seen petcoke neighborhoods that have this blowing into them.

I would just say to the Senator, this notion that somehow petcoke is going to be some fabulous discovery for new inventions—maybe it will, but at this point it is being sold to China and they are burning it to generate electricity. I would just try to imagine for a moment what is coming out of those smokestacks in China, where sadly the air pollution is awful at the moment.

I yield the floor, but I don't think it is adequate to say that the city of Chicago should be regulating this substance. We have a nation which will be affected by a national pipeline from this Canadian company. We ought to have a national standard to protect Americans from the dangers of petcoke. Whether we are talking about Fargo, Little Rock or Juneau, I wouldn't want to live this close to these petcoke piles.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds for a simple point of clarification.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, the characterizations of petcoke are from the EPA and from the Congressional Research Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about the President's speech from last night. I think it was very important. It was a major event. All Members of Congress were there. To me, it was a call to action. It wasn't just ideas, it was about how to turn ideas into action. It was a strong speech focused on the middle-class economy and how we can strengthen our economy. I thought there was a lot of energy.

I know some of my colleagues in the last few months have predicted that the President was somehow going to slide down because of the actions he took on immigration or the actions he took on Cuba, and I think what we are seeing around the country is quite the opposite. I think people are excited that there is an energy, and they are certainly pleased we have seen some major improvements in the economy.

I would say to my colleagues across the aisle, whom I take at their word when they say they want to work with us to govern this country, that I think we know—if we didn't know it before, after last night—that the President is not going to be spending his next year-and-a-half slouched in an armchair planning his Presidential library. I think what we saw last night is a President who wants to get things done in his remaining time in office, and I think we see an energized country that also wants to get through the gridlock and move forward.

First of all, I think the President did a very good job of laying out the status of the economy, and I think it is very important, when there are so many numbers out there and information and people throwing things out, that we

step back and look at that. Because when we look at where we are going to move forward, we need to understand from where we came and how we ended up where we were a few years back in the midst of a recession.

So as I look at these young pages—thinking about how difficult it was for so many years for young people to find employment and that we are now finally seeing hope for young people out in the job market and how we can build what we have got.

So what do we know? We have had 58 straight months of private sector job growth. Our national unemployment is below 6 percent. In fact, in my State it is down to 3.7 percent. Our unemployment rate last year went down faster than in any other year we have seen since 1984. We are now No. 1 in oil. This fall we surpassed Saudi Arabia as the No. 1 oil and gas producer in the world. That is what our country has done because of the work in North Dakota—I see my friend Senator HOEVEN over there—because of the work going on all over this country.

As the President also pointed out last night, we also are increasing our renewable energy in wind. I would add, from the State of Minnesota, that the renewable fuel standard and the fact that we have better gas mileage standards—all of these things have helped to bring down our consumption and to raise our production, bringing these prices down in our country.

I thought one of the most interesting statistics last night was a fact I had never heard before. Since 2010, America has put more people back to work than the combined countries of all of Europe, Japan, and all advanced economies across the world. That shows that our workers are so good—something we know. It shows that our businesses are so good. I think this is an opportunity we now have to finally in this Chamber govern from opportunity, not just be governing from a state of crisis. That is what we need to do.

One of my favorite parts, of course, was Rebekah and Ben Erler from Minnesota, who were mentioned right near the beginning of his speech, sitting right up in the First Lady's gallery in the House, a woman who had gone through some hard times. Her husband had lost his job in the construction industry, but because of the strength of our State and the strength of her family, her personal strength to want to go back to work and go to a community college, her family is now stabilized. As the President pointed out, maybe their big treat is getting together for a pizza on Friday, but the point is that they have gotten through some very hard times, as have so many resilient people in this country.

So the question we now have is this: How do we get ahead? How do we keep going? I am going to go through a few of the ideas that the President discussed last night that are near and dear to my heart.

The first is community college. I would not be standing in the Senate right now if it wasn't for community college. My grandpa worked 1,500 feet underground in the mines in Ely, MN. He never even graduated from high school. At age 15 he had to quit school. Even though he was getting A's in math, he had to quit school to go and help support his family. Within a few years he was down in those mines. That is where he worked his whole life. He had dreamed of a life at sea. He had dreamed of a life in the Navy. He had dreamed of a life where he could use his education, but he worked in that mine because he believed, more than anything, in the American dream—in his two young boys, in his wife, in his family, in the nine brothers and sisters he raised because both of his parents died. That is why, at ages 15 and 16, he and his brother went to work. They went to work to help their family. When the youngest kid, Hannah, had to go to an orphanage for a year and a half, my grandpa borrowed a car a year and a half after that and went and got her back, as he promised.

So what did he do for my dad? He saved money in a coffee can in the basement so he could send my dad to college, and my dad is a proud graduate of Ely Junior College, a 2-year community college. From there he was able to go to the University of Minnesota, get a journalism degree and interview everyone from Ronald Reagan to Mike Ditka, to Ginger Rogers. That is our family's story.

My sister never graduated from high school. She had some trouble in high school. So what did she do? She was able to get her GED, go to a community college, and move on from there to finalize her 4-year degree and get an accounting degree.

Those stories are all over America. The President's devotion to talking about these 2-year community colleges and using them as a launching pad for kids' careers is the right one.

I am hoping, given the support I have seen from businesses across my State—where we don't have enough welders, we don't have enough people to work the technology in a lot of the factories. I am hoping my colleagues will join us because of the strong business support, because of the need we have in our country to get more people into these jobs.

We have 5 million job openings. We have 8 million people who are unemployed. We need to match those two numbers. And the way we do it, I think, is by doing more with these 1- and 2-year degrees and doing more with kids in high school.

The second topic I appreciated that the President talked about was the middle-class tax cut. We all know the numbers. We all know the facts that due to the widening gap we have seen in income distribution, about 80 percent of families have $1 trillion less in income than they did during the Reagan time—$1 trillion less than during the Reagan time. The top 400 people in the country have more wealth than the bottom half of the country combined. So as we look at where we should be giving tax cuts and who we should be helping, it is clearly the middle class of this country.

That includes help with childcare and childcare credits that the President talked about. We are the only advanced country, as he pointed out last night, in the world that doesn't have some kind of sick leave or paid maternity leave. When I go and talk to women all over my State and I ask them what they most want, so many of them say time. They want time to be able to be with their kids when they are sick. They want time to be able to be with their baby when their baby is born. That is the best thing for our country. So I don't believe the naysayers that say we cannot work across the aisle to start talking about these important middle-class issues.

As the President pointed out, he is not running again, and he has nothing to do but to try to move forward with this country.

I appreciated the words of so many of my Republican colleagues who talked about governance, who said they wanted to get back to the real business of government, which is governing. I also appreciated those who have put out innovative ideas on things such as infrastructure. The simple idea that perhaps we can get some of these foreign earnings that are stuck there overseas that are just sitting there, billions of dollars—why don't we do something to bring that money back and make sure a portion of it goes into infrastructure? No one knows that better than our State. Our State is a State where a bridge fell down in the middle of a summer day—not just a little bridge, an eight-lane highway eight blocks from my house; a highway my family would drive over every single day—down into the middle of the Mississippi River on a summer day. That is infrastructure and that is a problem.

There are 75,000 bridges in this country that have been found to be structurally not efficient, not able to function. That is what is happening in this country right now.

So I truly appreciated the fact that the President talked about, yes, we are going to be defending something, we are going to be arguing about things in this Chamber. That is what this is set up to do. That is democracy. That is government. But there are also some very clear areas of agreement, and one of them is helping the middle class. Let's move. Let's go forward.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Morning business is closed.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Fischer amendment No. 18 (to amendment No. 2), to provide limits on the designation of new federally protected land.

Schatz amendment No. 58 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change.

Murkowski (for Lee) amendment No. 33 (to amendment No. 2), to conform citizen suits under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Durbin amendment No. 69 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure that the storage and transportation of petroleum coke is regulated in a manner that ensures the protection of public and ecological health.

Murkowski (for Toomey) amendment No. 41 (to amendment No. 2), to continue cleaning up fields and streams while protecting neighborhoods, generating affordable energy, and creating jobs.

Whitehouse amendment No. 29 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are back again with the Keystone XL Pipeline, S. 1, the bipartisan 60-sponsor bill in front of us. We had a good day yesterday debating three amendments and ultimately disposing of them. We have a half dozen of them in front of us this morning and this afternoon.

I think it is worth noting, there have been several Members who have come to the floor to give comments about the State of the Union last evening delivered by President Obama. It was his sixth official State of the Union Address. It marked the sixth address that he has given to the Congress and the Nation while this project has been under review the whole time throughout his entire administration. Every one of those State of the Union Addresses has happened at a time when the Keystone XL application has been pending. It puts into context how long we have been considering this legislation.

The President didn't really speak much to the demerits or the opposition to Keystone XL—it was basically a quick reference—but he did in a manner attempt to compare this bipartisan, subsidy-free bill to major taxpayer-funded infrastructure projects. Whether it is our highways or bridges, the need is clear. But I think we also recognize those are projects that are taxpayer-funded that will require millions and perhaps billions of dollars a year. What we are talking about with the Keystone XL is something where we don't have any Federal subsidies going in. It is not taxpayer-funded. I think it is important to make sure that we understand the difference.

What we didn't hear last night was how this project could be advanced. Once again, there was no indicator. I would like to remind everyone that we are sitting at over 2,300 days where we have not had a Presidential decision. I think the good news for us here on this floor is the debate on this issue is not going to last that long, thankfully.

Again, we moved into regular order, and I think it was helpful for Members of the body to not only know that there was a series of amendments that were called up, but that we were able to have debate on them, and then we were able to dispense with them.

The majority of the Senate voted to table two of those proposals, but then when it came to the Portman-Shaheen bill, the energy efficiency provision, we were able to move that by a vote of 94 to 5, demonstrating again a great deal of support for this small energy efficiency provision. I wish it had been bigger, in fairness to the bill sponsors who have been working so hard for years on that. We just advanced a very small piece of that. I think we have more to do in the area of energy efficiency, and I am looking forward to working with them on that.

What we have in front of us now at this point in the process is we have a bill that will approve the cross-border permit for the Keystone XL Pipeline and we will work to deal with some aspects of energy efficiency. I think that is some good progress.

Once again this morning I will encourage Senators. We have called for an open amendment process, but as the leader has reminded us, it is not open-ended. We are not going to be on this bill indefinitely. So move to file your amendments. If you want a vote on them, you need to be filing them now and talking to us now.

We are at 77 amendments that have been filed and that was as of last night. So there is clearly already a line, and my hope is we will be able to dispense with this half dozen today.

Briefly speaking to the measures that we have from each side, we have Senator FISCHER's amendment 18; Schatz amendment No. 58; No. 33 is the Lee amendment; we have Senator DURBIN's amendment 69; we have Senator TOOMEY's amendment 41, as well as the Whitehouse amendment No. 29.

I spoke a little bit on a couple of these measures yesterday, and I will be speaking more this afternoon before we move, hopefully, to votes.

I do want to take a minute before I turn it over to Senator CANTWELL to be recognized and then to Senator HOEVEN. There have been several sense-of-the-Senate amendments that have been filed—presented on the issue of climate change. I think it is important for people to note that in order to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, as the legislation itself lays out, there is no climate change provision that is required. I find it a little ironic that in neither of the two pending amendments that we have before us—Senator SCHATZ's and Senator WHITEHOUSE's—neither of them actually quotes the parts of the State Department's final EIS that explains, I think in pretty fair detail, that this project will not significantly contribute to climate change. In fact, the State Department found that without the Keystone XL Pipeline greenhouse gas emissions associated with transporting Canadian oil could actually increase, and the estimate is increasing somewhere between 28 and as high as 42 percent. One might ask, how can that be? The reality is that not only is a pipeline less costly and more efficient, but it has the least environmental impact in terms of any additional emissions.

So I think it is important to recognize that when we are talking about the oil coming from Canada, oil that Canada is producing for lots of different reasons that benefit Canada, that that oil is going to move. So our challenge is, is that oil going to move in a manner that benefits Americans with increased jobs and opportunities? Is it going to help fill our refineries in the gulf coast? Is it going to help from a safety perspective in terms of transporting a product in the safest manner as well as providing the least environmental impact?

The State Department also provided in the EIS that:

> Approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply and demand scenarios.

I think we are going to have some discussion this afternoon about what is contained in the State Department EIS. At 1,000 pages the full EIS is substantive. There is an executive summary that helps us all out and distills all of this. But I think it is important that Members look at what that report outlines.

I previously mentioned that we have about 77 amendments in front of us that have been filed at this point in time. We have nine, as of this morning, separate sense-of-the-Senate or sense-of-the-Congress amendments relating to climate change.

I have noted that this is the first time we have had an energy-related bill on the floor in a while where there has been an opportunity for debate. You will recall that this same measure was on the floor in December when the Democrats were in charge. The floor was managed at that point in time by the Senator from Louisiana, obviously very passionate in her support of the Keystone XL Pipeline. But in that debate there was no opportunity for amendments. You didn't see colleagues on either side of the aisle able to offer any amendments. We didn't see any amendments on climate. Now we have nine climate-related amendments here. So when you think about the urgency, we are having folks coming down and saying we must act on this now. I will remind people the reason we are able to

have this debate and the reason we are able to have votes on this issue is because we are operating under a regular order process where we are allowing for amendments, whether it is on issues such as climate change or whether it is on issues such as dealing with exports as we took up yesterday. We are not going to agree in many of these areas, but at least we are going to get back to being a deliberative body that not only talks about issues, but has an opportunity to vote on them.

So, again, I think we are probably going to hear a lot of different conversations about climate change.

I want to point out an article before I conclude this morning. This is an article that ran November 27, 2014, just a few months ago. It ran in the Financial Post, and it is entitled ''New emissions from Canada's oil sands 'extremely low,' says IEA's chief economist.'' The article has some interesting quotes that I think are relevant to our discussion.

The first line of that article states:

> As an energy advisor to some of the world's most developed economies, Fatih Birol worries about critical issues including security of energy and the impact of fossil fuels on the climate. One issue he does not spend any time worrying about, however, is carbon emissions from oil sands.

Mr. Birol is quoted as saying: ''There is a lot of discussion on oil sands projects in Canada and the United States and other parts of the world, but to be frank, the additional CO_2 emissions coming from the oil sands is extremely low.''

So here we have a statement by IEA's chief economist. If we combine that with what we have contained in the State Department's final EIS—again, I think these are important statements of support or fact to have on the record.

As we are debating these amendments today, I encourage everyone to keep in mind that oftentimes much of what we hear can be a little amped-up. I understand the passion that goes on, but we need to make sure we are looking critically at the facts as they exist.

I am just going to conclude my comments this morning by saying that what is happening in Canada—the simple facts are that Canada is producing its oil and it will move that oil to markets. Canada is our strongest partner, and they supply us with more oil than any of our other trading partners. So Canada is going to continue to produce oil, and they will move that oil.

The question is, Who will ultimately benefit from that production of oil? Will the United States gain the benefit of those construction jobs? Will the United States gain the benefit from the crude that will come down through the line and go into the gulf coast and benefit from the refineries that are built to handle and process that heavy crude coming from the north?

I want the United States to be a participant in this important project for a lot of different reasons, and I am encouraged that more than 60 of my colleagues seem to share that view.

We will continue the discussion through the series of amendments we have before us today. I know my colleague from North Dakota is prepared to speak, but at this time I will turn it over to my ranking member, the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Alaska helping us to work through this process and being down here to talk about how we move forward. I heard her say we are obviously thinking about how we move through the amendment process, and I am sure she and I will get a chance to talk about the potential votes we will have later on as we continue with this amendment process.

Like her, I wish to add a few comments to this morning's comments about the State of the Union Address last night because I do feel as though it was the first time we heard a speech from a President of the United States that was all about an innovation economy.

As someone from Seattle and the Pacific Northwest, I know a lot about innovation, and I was glad to hear he basically spoke about the whole perspective of what it takes to have an innovation economy and how we have to think about research and development and investing in our workforce. He mentioned trade and a variety of things that are all components of an innovation economy and how we can continue to move forward. I was very glad to hear that level of innovation, including his community college effort because it is about training the workforce for the future.

I also heard him talk about making improvements in infrastructure. The one thing I didn't hear him talk about was the issue of plug-in vehicles or electric cars. The reason I bring that up is because I think for most of the Bush administration, and maybe even some of the earlier days of this administration, I constantly heard talk about how we had to get electric vehicles and plug-in cars so we could get off our dependence on foreign oil.

We should take pride that in last night's speech we didn't have to listen to that because we have made progress in plug-in electric cars. Plug-in electric cars are in the marketplace, and we are making great progress in that area. We are also making progress in getting off foreign oil, and we are seeing how fuel efficiency is having a positive impact on our savings.

The President of the United States was asking what is the next level of innovation we have to do and how do we move forward while still protecting ourselves from what has been the deterioration of our environment from the greenhouse gases and the threat it makes to our planet.

Again, being from the Pacific Northwest, I consider those threats to be very real. The shellfish industry has been almost ruined due to the lack of oxygen in the water and the amount of carbon that basically sinks into our oceans and causes damage to the shellfish.

I see the Presiding Officer is also from the great State of Alaska.

When it comes to sources of feeding for Pacific Northwest salmon, there are not a lot of great food sources for the salmon. Climate change is having an effect on the ecosystem and the economy, so you can bet that climate issues are very important to our State. Those issues are no longer hidden and there is no longer a way to escape from that. It is on our plate right now.

The President of the United States said: Let's deal with that and move forward, and instead of talking about one pipeline, let's talk about an energy plan and an infrastructure investment for the Nation.

I will point out to my colleagues: You are becoming dangerously close to saying we can't do something like Portman. How many times were my colleagues from Ohio and New Hampshire held up on energy efficiency because no one would let us vote on that? How long—1 year, 2 years? Then yesterday we finally had a vote, and 95 of our colleagues voted yes on moving forward on energy efficiency.

I will also point out that energy efficiency is, I believe, key to our economy of the future. If the United States is a leader in making energy—no matter what source it comes from—more efficient, we will write the playbook around the globe because so many people will want to make very dear energy resources more usable, better utilized, and have lower costs to their individual businesses and consumers.

Energy efficiency is incredibly important, but we never got to energy efficiency. It is almost as if the other side of the aisle is saying: You will only get energy efficiency if we pair it with other legislation where we are rolling back environmental rules, and that is the objection I have and the people from the State of Washington have as well.

People want people to play by the rules. They want to know that if you propose a pipeline, you will actually follow the laws to protect the environment, such as the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and follow the process of what is in the public interest. We should be having that debate. We should not usurp the President of the United States in determining what is the national interest of this country.

At the very time the State Department was saying to this company, TransCanada, you have a pipeline proposal we don't like because it goes right through an aquifer, at the very moment when the State Department was telling them we don't like the proposal and you need to adhere to the environmental laws, the same people were in Congress trying to get Senators and House Members to vote on

legislation that would have said pass the pipeline right through the aquifer.

I believe the President should be given the due diligence to drive home with this foreign company the fact that we have a national interest, that this national interest will be met, and that we will set the standard for whether these environmental laws are going to be complied with. I don't believe we should be usurping them. I think my colleagues are now offering amendments on the other side that also usurp other environmental laws.

I hope my colleagues will think about this because it will certainly give the Senator from Alaska and myself something to think about. As we try to move forward on energy legislation, we are going to have to think about how we are going to pass something that has bipartisan support.

Since I have been on the energy committee—and I have been on the committee now the entire time I have been in Congress—I have had the opinion that you should not hold up good energy legislation just to try to get bad energy legislation. I have the opinion that we should pass energy bills every year. That is the transformation our country is going under.

I wish we would have helped the Senators who wanted to usher in energy efficiency 2 years ago, but it is telling that 95 of our colleagues have always thought that was an easy lift. We should keep moving forward on those issues that are easy lifts and ensure the businesses that need predictability and certainty that we can move forward on that.

Another example is the clean energy tax credits. While we are trying to overwrite environmental rules to give a foreign interest a pipeline through our country—I should say, people thought the pipeline that went through Yellowstone was safe, and we just had a big spill there this past weekend. It is not as if these spills don't happen.

We had a colleague from Michigan talk about the spill that happened in Kalamazoo. I just saw the Commandant of the Coast Guard again last night at the State of the Union Address and we talked about how we don't have a solution for cleaning up tar sands in the water, and that is why we in the Pacific Northwest are so interested in this issue.

Let's not hurry through a process of special interest when we can do things that we need to give predictability and certainty on, such as the energy tax credits that are germane and are within the boundaries of what Congress is supposed to be deciding on. The American people are asking us to debate those issues and to come up with a resolution on them. I don't know that the American people are asking us to override a process and usurp what is the right of the President to make sure our national interests are considered in this policy debate.

I do appreciate the Senator from Alaska working through this process, and I do appreciate the fact that I think she is serious about she and I sitting down and talking about a larger energy bill. I pride myself on having a Pacific Northwest view; that is, there are things that are good for both Alaska and Washington and we should work on them together. Maybe there are some things that are well and good for Alaska and Washington but maybe the rest of the country doesn't agree with, but we will work through a process together.

I say to my colleagues, as we look at these next tranches of votes, we should consider what the President said last night. We need a broader innovation strategy for our economy. I believe there are ways to get there. I think these amendments we are considering—I don't think we need to change the Antiquities Act. I am a big believer in the fact that there are some tremendous national beauties that have been established through the Antiquities Act both—actually by lots of Republican Presidents, and I don't feel we have to change the Antiquities Act. I certainly don't think we need to change the Endangered Species Act, and I don't think we need to overrule the Clean Air Act, as the amendment does of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

We will have more time to talk about these amendments on the floor, but I hope my colleagues will understand that we want environmental rules to be followed, and we want people to follow a process. We want these issues to move forward from an energy policy that will move America to a 21st century energy policy and not continue to hold on to the 19th century pollutions that are challenging our economy.

I am sure we are going to hear from our colleagues when they come down to debate these issues as it relates to greenhouse gases and other things. Again, I appreciate my colleague from Alaska helping us to work through this process. I appreciate that it is a debate and that all of my colleagues will have a chance to come down and express their opinions.

With that, I yield back to my colleague on whatever process we are going to follow to go back and forth on amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the comments of the ranking member of the energy committee and her focus on energy innovation. I think we can look to that as not only a bright spot in our economy where we have seen great progress in recent years, but we have also seen great enthusiasm and an optimism about the future of our country when we allow our great minds to work on some of the problems of the day to get us to these advanced solutions.

The Presiding Officer and I come from an energy-producing State. We are also a State that has some of the highest energy costs in the country. Right now in the village of Fort Yukon, they are paying $7.25 for a gallon of fuel. Up in Kobuk—in the northwest part of the State—they are paying $10 for a gallon of fuel. The rest of the country is enjoying a price break because of the drop in fuel, but in Alaska, when there is no neighborhood filling station that is connected to a road that is connected to someplace that brings people somewhere, people have to bring in their fuel by barge or by plane. The contract for that fuel in July—July's prices were not what they are now. Folks are locked in. Talk about being frozen in someplace—well, their prices are also frozen in.

So we know and understand the challenges when it comes to energy. We know and understand the challenges when it comes to paying to keep your house warm or your lights on. We have every interest—every interest—to make sure that we are pushing out, that we are being innovative, that we are being as efficient as we possibly can be when it comes to energy use and consumption. I want to urge us, to push us, to be really aggressive in pushing us toward those technologies that will allow us, in a small-population State that has no real energy grid, so to speak, to figure out how we can be more self-sufficient, get us off diesel, get us off $10-a-gallon oil in Kobuk, AK. We have to figure this out.

We are talking about the challenges we face, but as we begin this good, robust debate on issues such as the climate, I think we need to be careful about what we are doing in response to the issue of a changing climate. If the answer is to increase energy costs, if it is to implement a carbon tax, if it is to make it more expensive, if it is to cripple our economy, then we don't have the ability to move out on these technologies because they are expensive.

We need to have a strong economy. We need to figure out how we can address climate through adaptation, mitigation, and new technologies that are going to take us to cleaner fuel sources, to renewable energy sources we have in great abundance in Alaska and elsewhere. But it takes money. It takes a strong economy. So I am not willing to do anything that is going to put the brakes on our economic strength and viability.

This is a good part of the discussion. It is very germane to where we are right now.

I mentioned in my comments that we currently have six amendments pending to the bill. Our side would like to set up votes on these amendments, with a 60-vote threshold required for any amendment that is not germane. We are working on a side-by-side right now on the Schatz amendment as well as a potential modification to the Fischer amendment. But I don't think there is any reason why we wouldn't be voting on most, if not all, of the pending amendments shortly after lunch today. Once we have gotten through those amendments, Senator CANTWELL and I will queue up the next batch of

two to three amendments from each side so we can continue to make progress on this bill.

At this time, I turn to my colleague Senator HOEVEN, the sponsor of S. 1, who has been waiting to address the body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HOEVEN be followed by the Senator from Vermont to speak for 10 minutes about an amendment he has filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to verify that I have 10 minutes before my time expires. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not aware of a limit on the time of the Senator from North Dakota.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I don't know how much time the Senator from North Dakota is seeking this morning. Maybe that would help the Senator from Vermont in understanding the schedule.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, that is fine. I will use 10 minutes at this point, and I will use more later.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Vermont is just going to speak to an amendment he has filed. He is not seeking to call up the amendment; is that correct?

Mr. LEAHY. That is correct. I will probably need about 5 or 6 minutes.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. No objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont is only going to speak for 5 minutes, then I will defer to him. I may go longer than 10 minutes, so I will defer to him if we would like to proceed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his usual courtesy, and I appreciate it.

As the most senior Member of this body, I have served in both the majority and minority numerous times, under three Democratic Presidents, four Republican Presidents, and Democratic and Republican majorities. Throughout that time, I learned that the Senate can be productive. The Keystone Pipeline legislation we are considering today, though, is not one of those productive topics.

I hoped we would begin the 114th Congress by showing the American people that Congress is putting the needs of hard-working American families over those of powerful special interests, from job creation to charting a sustainable energy future for this country. We ought to be considering legislation that supports the highway trust fund. That would create tens of thousands of jobs across the country. We should be considering tax legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor at this time.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to respond regarding the legislation that is currently on the floor in several regards. I would like to discuss some of the environmental arguments that have been brought up. I wish to also reference the issue of export as well as touch on some of the comments of the President relative to this project and comments others have made regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline approval bill, S. 1, being the first bill we brought up.

One of the things we hear is, well, this is a private investment, it is $8 billion, but we should somehow be doing something else. The reality is this is an $8 billion shovel-ready project, good to go. It is vital energy infrastructure for this country. So it is important in its own right. To compare it to the highway bill, which is all funded by Federal tax dollars, whereas this is a private investment which is going to generate revenues in addition to providing vital infrastructure and providing jobs—that is not a fair comparison.

The point in bringing up this bill first was not only because this is important energy infrastructure but also because we wanted to try to get the Senate back to regular order, to an open amendment process. We just spent the last session and even before where we couldn't get amendments offered. Whether Republican or Democrat, we could not come to the floor of this body—the most deliberative body in government—and offer amendments, have the debate, and get a vote.

So understand that bringing up this legislation is important in its own right, particularly as we consider how we best build the energy future of the United States and have this important energy debate.

Look what is going on at the pump right now. We pull up to the pump and gas is down more than a dollar. I think the national average price of gasoline is $2.05, when it was up between $3 and in some cases $4 in some markets. That is a huge savings. That is hundreds of billions of dollars in consumers' pockets. That didn't just happen; that happened because we are building the right energy future for this country.

We are working to create energy security for the United States by producing more oil and gas in this country, along with other types of energy, and working with Canada to produce more oil and gas so we don't have to get it from OPEC, so OPEC doesn't get to dictate terms to American consumers and American businesses. And why don't they get to dictate terms? Because we are producing more energy. As we produce more energy and we get more energy from Canada, our closest friend and ally in the world, we become energy secure. That is more energy, that is more jobs, that is economic growth, that is national security, and that is what the American people want.

So when we talk about why this bill is up first, it is because we want to build an energy plan that works for this country. We want our Nation to be energy secure. This is how we do it. This kind of infrastructure is a vital part of building that energy plan where we produce more energy than we consume. So, together with Canada, we truly have North American energy security. That means lower prices, that means a stronger economy, and that means we don't have to depend on OPEC for our energy.

Now look what is happening. OPEC is pushing back, aren't they? We are now in this market fight, a fight for market share. So what do we do? Do we continue to build our energy resources here in this country or do we say: No, we are not going to build the infrastructure. We are not going to continue to produce more oil and gas in this country. We are not going to work with Canada. We are going to have Canada send that oil to China because they want it.

Then we will go right back to where we were before, where our energy shrinks back down and we don't work with Canada, and OPEC is right back in business. That has to be music to OPEC's ears. They probably love it when they hear that the President is going to block our efforts to build vital energy infrastructure—and private investment, mind you, not taxpayer dollars—that will create hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue for all of these States as they collect property taxes and payment in lieu of taxes. OPEC is doing great.

When we shrink our industry back down and Canada sends its energy to China, who is back in business? Who is back in the driver's seat? OPEC and the other petro-dependent countries, such as Russia. Russia finances virtually 50 percent or more of their economy on what? Petro dollars. Iran is a petro-dependent state. Do we want to be in the driver's seat or do we want to keep them in the driver's seat? Do we want to repeat history or do we want to take control of our own destiny? That is why this is an important issue.

It is also an important issue because it is about getting this body back to a regular order so we break the gridlock. We are offering amendments. We are saying to Republicans and Democrats: Come down and offer amendments.

We voted on three amendments yesterday. We have six pending amendments right now. We are looking for more. This is about breaking the gridlock and getting the important work of the country done.

It is the difference between the President giving a speech wherein he outlines all of his initiatives—OK, everybody, do it my way—and then spends the second half of the speech talking about how if we do it his way, somehow that is a compromise—that is not the case. That versus a project he has talked about vetoing.

Let's take a look at whether this is a bipartisan project where people have come together.

No. 1, it has been reviewed by the administration for more than 6 years. How long do we have to hold up private enterprise before we let them build the vital energy infrastructure we need—infrastructure that will not only move Canadian crude to our refineries but will move light sweet Balkan crude from my State and from Montana to other refineries as well. So it is moving domestic crude as well as Canadian crude. If we can't move it on this pipeline, it will be 1,400 railcars a day. How do we move our agriculture products and other goods when we have that kind of congestion on our railroads?

The whole point is that the President talks about coming together on issues that have broad bipartisan support. Let's think about it. We have broad bipartisan support in the House. This bill has already passed the House. We went through cloture in this body with 63 votes. The last time I checked, 63 votes out of 100 is a pretty strong majority. So we have bipartisan majority support in the Congress.

Second, in the polling over the 6 years that this project has been under review and under study, the public has overwhelmingly supported it. They said: Yes, we want to be energy independent in this country. We don't want to get our oil from OPEC. We would rather get it from Canada and produce it here at home, and we need the infrastructure to move it around. So in the polls, 65, 70 percent of the people consistently said: Build it. Build it.

By the way, all six States on the route, including Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, have all approved it. It wasn't as though they had to rush because they had 6 years to do it, but they have all approved it. Is the U.S. Federal Government the only entity that can make a good decision around here? All of these States, their legislatures, their Governors—they don't know what they are doing? The only one who can make a decision about whether this works or not is the administration?

What are we saying to our friends in Canada? They are our largest trading partner in the world. Think about our relationship with Canada. What if the situation were reversed and Canada wanted to work with us on a project of this importance to them and we said: No, go work with China.

When we think about all of these things, it brings home the reality. People can have their opinions on all kinds of issues, but those are the facts as they relate to this project.

So now I just want to take a few minutes and reference a couple of specific things, both on the environmental aspects that have been brought up and then also on whether this oil will be exported or used here at home. Again, this is an open-amendment process. So people can come down and offer amendments on climate change or all those other things. Everybody is entitled to their opinion and to advocate for whatever they want to advocate for. But at the end of the day, we are going to keep bringing them back to the facts on this project. Those facts were laid out in not one but five reports, three draft environmental impact statements and two final impact statements done by the Obama administration's Department of State.

When we come down and people want to use different discussions and talk about their views on climate change and all these other things, they can do that and we can vote on amendments in regard to those things. They can come down and talk about their views on whether oil should or shouldn't be exported and all of those kinds of things. They can offer amendments on them, and that is the process. But at the end of the day, we are going to work to bring them back to the facts. The facts are this is the finding in the Obama administration's environmental impact statements—three draft statements and two final statements done over 5 years. The Keystone XL Pipeline will have no significant environmental impact according to the U.S. Department of State environmental impact statements.

There is one thing I want to add to that. I talked about the fact that if we don't build a pipeline, if we are going to get the oil, it is going to have 1,400 railcars coming in here on a daily basis. The environmental impact statements point out that we get more greenhouse gas without the pipeline than with it because without the pipeline we are either going to move that by railcar or it is going to China. And if it goes to China, it goes in tanker ships, and they produce more greenhouse gas. It is refined in Chinese refineries, and they have higher emissions than our refineries. And we still have to bring our oil in from the Middle East. So now you have more greenhouse emissions from those tankers. The environmental impact statement itself points out that we have more emissions without the pipeline than if we actually build it.

I also want to take a minute to talk about the effort going on in Alberta for carbon capture and sequestration. In other words, one of the things I have always talked about in terms of building the right kind of energy plan for this country is that instead of holding up the investment, we empower the investment. If we empower private investment, we not only produce more energy here at home and with our closest ally in the world, we not only produce more energy, we not only get the infrastructure we need to move it—now understand, I am talking about private investment, just getting the government out of the way and letting the private sector do what they do. If we empower that investment, we not only get the infrastructure we need to move energy around, we not only get the new technologies that develop that energy more cost-effectively and more efficiently, we get better environmental stewardship.

New technologies produce better environmental stewardship. We are seeing that over and over. Take directional drilling in my State of North Dakota. We now drill down 2 miles off one ECO-Pad. We can put as many as 16 wells on one ECO-Pad. We drill down 2 miles, and we go out 3 miles and more in all different directions underground. Whereas before we would have seen wells all over the terrain, now we see one spot where there is a well for miles, and it is producing for miles around.

Think how much you reduced that environmental footprint, right? It is the same with carbon capture sequestration. People talk about clean coal technology. They talk about carbon capture sequestration. There are other fossil fuels such as oil and gas. The only way we are going to get to that is by stimulating private investment and encouraging not only the research and development that creates those technologies but actually getting them to deploy those technologies. That is exactly what is happening right now in the oil sands up in the Province of Alberta.

Since 1990 the greenhouse gas footprint of oil produced in the oil sands has gone down 28 percent. Because of better drilling techniques, because of cogeneration, because of other processes that have been put in place, the greenhouse gas emissions on a per-barrel basis for the oil producing oil sands has gone down by almost a third, 28 percent. Right now major companies are continuing not only to produce more oil in the oil sands but to find ways to reduce the greenhouse gas and do what is called carbon capture and sequestration—carbon capture and storage.

I will just touch on two of those for a minute and then relinquish the floor to the good Senator from Vermont, because there is more that I will pick up on related to this environmental aspect as we debate this legislation, as well as this whole issue of making sure that we get our country to energy security. But let me just touch for a minute on two projects. Exxon is one of the companies that produces oil up in the oil sands region, and they are investing on the order of $10 billion in that oil development and production. Their Kearl project, which is a huge part of it, will use cogeneration for steam and low-energy extraction processes to recover oil and heat integration between the extraction and the treatment facilities to minimize energy consumption. As a result, oil produced from Kearl will have about the same life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions as many other crude oils refined in the United States as a result of technologies which significantly enhance environmental performance.

Other environmental innovations for Kearl include onsite water storage to

eliminate river withdrawals and low-flow periods and progressive land reclamation which will return the land to the boreal forest.

The plan is this. They are developing these new technologies so the environmental footprint is the same as conventional drilling. That is what they are working to develop. How else are we going to develop this technology to reduce the carbon footprint if we continue to block these investments? That is what we have heard from opponents of the project is: Oh, well, gee, we don't want to have oil from Canada if it has higher greenhouse gas emissions or a higher environmental footprint.

Yet we pointed out that oil produced in California, oil that produced in Venezuela right now has the same level of carbon emissions, and we have huge projects going on up here to actually reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop that technology that will not only reduce the environmental footprint up here and reduce the greenhouse gas emissions up here but technology that we can use in the United States and around the globe.

That is how we get better environmental stewardship, by developing those technologies that help us do it. And who better to accomplish it, who better than the ingenuity of American companies and Americans—American entrepreneurs. That is how we make it happen. So the reality is—another one is the Quest project that Shell is undertaking. They are working right now with the Provincial government in Alberta on carbon capture and storage. So the Province of Alberta actually has a program where they work with these companies on carbon capture and storage. This is a tremendous opportunity to develop those technologies we hear talked about on this floor so often if we are willing to work with these companies and allow them to make the investments to do it.

My question to opponents or critics to the project is: How in the world are we going to develop these new technologies to improve environmental stewardship if we block the very projects that are trying to do it?

I see the Senator from Vermont is here, and so I want to provide him with his time to introduce his amendment, as well as the Senator from Louisiana. I will stop at this point. We will continue this debate, but I want to end on this very important subject by saying, again, the environmental impact shows we will have higher greenhouse gases without this project versus with it. Again, I understand people can come down and talk about their opinions, but that is what the reports determine—five reports done over 6 years. Furthermore, what I am pointing out is that doesn't even take into account the kind of carbon capture and other projects that are being done in a huge way up here to develop really the technologies that are not only going to help us in terms of reducing emissions and the environmental impacts of energy production in the oil sands but will help us in the United States and technology that can be adopted in other countries around the globe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank my friend from North Dakota for his usual courtesy shown earlier. Unfortunately, I had a nose bleed, and I had to stop my speech. I think I am not used to the elevation—the altitude of the Senate—but after over 40 years I should be.

I was saying earlier, I had hoped we begin this 114th Congress by showing the American people that Congress is putting the needs of hard-working American families first. I wish we were considering legislation to support the Highway Trust Fund. That supports tens of thousands of jobs around the country in every one of our States. I wish we were considering tax legislation to bring investments to our small local businesses and encouraging energy efficiency in construction and investment. I wish we were finding places to support the educational pursuits of our children. I would like to maintain our status as a premier leader on the world stage.

Instead, we are considering legislation that puts Canadian tar sands—which are intended for export, not to be used in the United States—as our priority. The pipeline will support 35 permanent jobs—just 35—not hundreds, not thousands—35. I would like to be considering legislation that creates thousands of jobs. It is hard not to question whether the new Senate majority is truly focused on the needs of hardworking Americans.

Some who support the legislation claim the pipeline is truly ''shovel ready.'' They claim the project has been thoroughly studied and analyzed, and that the Administration sat for 6 years with no decision on the permit.

Even before the Nebraska Supreme Court recently released its decision on the location of this pipeline, the Republican leadership said this should be our priority even ahead of that decision. The decision did not clarify lingering questions about the process. In fact, the majority of the justices said the decision to circumvent the public process and block Nebraskans' ability to raise concerns about the pipeline was unconstitutional. Four of the seven justices said that it is unconstitutional under State law. But in their state procedure, you need a supermajority of 5 of the 7 justices to halt this project, so the landowners' appeal was rejected.

What bothers me is not only that the majority opinion is being ignored in Nebraska but that the legislation approved last week by the House in consideration here would remove consideration of all appeals. You have to take them out of local Federal courts and put them before the DC Circuit. In other words, if you are in a State where this pipeline goes through your community and you have a question, you would have to make an appeal to the DC Circuit. What that is saying is that Congress believes that Washington knows best. Frankly, the people in my State of Vermont—and I suspect in States across the country—would prefer to trust the courts in their States.

We ought to be showing the American people that Congress cares more about the public process and the public's access to their courts, than about the wishes of foreign special interests. That is why I have offered an amendment that would strike the judicial review provision and restore the role of local federal district courts in reviewing challenges arising from the Keystone Pipeline.

The majority leader promised an open debate and open amendment process. I appreciate that. I certainly have concerns about circumventing what would be normal court procedure and the President's approval process, and I want to be able to address that. But more than that, I hope this debate can be an open and honest conversation, not about a pipeline that supports special interests but about the direction in which our country is moving on sustainable energy, on job creation, and on issues as fundamental to all Americans—Republicans or Democrats—as who will have access to our courts. Will it just be special interests or will it be the American people? I prefer the American people.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I have an amendment on this important bill at the desk, amendment No. 80. I am not going to offer that amendment now because the minority side is blocking the offering and calling up of additional amendments until we dispose of those presently called up. I want to do that right now. But hopefully, I will be doing that in the very near future. I look forward to a full debate and a vote on this amendment, probably in the next tranche of amendments on the bill.

My amendment is about energy. It is about a very crucial part of the domestic policy, something I believe will absolutely be a huge positive incentive and factor to allow us to produce even more American energy, to become even more energy independent, and to provide an even greater boost to our economy; that is, through revenue sharing, sharing the revenue produced by domestic energy production with the producing States.

That is fair for two reasons: one, because those producing States do bear costs and burdens and impacts, including environmental impacts, and, two, providing that incentive is the most important way we can boost even further important domestic energy production. That energy production is vital for our country and our economy. In fact, we are not in recession right now because of those U.S. energy jobs.

If it were not for those oil and gas and related jobs in America, we would still be in a technical recession right now. Last night President Obama talked glowingly of the state of our economy. I think he exaggerated that significantly. However, we would be in a technical recession and we would be in a far different and worse place were it not for those domestic oil and gas and energy jobs. That is what this amendment would boost and would improve even further.

Again, the heart of this amendment is revenue sharing, establishing and expanding revenue sharing for producing States. So rather than all the royalty and revenue produced by this domestic production just going to the Federal Treasury, we need to share that. A lot will go to the Federal Treasury. Most will go to the Federal Treasury. But we need to give producing States a fair share.

Again, as I stated, that is for two reasons—two very important, very basic reasons. First of all, those States bear a burden. They have impacts from that production, including environmental impacts. They need funds to deal with those impacts. It is manageable and it is worth doing, but there are impacts.

Secondly, and maybe even more importantly, providing that revenue sharing for producing States—host States—is the most important way that we will get more producing States, that we will get more host States, that we will have more American energy. So that is what this is all about.

My amendment, again, will be amendment No. 80. I look forward to a vote on the Senate floor soon. It is simple and straightforward. It does several important things. First, it would expedite Outer Continental Shelf lease sales and move forward with a positive OCS lease plan. By expediting leasing and opening up more areas to production, we can create jobs and further enhance and build our manufacturing renaissance and our American energy revolution.

In recognizing concerns for production in the North Atlantic Planning Area as well as the North Aleutian Planning Area in Alaska, this proposal excludes lease sales in those particular regions. Secondly, the bill would increase revenue sharing for Gulf States, and it would establish revenue sharing for brand new production in other areas, such as Alaska and the east coast.

Again, revenue sharing is fair, and it is the most powerful, positive thing we can do to get more States into the act in a positive way of producing American energy, helping our economy, and helping our energy independence. So that would provide revenue sharing for the first time for the Atlantic States of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. It would provide that revenue sharing for the first time for new production we would be authorizing for Alaska—a clear net gain for North Carolina, Virginia, South Carolina, and Alaska.

This is critical. I know my colleagues from those States are all very supportive of that offshore energy activity. So again, for Alaska, for the first time, Alaska would enjoy revenue sharing with the potential for significant dollars from offshore production going to Alaska. Now, one might ask: What about the Federal revenue impact? What about the fiscal impact? This amendment is fully offset in terms of the Federal Treasury. It is fully offset with revenue from two sources: No. 1, expedited and increased lease sales in our OCS that will produce more Federal revenue, and No. 2, trimming our Federal workforce by attrition, a policy laid out by the Simpson-Bowles Commission—bipartisan, straightforward, and exactly what we need to do in a fiscally responsible way.

Now, on that piece, the legislation would not fire anyone. It would simply reduce the Federal workforce through attrition. For every three Federal workers who retire, only one could be hired. That is exactly what Simpson-Bowles proposed. Two exemptions exist to this rule that could be used by the President in a state of war or extraordinary emergency—again, exactly the Simpson-Bowles proposal.

This amendment is very important in the area of energy and to be fair to producing States and to be a powerful incentive—the single most powerful incentive possible to get more producing States, more American production into the act. That is vital for our energy independence. It is also vital for our economy. This amendment, No. 80, would be a big, positive boost over time for our economy.

As I said, right now we would be in a recession still were it not for those American energy jobs. That energy renaissance has led the way in our economy. But for those jobs, we would still be in a recession. This can make a good thing better. This can provide more incentives to go further in a powerful, responsible way. It will also be a responsible way on the environment.

Let me note that in Louisiana, you know what we do with our revenue sharing? We spend all of it on environmental concerns, mostly coastal restoration. We are losing our coastline. We are losing a football field of Louisiana costal area every 38 minutes—every 38 minutes, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. That is the biggest environmental issue we have by far. That is what this money goes to in Louisiana—proper environmental stewardship.

So with that, I urge bipartisan support of this important amendment. I look forward to formally calling it up soon, after we vote on the pending amendments early this afternoon. I look forward to a vote on this on the Senate floor—hopefully, a strong bipartisan vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 58

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, yesterday I offered an amendment to the Keystone XL bill which is really straightforward and will not affect the underlying legislation. I do think it has the potential to get strong bipartisan support. That is because my amendment states a simple set of facts—that climate change is real and humans are contributing to it.

This is an opportunity for people on either side of the Keystone debate to agree on something; that is, the facts. It will inform, I think, what happens next in energy policy. As intense as this debate over this pipeline is, the real question in front of us, after we dispose of this legislation and it goes to the President's desk for a certain veto, is that then we have to contend with our national energy policy.

We need to agree on the set of facts that everyone outside of this Congress agrees on. These claims require evidence, and my amendment provides those pieces of evidence. It cites the final supplemental environmental impact statement prepared for the Keystone Pipeline by the State Department, which says that ''human activities . . . have added to the greenhouse gas accumulation and exacerbated the greenhouse . . . effect, resulting in greater amounts of heat being trapped in the atmosphere.''

Now, this is not controversial. It also states: ''These climate change shifts can . . . affect other processes and spark changes that cascade through natural systems to affect ecosystems, societies, and human health.'' Only in the halls of Congress is this a controversial piece of legislation.

This impact statement, in turn, cites the work of thousands of scientists who have contributed to reports by the IPCC, the National Research Council, and the U.S. Global Change Research Program. These independent fact-finding bodies have conducted decades of research on questions related to climate change. They have been subject to intense scrutiny both internally and externally. Their work has held up to repeated concerns about impartiality and accuracy.

This scrutiny helps. It has forced these organizations to improve their methodology and be increasingly deliberate as they develop their findings and present the facts and only the facts. Human-caused climate change is accepted by Fortune 500 companies, school teachers, religious groups, and the U.S. Department of Defense. It is accepted by nurses and doctors, professional sports leagues, the majority of other countries, more than 97 percent of scientists, and many of my colleagues in the House and Senate.

For most people, climate change existing is not a controversial issue. Certainly, the Keystone Pipeline is a controversial issue. Once we together set the premise of climate change facts, there is plenty to argue about. What approach ought we take with respect to

solving this problem? Is a carbon tax the right approach? Is the President's clean powerplant the right approach? Ought we to wait for or accelerate our actions with respect to international coalitions and agreements?

Those are legitimate debates to have. But we have to agree on the facts. That is why a vote on my amendment is so important. The Senate has before it a bill to approve a pipeline and an environmental impact statement touted by Keystone supporters as a comprehensive, accurate document that impartially assesses the environmental impacts of the pipeline. Within that impact statement is a comprehensive review and an acknowledgment of the reality of the facts of climate change.

Many of my colleagues who support Keystone might be the same ones who question the reality of climate change, but I want to try to create a political space where one can be for Keystone XL and still want action on the climate. Now, I think Keystone XL is the wrong direction to move in. I think it is absolutely doubling down on fossil fuel energy and the tar sands oil. So I will be voting against Keystone.

But I understand there are people of good faith and plenty of knowledge who are going to be supporting the pipeline. What we need to do after this legislation is disposed of—and it will be relatively quickly—is agree on a set of facts and move forward with intelligent, bipartisan climate policy.

Last week, we learned that 2014 was the hottest year on record according to two separate studies by our Nation's brightest scientists at NASA and NOAA. That means that the 10 hottest years on record have all occurred since the year 2000. A warmer planet means big changes in weather patterns, rising sea levels, and increases in extreme weather events.

Sea level has been rising more than twice as fast since 1990 as it did over the previous century, nearly doubling the likelihood of storm surges such as the one we experienced during Hurricane Sandy. Over the years, the issue of climate change has, unfortunately, become a partisan issue. It did not used to be that way. It does not need to be that way going forward.

We may not agree on the solutions, on the path forward or even on some of the details, but I do believe it is time for us to begin to agree on a basic set of facts. The purpose of my amendment is to take a step back, to take a deep breath on a very contentious issue, and to give the Senate an opportunity to come together and state with no value judgment that we accept the work of thousands of the world's brightest and most dedicated scientists, including those working at U.S. agencies and for U.S. companies; that we accept the reality our farmers, our fisherman, and our families see with the every passing season.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this amendment. It is an opportunity to restate a set of facts with which a majority of Americans already agree. It makes no presumptions about where we go from here.

I am hopeful that we will have a big bipartisan vote this afternoon on this amendment. I think there is an opportunity for common ground.

Obviously, Keystone XL is dividing not just this Congress but the Democratic conference, so I understand that. But agreeing on the set of facts related to climate change is a good predicate for all of us moving forward.

I yield the floor and 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. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I rise today to speak on behalf of my amendment to the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline bill. I thank Senators BENNET, CARPER, LEAHY, MENENDEZ, WARREN, and WHITEHOUSE for cosponsoring this amendment.

My amendment is extremely simple. It is about 1½ pages, and I think it is easily understood by anyone who reads it. It says:

> It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community that—
>
> (1) climate change is real;
>
> (2) climate change is caused by human activities;
>
> (3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;
>
> (4) a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm; and
>
> (5) it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

That is it. That is the entire amendment.

What this amendment does is simply ask the Members of the Senate whether they agree with the overwhelming majority of scientists who have told us over and over and over again that climate change is real, that climate change is caused by human activity, including the emission of carbon, that climate change is already causing devastating problems in the United States and around the world, and that if we are going to leave our children and our grandchildren a planet that is habitable, we must transform our energy system away from fossil fuels.

Progressives, conservatives, and people in between have many disagreements on issues—and that is called democracy. There is nothing to be ashamed about that; that is the democratic process. We all have differences of opinion. But what is not a good thing is when we make public policy in contradiction to what the scientific community tells us. That is not a good thing.

When we look at medical issues such as cancer or heart disease, what we do is look at the scientific communities and medical doctors for their opinions as to how we should proceed.

When we look at infrastructure issues, the issues of roads and bridges, we look at engineers for their opinion as to how we should proceed.

When we look at education and try to understand how best kids can best learn, we look at educators and those people who know most about education for advice as to how we should proceed.

In terms of the issue of climate change, the process should not be any different. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC, is the leading scientific body that deals with the issue of climate change. I will very briefly quote what the IPCC said last fall:

> Warming of the climate system is unequivocal as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice and rising global average sea level.

More than 97 percent of the scientific community in the United States and across the globe agrees with these findings, including the American Chemical Society, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Meteorological Society, and the American Geophysical Union, to name just a few.

In fact, at least 37 American scientific organizations, 135 international scientific organizations and national academies of science, and 21 medical associations, all agree that climate change is real and is significantly caused by human activities.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of 37 American scientific organizations, 135 international scientific organizations and national academies, and 21 medical associations which all have gone on record as stating that climate change is real and is significantly caused by human activity.

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

> Virtually every major scientific organization in this country and throughout the world have said that climate change is real, climate change is caused by carbon emissions and human activity, and that climate change is already causing devastating problems in the United States of America and around the world.
>
> This list includes at least: 37 American scientific organizations, 135 international scientific organizations, 21 medical associations, 4 religious organizations.
>
> 37 AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS
>
> American Anthropological Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Association of Geographers, American Association of State Climatologists, American Astronomical Society, American Chemical Society, American Fisheries Society, American Geophysical Union, American Institute of Biological Sciences, American Institute of Physics, American Meteorological Society, American Physical Society, American Quaternary Association, American Society for Microbiology, American Society of Agronomy,

American Society of Plant Biologists, American Statistical Association, Association of American Geographers, Association of Ecosystem Research Centers, Botanical Society of America.

California Academy of Sciences, Crop Science Society of America, Ecological Society of America, National Academy of Engineering, National Academy of Sciences (USA), National Association of State Foresters, New York Academy of Sciences, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Society of American Foresters, Society of Systematic Biologists, Soil Science Society of America, The Geological Society of America, The Wildlife Society, United States National Research Council, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

135 INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC ASSOCIATIONS

Academia Brasiliera de Ciências (Brazil), Academia Chilena de Ciencias (Chile), Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa (Portugal), Academia de Ciencias de la República Dominicana, Academia de Ciencias Físicas, Matemáticas y Naturales de Venezuela, Academia de Ciencias Medicas, Fisicas y Naturales de Guatemala, Academia Mexicana de Ciencias, Academia Nacional de Ciencias de Bolivia, Academia Nacional de Ciencias del Peru, Academia Sinica, Taiwan, China, Académie des Sciences et Techniques du Sénégal, Academiê des Sciences (France), Academy of Athens, Academy of Science for South Africa, Academy of Science of Mozambique, Academy of Sciences Malaysia, Academy of Sciences of Moldova.

Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Academy of Sciences of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology, Egypt, Accademia dei Lincei (Italy), Africa Centre for Climate and Earth Systems Science, African Academy of Sciences, Albanian Academy of Sciences, Amazon Environmental Research Institute, Australian Academy of Science (Australia), Australian Coral Reef Society, Australian Institute of Marine Science, Australian Institute of Physics, Australian Marine Sciences Association, Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society, Bangladesh Academy of Sciences, Botanical Society of America, British Antarctic Survey, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Cameroon Academy of Sciences, Canadian Association of Physicists, Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences, Canadian Geophysical Union, Canadian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society.

Canadian Society of Soil Science, Canadian Society of Zoologists, Caribbean Academy of Sciences, Center for International Forestry Research, Chinese Academy of the Sciences, Colombian Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (Australia), Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cuban Academy of Sciences, Delegation of the Finnish Academies of Science and Letters, Deustche Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina (Germany), Ecological Society of Australia, European Academy of Sciences and Arts, European Federation of Geologists, European Geosciences Union, European Physical Society, European Science Foundation, Federation of Australian Scientific and Technological Societies.

Geological Society of Australia, Geological Society of London, Georgian Academy of Sciences, Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences, Indian National Science Academy, Indonesian Academy of the Sciences, Institute of Biology (UK), Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Institute of Marine Engineering, Science and Technology, Institution of Mechanical Engineers, UK, InterAcademy Council, International Alliance of Research Universities, International Arctic Science Committee, International Association for Great Lakes Research, International Council for Science, International Council of Academies of Engineering and Technological Sciences, International Research Institute for Climate and Society, International Union for Quaternary Research, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, Islamic World Academy of Sciences, Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

Kenya National Academy of Sciences, Korean Academy of Science and Technology, Kosovo Academy of Sciences and Arts, Latin American Academy of Sciences, Latvian Academy of Sciences, Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Madagascar National Academy of Arts, Letters, and Sciences, Mauritius Academy of Science and Technology, Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts, National Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences, Argentina, National Academy of Sciences of Armenia, National Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic, National Academy of Sciences, Sri Lanka, National Council of Engineers Australia, National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research, New Zealand, Natural Environment Research Council, UK, Nicaraguan Academy of Sciences, Nigerian Academy of Science, Norwegian Academy of Sciences and Letters, Organization of Biological Field Stations.

Pakistan Academy of Sciences, Palestine Academy for Science and Technology, Polish Academy of the Sciences, Romanian Academy, Royal Academies for Science and the Arts of Belgium (Belgium), Royal Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences of Spain, Royal Astronomical Society, UK, Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Royal Irish Academy, Royal Meteorological Society, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, Royal Scientific Society of Jordan, Royal Society of Canada, Royal Society of Chemistry, UK, Royal Society of New Zealand, Royal Society, UK, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Russian Academy of Sciences, Science Council of Japan.

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Society of Biology, UK, Society of Systematic Biologists, Sudanese National Academy of Science, Tanzania Academy of Sciences, The Geological Society (UK), The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS) for the developing world, Turkish Academy of Sciences, Uganda National Academy of Sciences, Union der Deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften, World Meteorological Association, Zambia Academy of Sciences, Zimbabwe Academy of Sciences Sudan National Academy of Sciences.

21 MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, American College of Preventive Medicine, American Lung Association, American Medical Association, American Nurses Association, American Public Health Association, American Thoracic Society, Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Australian Medical Association, Children's Environmental Health Network, Health Care without Harm, Hepatitis Foundation International, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Association of Local Boards of Health, National Environmental Health Association, Partnership for Prevention, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Trust for America's Health, World Federation of Public Health Associations, World Health Organization.

4 RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Interfaith Power and Light, National Association of Evangelicals, Presbyterian Mission Agency, The Pope.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Association for Wildlife Veterinarians, American Society of Civil Engineers, International Association for Great Lakes Research, Institute of Professional Engineers New Zealand, Natural Science Collections Alliance, Organization of Biological Field Stations, The Institution of Engineers Australia, The World Federation of Engineering Organizations, World Forestry Congress.

Mr. SANDERS. I know that recently a number of my colleagues have made the point that they are not scientists and they cannot formulate an opinion on this subject. Well, let me be clear: I am not a scientist. I had a lot of problems with physics when I was in college. I am not a scientist.

But these are scientists. These are 37 American scientific organizations and 135 international scientific organizations. These are scientists who tell us that climate change is real, it is caused by human activity, and that it is imperative we transform our energy system away from fossil fuel.

I will read an excerpt from a letter sent to the Senate in 2009 signed by virtually every major scientific organization in this country:

> Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer reviewed science. Moreover, there is strong evidence that ongoing climate change will have broad impacts on society, including the global economy and on the environment. For the United States, climate change impacts include sea level rise for coastal states, greater threats of extreme weather events, and increase risk of regional water scarcity, urban heat waves, western wildfires, and a disturbance of biological systems throughout the country. The severity of climate change impacts is expected to increase substantially in the coming decades.

Once again, I am not a scientist, but that is what the scientific community overwhelmingly in the United States and around the world is saying. It is imperative the Senate goes on record in saying we agree with science.

Climate change is one of the great threats facing our country and the entire planet. It has the capability of causing severe harm to our economy, to our food supply, to access to water, and to national security.

According to NASA and NOAA, 2014 was the warmest year ever recorded. The most recent decade was the Nation's warmest on record. Across the globe, the 10 warmest years on record have all occurred since 1997. We know that the Earth's climate is warming and doing so quickly.

According to NOAA, October, August, June, and May were the hottest October, August, June, and May months ever recorded.

The consequences of this rapid and dramatic rise in global temperatures will have a profound impact on billions of people throughout the world. What we can expect are more severe weather disturbances, more flooding, more heat waves, more droughts, more forest fires, and saltwater inundation of water supplies and agricultural land.

As the New York Times reported in August, droughts in the Western and Southwestern United States appear to be intensifying as a result of climate change:

> Over the past decade, droughts in some regions have rivaled the epic dry spells of the 1930s and 1950s . . . The country is in the midst of one of its most sustained periods of increasing drought on record.

China's heat wave 1½ years ago was the worst in at least 140 years. As ClimateWire reported in November, the Sao Paulo region in Brazil is suffering from its worst drought in 80 years. In the United States, fire suppression costs have increased from roughly $1 billion annually in the mid-1990s to an average of more than $3 billion in the past 5 years.

Our oceans are not only getting warmer, they are also becoming more acidic, threatening fish, coral reefs, and other sea life. As a study published in the journal Science reported, carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere are driving a rate of change in ocean acidity that is already thought to be faster than any time in the past 50 million years. The authors warned that we may be ''entering an unknown territory of marine ecosystem change.''

Extreme storms, weather disturbances, are also becoming more common and more intense with extraordinary impacts. When Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines over 1 year ago, it displaced more than 4.1 million people, killed thousands, and cost that country at least $15 million in damages.

The situation clearly is bad today in the United States and around the world, but—according to the scientific community—if we do not get our act together, if we do not cut carbon emissions, it will only get worse in years to come.

The IPCC estimates—and I hope people listen to this—that without any additional efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions—in other words, if we continue to go along our merry old way of dependency on fossil fuels—''warming is more likely than not'' to exceed 4 degrees Celsius, which is 7.2 degrees Fahrenheit, by the end of the century.

Let me repeat that extraordinary observation. If we continue along our present course, ''warming is more likely than not'' to exceed 7.2 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century.

Similarly, just last year the White House released the National Climate Assessment warning that global warming could exceed 10 degrees Fahrenheit in the United States by the end of this century. Take a deep breath and imagine what it will mean to this country—the huge impact on every aspect of our life, on our economy, on agriculture, on health—if the temperature of the United States rises, as some are predicting, by 10 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century. It is almost unthinkable. Yet that is what the scientific community is telling us.

The World Bank is by no means a radical institution. It is a very conservative institution. It tells us that temperature increases by even just 7.2 degrees Fahrenheit would bring about unprecedented heat waves, severe drought, and major floods in many regions, with serious impacts on human systems, ecosystems, and associated services.

The IPCC reports that sea levels are likely to rise by another 10 to 32 inches by the end of this century. As the New York Times reported, a sea level rise of less than 4 feet—less than 4 feet—would inundate land on which some 3.7 million Americans live today. We are talking about Miami, New Orleans, New York City, and Boston all being highly vulnerable to rising sea levels. Similarly, of course, this problem will impact people all over the world.

According to the IPCC:

> Many small island nations are only a few meters above present sea level. These states may face serious threat of permanent inundation from sea-level rise. Among the most vulnerable of these island states are the Marshall Islands, Kiribati, Tuvalu, Tonga, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Cook Islands.

The Army Corps of Engineers has predicted that the entire village of Newtok, AK, could be underwater by 2017 and that more than 180 additional Native Alaskan villages are at risk. Parts of Alaska—one of our great and beautiful States—are already vanishing as a result of climate change.

The evidence is overwhelming, and it is no longer good enough for people to say: I am not a scientist; I don't know. We may not be scientists, but we can read and we can listen to what the overwhelming majority of scientists are telling us. That is our job—to listen to the experts who know something about this issue.

As we debate the Keystone Pipeline, what disturbs me very much is that in the face of this overwhelming evidence from the scientific community, in the face of deep concerns about climate change all over the world, what is the Senate going to be doing in the next week or two as part of the Keystone Pipeline? Are we going to be voting to impose a tax on carbon so we can break our dependence on fossil fuel? Is that what we are going to be voting on? No, I don't think so. Are we going to be voting to pass legislation that moves us aggressively toward energy efficiency and weatherization and such sustainable energies as wind, solar, and geothermal? Is that what we are going to be voting on as we listen to the scientific community? No, I don't think so. Are we going to be passing a bill investing in research and development so that we can make our transportation system more energy efficient? Is that what we are going to be voting on? No, we are not. In fact, what we are going to be voting on is a bill that will allow for an increase in the production and transportation of some of the dirtiest oil on this planet. That is what we are going to be voting on. What we are voting on is a proposal that moves us in exactly the opposite direction from what the scientific community wants us to do.

Let me conclude by saying this: Honest people can and do have disagreements on many issues, but it is not a good thing for the United States to reject what the scientists and the experts are telling us. That is not a good thing. So I hope very much that on the amendment I have brought forth—which says nothing more than to listen to the scientists on this important issue; do not reject science—that we can get widespread bipartisan support for the amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 33

Mr. LEE. Madam President, excessive litigation under the Endangered Species Act has become an obstacle to the act itself and the good it promises to do for the American people.

According to the Department of Justice, more than 500 Endangered Species Act-related lawsuits have been filed or opened against the Federal Government since 2009. As a result, Federal agencies have to spend their time, their energy, and taxpayer-funded resources fighting lawsuits instead of protecting endangered species.

One of the primary reasons for this excessive litigation is the potential for massive awards of attorney's fees under section 11(g)4 of the Endangered Species Act. These awards can be granted regardless of whether the parties seeking the attorney's fee award prevails, and there is no limit on the hourly fee that can be collected. These attorney's fees can reach upward of $700 per hour. In one case involving a series of lawsuits related to the operation of hydroelectric power facilities in the Northwestern United States, attorney's fees were awarded in an amount totaling nearly $2 million—in one case lasting just a few years. Such lofty levels of compensation would be high even in a private law firm setting, even in a big city, but they are completely indefensible when one considers they are paid for by American taxpayers, often to well-funded activist organizations.

Excessive awards of attorney's fees also create perverse incentives for cottage industries of lawyers to sue the Federal Government in order to advance specific policies—policies that cannot be achieved through the legislative process and are therefore sought

out by these very same lawyers in the courts. This is what many call a sue-and-settle strategy: Sue the Federal Government and then settle with the Federal Government. Achieve what you want to achieve and then get paid by the court without limit. Sue-and-settle is the dishonest, distorted practice of suing the Federal Government not to achieve a judicial outcome in court but to resolve the suit in a settlement with terms that advance narrow political ends, narrow political goals. The recent decision by the Fish and Wildlife Service to grant Gunnison sage-grouse protected status under the Endangered Species Act is the result of this precise sue-and-settle strategy.

Congress must put an end to policymaking by litigation, and it must do so by removing the incentives to engage in this kind of litigation. My amendment would do just that by bringing a citizen's suit provision of the Endangered Species Act into harmony with a similar provision of the Equal Access to Justice Act. The Equal Access to Justice Act limits awards for attorney's fees to $125 per hour and allows those awards to be granted only to prevailing parties. Any departure from this limit has to be approved by the judge based on some unique circumstance in that case. If such terms are acceptable for nearly every other type of lawsuit against the Federal Government, certainly they should be acceptable as applied to the Endangered Species Act. This simple fix would deter the frivolous lawsuits that so often end up in closed-door settlements with Federal agencies.

There is a lot of work to do to reform the implementation of the Endangered Species Act. This amendment is just one of many reforms I am developing with my colleagues in the Senate and our counterparts in the House of Representatives.

I ask for support on this amendment. Again, this is something that just brings into harmony section 11(g)4 of the Endangered Species Act with requirements that are already in existence, already on the books in connection with the Equal Access to Justice Act. We need those same limitations in this Endangered Species Act that already exist in the Equal Access to Justice Act. I ask all my colleagues to support this amendment and to help us resolve this problem that has crept into Federal law based on an inequity and imbalance in these two statutory regimes.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Before I begin my comments, let me commend the Presiding Officer on her excellent presentation last night. The Presiding Officer did an extraordinary job and made all of us very proud.

FORTY HOURS IS FULL TIME ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, 2 weeks ago Senator JOE DONNELLY and I reintroduced bipartisan legislation that we call the Forty Hours is Full Time Act. It would correct a serious flaw in the Affordable Care Act that threatens the hours and pay of part-time workers all across America. Our bill would change the definition of ''full-time'' work under ObamaCare from 30 hours a week to the standard 40 hours a week, a commonsense threshold that has always been the standard for full-time work. In fact, under the Fair Labor Standards Act, it is 40 hours a week that defines ''full time,'' after which workers are eligible in many cases for overtime.

Information I received from the Home Care & Hospice Alliance of Maine demonstrates that this illogical definition of ''full-time'' work could result in hundreds of home health care workers losing their jobs and 1,000 seniors losing access to home care services in the State of Maine alone.

The impact would be just as severe outside of Maine, a point driven home by a letter I recently received from the National Association for Home Care & Hospice, an organization that represents caregivers who provide in-home health and hospice services to chronically ill, disabled, and dying Americans. The association just conducted a survey of its members that reveals the devastating impact this definition will have on home care and hospice services around the country if Congress does not act to change it. Let me share with my colleagues just a few of the key findings of this survey.

Nationally, four out of five home care and hospice providers are unable to provide health benefits to their employees because they rely on government programs such as Medicaid, with its low reimbursement levels, and because they provide services to people with limited incomes.

So it is not as if they can simply boost their rates. In many cases their rates are set by Medicaid and at a very low level. In other cases they are serving people with limited incomes who simply cannot afford more expensive home care.

Another finding: Three out of four providers will have to cut the hours of their caregivers. That means those caregivers who are engaged in such compassionate and skilled work will have smaller paychecks on which to live.

Nine out of ten providers expect patients to lose access to home care in their communities.

One in five providers of home care and hospice services will actually have to close their doors. Think of the impact closing one in five home care and hospice agencies would have on America's seniors and our disabled citizens. In my view, taking action to spare this vulnerable population would, by itself, justify restoring the threshold for full-time work to the standard 40 hours a week.

But this is not the only reason to do so. Reforming the law would also help protect the caregivers who provide the services as well as their patients, and ironically it would protect taxpayers as well. Data from Maine's Medicaid Program shows that home care services are extremely cost-effective compared to alternatives. If access to these services is restricted because of the application of the 30-hour rule, those in need of these services will be forced into costlier forms of care paid for by Medicaid and Medicare, such as hospitals and nursing homes, driving up both Federal and State costs. In addition, the patients now served by home health care providers would no longer be able to receive vital care in the comfort, privacy, and security of their own homes.

So whether we look at it from the perspective of the patients served or the caregivers employed or the taxpayers who pay for the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, this hurts all three groups. Of course, there is obviously a lot of overlap among those groups.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, an excellent letter from the National Association for Home Care & Hospice which elaborates on the problems created by this definition under ObamaCare.

Of course, the justification for using the standard definition of full-time work extends far beyond the field of home care services to the full breadth of our economy. Raising the threshold for full-time work to 40 hours a week is necessary not only to protect the paychecks of workers employed by private sector businesses, such as restaurants and hotel staff, but also to protect those who work in the public sector, such as substitute teachers, ed techs, and schoolbus drivers, to name just a few.

The 30-hour rule will not only harm school staff who want and need more work, but it will also hurt our students by causing unnecessary disruption in the classroom. It does not make sense to have to limit substitute teachers to 29 hours a week because of the definition of ''full-time'' work under ObamaCare. That means there will be a revolving door of substitutes in our classrooms and lower paychecks once again for those substitute teachers.

I have also heard of a school district that has been forced to cut field trips and transportation to athletic events and employees who used to work more than 30 hours total in two jobs who have been forced to give up one of their

jobs, thus hurting their financial security.

Several Maine municipalities have described to me the impact on their workers, particularly volunteer and oncall firefighters, emergency medical technicians, and employees of the parks and recreation and public works departments.

Although the IRS adopted regulations last year in an attempt to exclude volunteer firefighters from the calculation of the employer mandate, these regulations do not give our towns and cities the level of protection provided by the Forty Hours is Full Time Act.

In most Maine communities, the fire department is staffed by volunteers and oncall firefighters who typically have health care coverage through their regular day jobs. In fact, in Maine, oncall firefighters for our smaller communities often serve as full-time firefighters—receiving full health care benefits—in a neighboring community. They help the smaller towns by serving as on-call firefighters. Unfortunately, under ObamaCare it doesn't matter that these on-call firefighters already have health care coverage; the towns that employ them for more than 30 hours a week may still face the $2,000 penalty per on-call firefighter for doing so. This makes no sense whatsoever.

For example, one town in southern Maine has told me that the 30-hour rule will require it to offer health care coverage to more than a dozen volunteer and on-call firefighters who do not qualify for coverage from the town today. The cost of doing so will drive up that town's health care budget by 20 percent at a time when its budget is already stretched to the breaking point.

Another Maine community has employees who work part time but year-round performing various tasks, including plowing and salting the roads in the winter. These employees typically work 30 to 34 hours a week, and they do not qualify for health benefits under the town's plan. Since the town cannot afford to add them to its health care plan, it simply will have no choice but to cut their hours back to 29 hours a week. The town doesn't want to do that. The workers don't want to have their hours cut. As anyone who has lived in Maine or any Northern State can tell you, snowstorms do not keep to a schedule. Mother Nature seems not to have heard about the 30-hour workweek under ObamaCare. So it will be a challenge for this town to keep its roads safe, clear, and passable in the winter while making sure its part-time employees don't exceed 29 hours a week. So, once again, what is the result? Reduced hours, a smaller paycheck for part-time workers, and more costs for the town and more disruption in the services it provides.

Winters are long in Maine and summers are short. Towns have to manage their workers' schedules to match the season, but the 30-hour rule will make it very difficult for them to do so.

For example, one town in central Maine told me that a number of its employees work full time in its parks and recreations department in the summer, and then they work part time in the winter. Because of the 30-hour rule, however, this town won't be able to stagger the schedules of these employees in the winter the way it used to and will have to lay them off instead and then, adding insult to injury, pay them unemployment during the layoff period. So here we have a case where the law is actually going to force the town to lay off part-time employees who want to work. This makes no sense.

Part-time workers who are hired to help with snow removal are often shifted to other departments in the spring and summer months to assist full-time employees or to take their place when they are on vacation. But the 30-hour rule once again takes away the flexibility towns need to do this.

For example, one town in northern Maine has told me that the part-time workers it has relied upon to help cover vacation time for its firefighters in the summer months will have to be cut back to 29 hours a week because the town cannot afford to pay the $2,000 penalty it will face for each employee if they work their usual hours. Raising the threshold for full-time work to 40 hours a week would restore the flexibility this town needs to manage its workforce, give these part-time workers more hours and the bigger paychecks they need, and help full-time firefighters get a break after a long, tough winter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 1 more minute.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Today I have described just some of the damage the 30-hour rule is doing to municipal employees, to providers of home health care and hospice services, and to those who work in our school systems. Nationwide, 100 school systems have had to scale back the hours of their workers already. Employees in all industries—for-profit and non-profit, private sector and public sector—are similarly affected.

Regardless of the varying views of Senators in this Chamber on the Affordable Care Act, surely we ought to be able to agree to fix this problem in the law that is hurting workers' paychecks and creating chaos for employers. Senator DONNELLY has introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator JOE MANCHIN and Senator LISA MURKOWSKI that would do just that. It is the Forty Hours is Full Time Act, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in supporting it.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
FOR HOME CARE & HOSPICE,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2014.

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

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND DONNELLY: I am writing to offer our support for the ''Forty Hours Is Full Time Act.'' The National Association for Home Care & Hospice (NAHC) is the leading association representing the interests of the home care and hospice community since 1982.

Currently the provision in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) that imposes penalties on employers with more than 50 full-time equivalent employees for not providing health insurance for their ''full time'' workers defines an employee working just 30 hours a week as full time. This definition of full time is entirely out-of-keeping with standard employment practices and could cause irreparable harm to many home care agencies and the patients they serve.

The great majority of the estimated 25,000 home care agencies are small businesses under the standards of the Small Business Administration, but most are considered ''large employers'' subject to the employer mandate under the ACA because of the number of workers they employ. All told, there are over 2 million persons employed in home care. These home care agencies are innovative job creators that provide much needed compassionate, high quality care to elderly and disabled individuals in their homes and communities.

The majority of personal care home care workers do not receive employee health insurance because home care agencies have three problems that are fairly unique: reliance on government programs such as Medicaid where payment rates as low as $11 an hour won't cover the increased costs of providing health insurance; consumers of private pay home care who are often elderly and disabled with fixed, low incomes; and a home care workforce with widely varying work hours primarily to accommodate the needs of their infirm clientele.

Home care agencies that are unable to provide health insurance or absorb the ACA penalties will have to restrict their employees to no more than 29 hours per week to ensure their workers are considered part-time under the ACA. A survey that NAHC concluded in December 2014 showed that the employer mandate would weaken patient access to care, reduce wages and working hours of home care staff, and require home care companies to restructure their operations to rely on part-time caregivers. Home care companies that primarily provide Medicaid services and those that service private pay personal care clients were most susceptible to these adverse outcomes as Medicaid funding is already stretched and seniors on limited incomes are unable to spend more on home care.

Our survey showed:

1. 82.54% of home care and hospice companies do not provide health insurance to all of their employees because of reliance on government program payments and service to individuals with limited incomes

2. 46.2% of those companies face a financial penalty under the employer mandate ranging as high as $4.5 million

3. 73.3% of the companies would reduce the working hours of employees to under 30 per week in order to avoid the cost of health insurance or financial penalties that they cannot afford

4. 22.16% of the businesses expect to close because of the financial penalties

5. 83.2% of the companies expect that access to home care in their community would be reduced with fewer providers of care, more restrictive patient admission criteria to fit a part-time workforce, and restrictions on service areas.

6. 88.46% expect that access to Medicaid home care will no longer be sufficient to meet client's needs

Home care agencies are an essential part of the network of services that our growing population of elderly and persons with disabilities rely on. The last thing we need is an obstacle to helping them grow and create much needed jobs. Simple common sense solutions are often the best answers to complex problems. As far as most people are concerned 40 hours a week equates with full time employment.

Thank you for offering this important legislation.

Sincerely,

VAL J. HALAMANDARIS,
President, National Association for Home Care & Hospice.

DECEMBER 19, 2014.

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

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of AASA: The School Superintendents Association, the Association of Educational Service Agencies, the National Rural Education Association and the National Rural Education Advocacy Coalition, I write to express our support for the Forty Hours is Full Time Act. Collectively, we represent public school superintendents, educational service agency administrators and school system leaders across the country, as well as our nation's rural schools and communities. We have followed closely the Affordable Care Act and stand ready to implement the law, and see your proposed legislation as one way to alleviate an unnecessarily burdensome regulation.

The Forty House is Full Time Act would change the definition of 'full time' in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to 40 hours per week and the number of hours counted toward a 'full time equivalent' employee to 174 hours per month. The current ACA arbitrarily sets the bar for a full work week to 30 hours. This is inconsistent with how most Americans think: full-time is a 40 hour work week. The current definition causes confusion among employers who struggle to understand and comply with the new requirements, especially ones that are in conflict with long-standing practices built on the long-standing 40-hour work week premise.

We welcome the opportunity to ensure our employees have a positive work environment and we remain committed to providing a robust set of work benefits. We are concerned that the ACA, as currently written, puts additional, undue burden on school systems across the nation, many of whom will struggle to staff their schools to meet their educational mission while meeting the strict 30-hour regulation.

We applaud your continued leadership on this issue and look forward to seeing the Forty Hours is Full Time Act move forward.

Sincerely,

NOELLE M. ELLERSON,
AASA, The School Superintendents Association, Associate Executive Director, Policy & Advocacy, AESA, NREA and NREAC Legislative Liaison.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise today to propose three important amendments to S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act.

First of all, I want to make it very clear that I strongly oppose the Keystone XL Pipeline plan. I have serious concern about the effects this project would have on our health and safety; I have serious concerns about the environmental impact; and I am skeptical of the real, permanent jobs it could create.

This project has many risks and very few advantages, and I will be voting against it. But if this legislation does pass the Senate, we should at least try to make it a better bill. There is no excuse why we cannot turn the Keystone XL Pipeline Act into an opportunity to protect our clean drinking water and ensure that polluters have to pay to clean up their own messes.

First, I have offered amendment No. 48, which would remove the Halliburton loophole from the Safe Drinking Water Act and finally require gas storage and gas drilling companies to comply with our clean water laws. Every other industry has to do it. Our farmers have to do it. Construction companies have to do it. Yet our gas companies have been exempt for years.

It should give my colleagues pause that fracking companies are allowed to ignore our clean water laws when they pump chemicals deep into the ground. In this country, when we turn on the tap for a glass of water, we need to know that our drinking water is safe. So let's be fair and hold the gas industry to the same environmental and public health standards as everyone else.

Second, I worked with Senator MENENDEZ on amendment No. 65, which would make oil companies financially responsible for the damages they cause when they spill on our land and leak into our waterways. Under current law, when an onshore oilspill occurs, the company that causes the spill is only liable for $350 million in damages, including cleanup and compensation. Yet a major oilspill into a river or lake, such as the one this week in Montana, could easily result in damage well above that arbitrary limit.

Hard-working taxpayers should never be stuck paying for an oil company's mess, and local property and businesses should not have to slog through endless litigation just to get the compensation they deserve from a negligent oil company. This amendment would finally place the burden on companies to clean up after themselves.

Third, I have proposed amendment No. 76, which would allow our homeowners and business owners whose property has been damaged by natural disaster to use Federal disaster assistance funds to upgrade their property's energy efficiency. Under current law, the disaster assistance can only be used to replace what was lost even if that property was antiquated and not up to current standards. We need to have much more forward-looking policies that actually make sense.

Due to the effects of climate change, we have seen a growing number of natural disasters in recent years, from blizzards, to hurricanes, to raging fires, to endless droughts. When we pick up the pieces after a major storm, we want to make sure that when we rebuild, we rebuild in the smartest way possible, and that includes not only protections against the next disaster but also proactive measures to save energy, reduce emissions, and lower costs.

As I said, I don't support the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, but if this new Congress is intent on sending this bill to the President, then we need to make sure the bill keeps our drinking water safe, holds companies accountable for their own messes, and encourages efficiency in our economy.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BENNET. I congratulate the Presiding Officer for sitting in that chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 18

I wish to speak about the Fischer amendment which is slated to be voted on at some point. While I respect where my neighbor from Nebraska is coming from with this effort, the proposal unfortunately misses the mark by a mile.

The amendment would set up a new and unprecedented process for protective land designations. It says the Secretary of the Interior or Agriculture has to publish in the Federal Register two findings before any congressional protections on public lands would go into effect. First, the Secretary has to find that new, protected land would not adversely affect our efforts to administer existing protected land. Second, the Department has to have ''sufficient resources''—whatever that is—to implement plans for existing protected land. While perhaps innocuous sounding, these would be huge changes in how we do business around here.

Coming from a State that is over a third Federal land, I prefer that drastic reform proposals such as this at least have the benefit of a committee hearing before we vote on them on the floor. That way, we can hear expert testimony as to whether this is a good idea or consider ways we might be able to improve the measure. But as far as I know, this language hasn't had a hearing in this Congress, or any other Congress, for that matter.

Proponents of this amendment are going to argue it simply ensures that our land agencies can afford to keep up with the maintenance of new protected lands. Listen, I am the first—and I have been on this floor year after year after year talking about the fiscal condition of this country—to believe we need more fiscal discipline around

here, but this is not the way we should get it. I am also a huge believer that we shouldn't be overburdening these agencies, and we shouldn't be overregulating through them, either.

Unfortunately, this amendment takes a hatchet when the absolute most that is needed, if anything, is a surgical fix. In fact, under the amendment, the opponents of protected lands could reduce funding for our land agencies through the appropriations process and then turn around and say the Secretary got a veto of the new proposals because sufficient resources aren't available. As one of my friends from Colorado said in the paper this morning: ''This amendment would be a one-two punch—first starve conservation agencies of needed funding and then block any new protections.''

This amendment is drafted in a way that it leaves huge discretion to a future Secretary to approve or veto protections that Congress has seen fit to create. If the amendment passed, nothing would stop a future Secretary from finding that every single conservation bill this Congress has passed should not take effect, all because he or she failed to publish the vague set of findings laid out in this proposal.

Historically, we don't give a member of the executive branch any discretion as to whether they implement the laws that Congress passes and that the President has signed. Yet, this measure would do just that.

I think keeping that historical precedent—where the legislative branch makes the laws and the executive branch implements them—is important. We have heard a lot about that on this floor recently, particularly in a case such as this where we are talking about our national heritage.

Coloradans, and all Americans, love their public lands and want to see more done to protect them. Instead, this amendment creates new layers of red-tape and makes enacting protective designations even more difficult than it has been.

Once again, I wish to say on this floor that I appreciate the effort of the Senator from Nebraska and I would be happy to work with her to address some of her concerns. But I would argue that the investments we make in our public lands are worthwhile ones, and I would invite anyone in this Chamber to come to Colorado and see what I am speaking about.

Protected lands and wide-open spaces are a huge driver of economic growth all across our country. They help sustain a $600 billion outdoor recreation economy, and a lot of those businesses, for obvious reasons, are headquartered in Colorado. On top of the economic benefits, wilderness areas, national monuments, and national parks are a fundamental part of the fabric of our country and of our country's history. It is important to preserve these lands for our kids and our grandkids, just as our grandparents preserved them for us. It is worth investing some money to do that so the next generation and the one after that can experience the greatness that all Americans feel when they first visit the Grand Canyon or Rocky Mountain National Park, or Chimney Rock National Monument, or the Everglades, or wherever we find the next beautiful or historically significant area that Congress or the President decides to protect.

This discussion is actually a timely one because just this past December we passed a large package of conservation measures into law on a bipartisan basis. That package included a bill that we worked on in Colorado called the Hermosa Creek Watershed Protection Act. Let me say at the outset that our office may have introduced that bill in Congress, but it was really the people I represent in southwest Colorado who wrote that bill. This legislation grew from the grassroots up from day one—Republicans, Democrats, Independents working together to cement a long-term plan for their community's future. Not only was it bipartisan at the local level, but also in Congress. My friend SCOTT TIPTON championed the bill on the House side.

The Hermosa Creek Watershed deserved to be protected. That is why the community came together to keep it just as it is. That was the plan in the community, and that is what our bill finally accomplished at the end of the last Congress. However, if we were to pass the amendment in front of us today, all the hard work that went into passing the Hermosa bill could be undone by the Secretary of the Interior. Every single meeting that took place in southwest Colorado, every single conversation that led to the improvement of this legislation—all of that could be gone in an instant, not because the Congress undoes the law but because some administrator, using their fiat, is able to undo the law. It is unlikely—I can't say this for sure, but it is unlikely that person is going to have any idea what is in the Hermosa Creek bill or any of the other bills we have worked on in the past. That is just simply not how we do business around here, and there is a good reason for that.

I am compelled, therefore, to urge other Senators in this body to please oppose the Fischer amendment so we can avoid such a scenario. Rejecting the amendment will preserve our conservation legacy—a legacy that goes straight back to President Teddy Roosevelt, a Republican, who signed the Antiquities Act into law in 1906. It includes the formal establishment of the national park system almost 100 years ago.

This is an extraordinarily beautiful country that we all have the privilege to represent. We ought to encourage conservation efforts, not make them harder to achieve. We ought to build on the legacy of generations of Americans and generations in this body of Republicans and Democrats working together to preserve our natural heritage.

I will, therefore, oppose the Fischer amendment when it comes up for a vote, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to share some thoughts about the debate we are having on the Keystone Pipeline, climate change, and how the two intersect. The concept that climate change is real, I completely understand and accept. To the point of how much man is contributing, I don't know, but it does make sense that manmade emissions are contributing, and the global warming effect, the greenhouse gas effect, seems to me scientifically sound. The problem is how we fix this globally is going to require more than just the United States to be involved.

This deal with China where they have to do nothing for 20 years is probably not exactly where I want to be. The bottom line is that the solutions coming from our Democratic friends about how to deal with greenhouse gas emissions turn our economy upside down and do more damage to the economy and to the welfare of the American people than it will in terms of helping the environment.

Our liberal friends give us a false choice. You have to reorganize the economy in a draconian fashion to help the environment. Some people on my side believe that the whole climate change experience is scientifically unsound. I am not a scientist, but I have heard enough regarding those who make it their life's work to be convinced that manmade emissions are causing the problem and contribute to the overall warming of the planet.

About the Keystone Pipeline, my Democratic friends are making an argument that is just absolutely false. The product that Canada will produce from the oil sands is going to be used by us, the world community through the gulf port or by China.

Those who believe denying the building of the pipeline protects the planet from fossil fuels do not understand what Canada is about to do. Canada is going to sell the product to somebody. The question for us is, Would we benefit from building a pipeline that will create American jobs and help us put oil into that pipeline within the United States in a joint venture with Canada or we will say no to the Canadians and they will go build a pipeline and send it to China?

The product is going to be burned. It is going to be used. The only question for this Congress is, Do we want the pipeline to go West and export the product to China or do we want to

build the pipeline so we will have more product from a friend rather than enemies?

Dirty oil is oil that comes from people who hate your guts. The sulfur content of oil sands product is higher than Mideast sweet crude but no different than the oil we find off the coast of California. The actual carbon content is no different than the oil we find off the coast of California. To lock this country and the world into buying more Mideast product seems to me to be a very bad idea at a very dangerous time. So when I hear Members of the Democratic Party take the floor and say: Don't build this pipeline because it will help the environment, you obviously don't realize what Canada is about to do. Canada is going to sell the oil to another customer, build a new pipeline, and the only question for you is, How do you justify that? How do you justify destroying the ability to create thousands of jobs in the country at a time when we need them? How do you justify not building a pipeline that could be used to help us with product from North Dakota and other places within our own country?

You can justify it, but you can't say it is based on climate change because the product you are talking about is going into the environment. It is going to be used. It is either going to be used coming to America to our benefit or the pipeline will be built west and it will go to China.

To our friends in Canada, I imagine your patience is about to run out with us, and I don't blame you one bit if you get tired of dealing with an American Government that seems completely out of sync with reality. In terms of the lawsuits, it is a procedural issue. In Nebraska the pipeline is one of thousands of pipelines we already have in America.

To the President last night, instead of one pipeline, why don't we have a comprehensive infrastructure strategy? I am all for that. But you are threatening to veto building this pipeline. Why? Because your judgment has been taken over by the environmental community which is hell-bent on no fossil fuels anywhere, anyway, anyhow.

That is not the world in which we live. I embrace the fact that a lower carbon economy will be beneficial over time. My view is: Find more fossil fuels from friendly people, including our own backyard—Canada, the United States—to replace fossil fuels we have to buy from foreign entities that do not like us very much. That concept is a reality. We are not going to be able to replace fossil fuels any time soon.

We can invent technology to make it cleaner. We can find alternatives. But at the end of the day it comes down to this: If you are using climate change as a reason not to build this pipeline, you are kidding yourself or you are misleading the public because the product is going to be used. They are going to build a pipeline in Canada. The question is, Do they build a pipeline that we get no benefit from or do they build a pipeline in collaboration with us that helps us with our job problems and our energy needs?

I don't understand how you can justify voting against the Keystone Pipeline based on a concern about climate change because it has absolutely nothing to do with the issue in this regard. The product is going to be used by somebody, and they are going to build a pipeline somewhere. For you to deny us the ability to build this pipeline that would make us more energy independent from overseas' fossil fuels is shortsighted and does not advance the cause of climate change.

To the people who believe in climate change, it is gimmicks such as this and tricks such as this that hurt your cause. You are undercutting a real genuine debate. You made climate change a religion rather than a problem. It is a problem, but you are taking a draconian approach to the problem to the point that you are denying our country the ability to build a pipeline that we would benefit from economically and energy security-wise. The alternative you are leaving this country is that the same product will go somewhere else, and the next pipeline will not benefit America. So it is stunts like this that undercut your overall efforts.

I wish you would change your mind about the pipeline and work with Republicans who are willing to work with you to deal with emissions in a realistic way and stop selling what I think is a fraud when it comes to this debate.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 29

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am on the floor to say a few words about my amendment No. 29, which we will be voting on shortly after 3 o'clock, I am told. That is the simple amendment that says it is the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax.

It is, perhaps, a telling coincidence that we are having this conversation on the floor of the Senate now on the fifth anniversary of the Citizens United decision, because before Citizens United came along, there was actually a pretty robust conversation between Democrats and Republicans about carbon pollution, climate change, and what needed to be done about it.

For instance, Senator JOHN MCCAIN ran for President on a robust platform of addressing the carbon that causes climate change.

Senator COLLINS worked with the current energy ranking member, Senator CANTWELL, on a very robust climate bill that would have put a cap on carbon pollution and paid a dividend back to the American people.

Senator MARK KIRK voted for Waxman-Markey when that bill was on the floor of the House, the famous cap-and-trade bill.

Senator FLAKE wrote an article in his home State paper expressing the value and merit of a carbon fee when it is offset by reductions in other taxes as a way to help workers and address the pollution problem.

Over and over again there were these joint actions all the way back to when I first came to the EPW Committee and Senator John Warner of Virginia was its then ranking member. He wrote Warner-Lieberman with our colleague, then Senator Lieberman.

Then came Citizens United. Then came the massive influx of polluter money into our political system, much of it dark money. At about the spring of 2010—and Citizens United was decided in January of 2010—that was the end of the conversation.

So here we are today. We are just now reaching agreement on several votes by which I believe our Republican colleagues will, for the first time since Citizens United—some of them, at least—acknowledge that climate change is real.

Indeed, we just heard my friend Senator GRAHAM come to the floor and speak—right there—saying that climate change is real, that humans had a significant role in causing it, and it was something we ought to pay attention to.

This is new. Today, after 5 years of more or less silence. I have spoken on this floor, as everybody knows, a great deal on this subject, and nobody has ever come from the other side of the aisle to respond to me, except for the now-chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, to maintain his view that climate change is actually a hoax that is perpetrated by the scientific community in order to get grants and funding.

So it has been a long drought. It has been a long, long drought. Frankly, it has been a drought that does not reflect the best traditions of this body.

This body has taken on big issues in the past. It took on civil rights. It tried to hold this country together over the issue of slavery.

This body has been significant in the history of the United States at important junctions, and here we are at this important junction where our energy policy needs to change and half of the body basically was mute.

Today that seems to have changed.

That, to me, is very significant. I look forward to a vote on my amendment. As I said, it is very simple. Climate change is real and not a hoax. I hope that is something we can agree on as a body. If we do, then it becomes a predicate for beginning to advance an important conversation.

I am not going to agree with all of my Republican colleagues about their views on how to respond to this problem, and I don't expect my Republican

colleagues to agree with all of my views on how we should respond to this problem. But the dark days of denying that there actually is a problem may very well have seen their first little break of dawn right now.

If that is so, that is exciting news because, as many Republicans have noted—Republicans such as Secretary Schultz, Republicans such as Secretary Paulson, Republicans such as Ronald Reagan's economic adviser, the economist Arthur Laffer—there are smart, conservative ways to address this problem.

I continue to think that the idea that Senator FLAKE signed off on all those years ago is still the right one to do: Raise a fee by putting a price on carbon that reflects the economic fact that it creates harm for so many other folks, the so-called externalities, what the economists would say. The costs that burning carbon causes to fishermen, to foresters, to homeowners, to people who live near the sea, those costs—build them into the price of the product. That is economics 101. Then take every single dollar that we raise and lower working people's taxes.

I am completely comfortable with that notion. That is one that has been over and over again brought up in the context of Republican and conservative discussions, including a very good recent paper jointly authored by a writer from the American Enterprise Institute.

I see the deputy minority leader on the floor. I had the pleasure of traveling with him and with our ranking member on the Judiciary Committee and other colleagues to Cuba. When we spent time with Cuban officials, Cuban religious leaders, Cuban—just regular folks on the street, over and over again we heard the same phrases coming at us, that it was a time of hope and it was a time of promise.

If there is going to be a time of hope and a time of promise in Cuba, let's hope it can be a time of hope and a time of promise in this body on climate change. It starts with admitting that you have a problem, just like in so many other areas of human life. So I hope that, frankly, every Member of the Senate will vote for my amendment. We appreciate the opportunity to work with the new majority on ways that we can address this telling problem.

I will close by saying this. I am never going away on this subject. It is too important to my home State of Rhode Island. There is no Senator in this body who, if they had an issue as important to their home State as this issue is to Rhode Island, I would not expect and respect to fight all the way through to the bitter end for the interests of their State. My fishermen are not finding the fish where they have been for generations. People who have built homes on the shore are losing them into the sea in big storms. These are real consequences, and we—I promise you one way or the other—are going to do something about it. I hope this is the dawn of that new day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Rhode Island. He and I did travel to Havana, Cuba, earlier this week. Interestingly enough, we sat down with the scientists and the people responsible for the oceans and other natural benefits in Cuba to discuss global warming, and the conversation started at the same place. Even with these scientists, there is no question they can see the impact, and they started their predictions about the rise of the ocean levels—and the Senator from Rhode Island knows this far better than I do—with their anticipation that the ocean levels will rise over a foot in just 10 or 20 years and then twice that over a period of 50 years or more. That will have a profound impact on the island, the archipelago of Cuba, and the United States.

Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, more than any other Senator, has really brought this issue home—not just to his home but to the Atlantic Coast States—and has reported on the impacts they face. Now, I live smack dab in the middle of the country—in Illinois. I can tell you we appreciate there are changes taking place on this planet that are not in our best interests—nor will they leave our children and grandchildren a better place to live.

The obvious question we face is what will we do in this generation. This bill, S. 1, which has been chosen by the Republican majority, has given us a venue finally to raise some important environmental issues which have been ignored for too long.

I know the object of this bill was to build a pipeline. TransCanada, a Canadian company, wants to build a pipeline through the United States. They may or may not sell any oil from it in the United States. We had a vote on that yesterday, and the Republicans overwhelmingly said they would not require them to sell their oil in the United States. They may or may not use American steel to build their pipeline. We had that amendment yesterday, and the Republicans voted overwhelmingly that there is to be no requirement to use American steel to build this pipeline. Yet it is characterized as an American jobs bill. It is hard to understand that characterization.

If nothing else, whatever happens to this bill—and it may not have a great fate ahead of it, if it is not changed significantly because the President has already threatened to veto it—what the Senator from Rhode Island said is significant. After years of denial from the other side of the aisle about the issues of global warming, we may have just reached a point where we are finally, on a bipartisan basis, going to acknowledge the obvious—the scientific facts which have been given to us over and over and over. That is a step in the right direction, and so I want to thank my colleague from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 69

Let me take 2 minutes to say a word about my pending amendment, which may come up for a vote shortly. It is amendment No. 69.

What I have said on the floor is there is a dirty little secret about the Keystone Pipeline. You don't take Canadian tar sands and turn them into gasoline and diesel fuel without filtering and refining out some pretty horrible things. What is filtered out is called petcoke, and petcoke is going to be produced in the refining process if this pipeline is ultimately built—over 15,000 tons a day of petcoke, the byproduct of this refining process.

If you look at it and you think to yourself what impact will that have, it could have a very negative impact. In my city of Chicago, which I am very proud to represent, as well as in other communities, petcoke piles have become a challenge to the public health and the people in the community. I am asking in my amendment that we establish a standard of safety when it comes to petcoke—that we establish a standard of transportation and storage of petcoke to protect American families and children from the hazards of breathing petcoke dust.

This is a simple public health amendment, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. May I inquire of the Senator—we will be shortly voting on a number of measures. One is a side-by-side to the Schatz amendment which includes a quotation from an environmental impact statement, and the quotation is as follows:

> . . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios.

Does the Senator recall when the EIS was written and what the oil prices were that were expected at the time this document was prepared?

Mr. DURBIN. Until very recently, of course, the price of a barrel of oil was high enough to justify tar sands, their extraction, the cost of transportation and the additional cost of refining them into a final product. Since that time, the cost of oil is almost half today what it was when that report was written.

I don't remember the exact date, perhaps the Senator has it handy.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Indeed, I would say the breakpoint for that study was at $75 per barrel, and it was at that point that the environmental impact became very real from this harmful tar sands fuel. Not only are we not just under $75 per barrel, we have hit as low as below $50 per barrel.

So I just want to make sure, as long as we are voting on this language very

shortly, that it is clear in the RECORD of the Senate that the environmental impact statement was hinged on that the ''expected oil prices'' were north of $75 per barrel; that they are now well below that, around $50 per barrel. And, indeed, I would add that the Canadian Research Institute has said the tar sands can't be properly extracted at prices less than $85 per barrel.

So that puts in context what we will be voting on that I thought should be in the RECORD.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

It is significant that the first bill of the Senate Republican majority is a bill to build a pipeline for a Canadian company to bring tar sands across the United States to be refined in Texas and then sold overseas. That is the highest priority of the Republican majority.

There are those who, based on what the Senator just said, question whether this is economically viable with the price of a barrel of oil today. I am not an economist in energy, but it strikes me there has been a significant change in the premise of this whole project.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Indeed, in my remarks earlier, I referred to this pipeline as possibly an economic zombie at the current oil prices. I have not seen a single report that this pipeline can be built and operated properly at oil prices where they are right now.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for Senator HOEVEN or his designee to offer his amendment No. 87, as modified; further, that the time until 3:15 p.m. this afternoon be equally divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate then proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Lee, No. 33; Durbin, No. 69; Toomey, No. 41; Whitehouse, No. 29; Hoeven, No. 87, as modified; and Schatz, No. 58; further, that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption and that no second-degrees be in order to the amendments. I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

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

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, as my colleague from Alaska just said, we are making progress. We have another group of amendments we are going to be voting on shortly. I would encourage any of the Members on our side who would like to take a few minutes to go over their amendments before the vote—we have a few minutes between now and 3:15 p.m.—to do so. During this series of votes coming up, we will be working with our colleagues to get the next set of amendments and to continue to move forward.

I will have a little more to say, but I see a couple of our colleagues here, so I will give them a chance to talk about their amendments.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. My understanding is that we have time equally divided between now and 3:15, before the votes start.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 69

Mr. DURBIN. Seeing no one on the floor, I would like to say a word about an amendment which will be voted on. I believe it is the second in the queue, and it is the amendment I have offered relative to petcoke.

Petcoke is the product derived from the refining of Canadian tar sands, and if you happen to live in some communities in America, petcoke can be a real problem.

This is the city of Chicago, IL. You can see some of the bungalows and houses here, and right across the railroad tracks you can see mounds of petcoke coming in from the British Petroleum refinery. They generate somewhere in the range of 6,000 tons a day of this petcoke and pile it up right here. It is ultimately transported to different places, but it sits here. It obviously is a hazard to people who live nearby. It blows in the wind, creating public health issues and real concern for families with children with asthma, respiratory disease.

I have an amendment, and it is very basic. No. 1, the amendment talks about making sure there are standards and rules for the storage enclosure of petcoke. Most of the cities—whether it is Long Beach, CA; or Detroit, MI; or Chicago, IL—are trying to find established standards to enclose this petcoke so it doesn't blow freely in the atmosphere.

Senator HOEVEN spoke earlier and said it was not carcinogenic. Those findings related not to the breathing in of this dust but to the ingestion of petcoke itself. We have yet to establish that this is a benign substance, and we are trying to take care to protect families who might be exposed to it.

I am not surprised to see that there has been a letter issued by the National Association of Manufacturers opposing my amendment. They start by saying that petcoke is a valuable, essential commercial product that is used in a wide array of applications. I am not stopping that at all. Anyone who wants to take this petcoke and use it to produce energy and power generation, cement kilns, steel, glass, as long as they comply with basic environmental standards, be my guest. But to store it in such a fashion that it can blow all over and cause public health hazards is unacceptable—it should be—in a modern society. Secondly, if those who store it end up, we find over the long haul, creating a long-term hazard to the environment, they should be held legally responsible.

That is the extent of my amendment. I am not surprised that the National Association of Manufacturers would oppose it. But I would ask each and every Member to consider the possibility that if they lived across the tracks from this kind of petcoke conglomeration—I have seen it. It is horrible, and we are fighting it in the city of Chicago. The company that owns the petcoke—the Koch Brothers. So it shouldn't be any surprise that the National Association of Manufacturers took the position they did.

I hope that all of us who may be subject to this kind of dumping of petcoke near a city in our State will think twice. Let's at least have some standards for storage and enclosure to protect the people in our States, and let's make certain that if there is ultimately environmental damage here, that the parties who make the profit off of petcoke are ultimately responsible.

That is the extent of my amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 33

Ms. CANTWELL. I would like to take a few minutes to talk about the Lee amendment, No. 33, which is going to be voted on shortly. I know my colleagues are going to have 2 minutes divided before the vote, so people can add comments as they wish.

This amendment makes it very difficult for citizens to retain counsel, particularly related to the Endangered Species Act. I don't know why we would be handicapping legal cases just because they deal with the environment. I mean, I guess if you are not interested in protecting the environment, you would want to make it harder for people to retain lawyers. But when I think about property rights and clean water and clean air and all of those issues, I think that is something on which we ought to go the extra mile

and make sure they get representation and counsel, not handicap them and make it harder just because we don't want companies to adhere to environmental laws.

I believe this is important because my colleagues should remember that the ESA was signed into law in 1973 by then-President Richard Nixon and was intentionally drafted to manage and to engage citizens in the protection of endangered species.

Now, in general, litigants in the country must bear their own costs, and the prevailing party is not ordinarily entitled to collect his or her expenses in a defending suit from the loser. But both the courts and Congress have provided an exemption from that rule, and so they have allowed in certain circumstances for judges to shift the cost to litigants in the interest of fairness and to further protect the public interest.

So that is what is at stake this morning. I think the Endangered Species Act is a prime example of why the courts decided they wanted to have this kind of leeway and protection. Congress knew when it enacted the Endangered Species Act that it would be difficult and the Nation would want to make sure that ordinary citizens had the opportunity to help ensure compliance with the law. So Congress recognized that when a citizen did so, he or she did not do so necessarily by themselves alone but with the counsel of a private attorney. Congress recognized this reality in statute.

So this is what we are going to be addressing. In contrast, the Lee amendment would weaken the prevailing citizen's request for reimbursement under an Endangered Species Act—and narrow those restrictions of equal access to justice. This is because the cap on fees would include the Equal Access to Justice Act, which often falls well below the market-based rate for attorneys. Basically, what the Lee amendment does is say you will not be able to recap on the attorneys' fees at the cost of doing business, and their hope is that citizens will then not have representation before the courts on issues such as clean air, clean water, and other environmental issues.

I say to my colleagues—and I have said this to the now-ranking member on the EPW Committee—I don't know why we are not taking up the Superfund bill. To me, getting the Superfund reauthorized—these are polluters that have polluted our country, and they are not even paying the tax that it would cost to clean up the pollution.

Instead, we are considering an amendment that says: Let's roll back the environmental law on this issue and make sure that citizens don't have the right to help enforce environmental law.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the Lee amendment when we get to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 87, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HOEVEN] proposes an amendment numbered 87, as modified, to amendment No. 2.

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

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding climate change)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The environmental analysis contained in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement referred to in section 2(a) and deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) as described in section 2(a), states that—

(1) ''[W]arming of the climate system is unequivocal and each of the last [3] decades has been successively warmer at the Earth's surface than any preceding decade since 1850.'';

(2) ''The [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change], in addition to other institutions, such as the National Research Council and the United States (U.S.) Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), have concluded that it is extremely likely that global increases in atmospheric [greenhouse gas] concentrations and global temperatures are caused by human activities.'';

(3) ''A warmer planet causes large-scale changes that reverberate throughout the climate system of the Earth, including higher sea levels, changes in precipitation, and altered weather patterns (e.g. an increase in more extreme weather events).

(4) ''The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route'' (FSEIS page 4.16–1, section 4.16.;

(5) ''The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project'' (FSEIS page ES–34, section ES.5.4.2).; and

(6) ''. . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios'' (FSEIS page ES–16, section ES.4.1.1).''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Consistent with the findings under subsection (a), it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is real; and

(2) human activity contributes to climate change.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 33

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a vote in relation to amendment No. 33, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry—I wish to speak on the Hoeven amendment and take the 1 minute.

Excuse me. I withdraw my request.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 69

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 69 offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is the petcoke amendment. There are communities in this Nation—Chicago, Detroit, Long Beach, CA—and it may be coming to other areas soon. Petcoke is the byproduct of Canadian tar sands when it is refined. This pipeline will

generate 15,000 tons a day of petcoke that has to be stored. We are asking that it be stored responsibly so it doesn't blow through towns and neighborhoods that I and my colleagues represent, and let's establish standards for that purpose. It can still be used legitimately for many products, but let's make sure it doesn't cause respiratory problems for the people we represent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. When Canadian oil sands are refined, they produce petroleum coke, which is this high-energy, mostly carbon, coal-like substance, but it does have economic value. It can be used for fuel; it can be used for smelting; it can be used for producing dry cell batteries and other purposes.

The EPA's own Web site states—and this is from their Web site—petroleum coke itself has a low level of toxicity, and there is no evidence of carcinogenicity. The EPA's hazard characterization has also shown there are no adverse environmental effects associated with petroleum coke piles and the EPA's words are ''they are essentially inert.''

I have listened to the comments of my colleague from Illinois, and I appreciate the concerns those in neighborhoods have, but I think it is important that we recognize we are not trying to skip the science. We are not trying to add regulations for the transport and storage of something that is apparently not hazardous, according to the EPA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—58

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

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 41

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 41, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, before we proceed to hear from the sponsor of this amendment, I would just remind Members that these are 10-minute votes. It would be good—we have four more that we need to do. It would be good if we could stick to our 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to thank Senators CASEY and HATCH for joining me in this amendment. For almost 200 years, we have been mining coal in Pennsylvania. Some of it came out of the ground, and it turns out it was not suitable for the steel industry for which it was intended. The unsuitable coal has been piled up for decades. It forms mountains. Pennsylvania alone has 2 billion tons and 180,000 acres of contaminated land. These mountains of coal poison our water. They poison our air when they spontaneously combust and burn—sometimes for over a year—releasing pollutants with no controls whatsoever.

So we have an industry that is solving this problem, systematically turning this coal into electric power. Senators CASEY, HATCH, and I have an amendment that will simply allow this cleanup to continue, to exempt these 19 powerplants from the particularly onerous regulations in utility MACT and from the cross-air pollution regulations.

A vote in favor of this amendment is a vote to continue to clean up this environmental disaster that we have on our hands. I would be very grateful for Member support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, in speaking in opposition to the Toomey amendment, it is an attack on the Clean Air Act. I want to speak in favor of making sure that we are doing everything the Supreme Court said we need to do, which is to enforce the Clean Air Act.

While my colleague is making a point, I do not know why we should give some powerplants in Pennsylvania an exemption to the Clean Air Act. Obviously, there are businesses all across America that have to comply with environmental laws. By voting against this amendment, we can continue to fight against these pollution issues and make sure that special interests are not getting another narrow carve-out in this legislation.

So I would ask my colleagues to make sure that we are not creating a special exemption for the mercury and air toxic standards in the Clean Air Act and vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Toomey amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, is any time remaining at all?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—45

Alexander	Feinstein	Murray
Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Boxer	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Tester
Carper	McCaskill	Udall
Collins	Menendez	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warren
Donnelly	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 29

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 29, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Colleagues, I almost hate to use my minute because I am so eager to hear what will be said during the minute when our energy chairman will follow me, but I am hoping that after many years of darkness and blockade, this vote will be a first little beam of light through the wall that will allow us to at least start having an honest conversation about what carbon pollution is doing to our climate and to our oceans. This is a matter of vital consequence to my home State, the Ocean State, my home, Rhode Island, and to many of yours as well.

I hope this is a place where we can get together and have a strong, positive vote that sends a signal that this Senate, at this time in history, is ready to deal with reality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I yield 1 minute on our side to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor to the Whitehouse amendment.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Climate is changing. Climate has always changed, and it always will. There is archaeological evidence of that, there is biblical evidence, and there is historical evidence. It will always change. The hoax is that there are some people who are so arrogant, who think that they are so powerful that they can change the climate. Man can't change the climate.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the Whitehouse-Inhofe amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. In the time remaining, I recognize and thank the cosponsors on my side of the aisle, Senator SANDERS, Senator MANCHIN, and Senator LEAHY. Senator INHOFE and I are not alone on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Fischer	Murphy
Ayotte	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blumenthal	Graham	Peters
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Boxer	Heitkamp	Roberts
Brown	Heller	Rounds
Burr	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sanders
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	Kaine	Scott
Cassidy	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Corker	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McCaskill	Udall
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Enzi	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murkowski	

NAYS—1

Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 87, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 87, as modified, offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have an amendment before us, a side-by-side to the amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Hawaii, and what we do within this side-by-side is effectively lay out findings contained within the administration's EIS that outline the environmental impact of a Keystone XL Pipeline, recognizing the impact to the environment will be less if this line is actually constructed.

We further go into a sense of the Senate that acknowledges—again after the vote we just had—that climate change is real and that there is an impact.

With that, I would recommend that folks look at the language that has been offered. I will be supporting the Hoeven amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we are about to vote on something that I think will be recorded as a breakthrough moment in the climate debate. For the first time we will go on record saying the following: Climate change is real and human activity contributes to climate change.

What a breath of fresh air this amendment is, and I urge an ''aye'' vote very strongly.

The front part of the amendment accurately quotes the EIS, parts of which a lot of us agree with and parts of which we don't. Let it be known that the parts we don't agree with are under review by various agencies, but this is accurate. This is a quote from the current EIS.

You are not voting to endorse the EIS, you are just voting to acknowledge that is what it says. But you are voting on original language written by Senator HOEVEN that says climate change is real and human activity contributes to it.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the Hoeven amendment, as modified.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Hatch	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Paul
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Peters
Booker	Heller	Portman
Boxer	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Kaine	Rounds
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Kirk	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Toomey
Corker	McCain	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—40

Barrasso	Cornyn	Gardner
Blunt	Cotton	Grassley
Boozman	Crapo	Hoeven
Burr	Cruz	Inhofe
Capito	Daines	Isakson
Cassidy	Enzi	Johnson
Coats	Ernst	Lankford
Cochran	Fischer	Lee

McConnell	Sanders	Thune
Moran	Sasse	Tillis
Perdue	Scott	Vitter
Risch	Sessions	Wicker
Roberts	Shelby	
Rubio	Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 affirmative votes for the adoption of the amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. THUNE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 58

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 58 offered by the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. SCHATZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. My colleague from Hawaii, Senator SCHATZ, wishes to speak on his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Thank you, Mr. President.

This has been a surprisingly productive day on the issue of climate debate. I know there has been a lot of consternation and discussion, but that is a good thing.

We have one final amendment to consider today, and it simply takes a portion of the language from the EIS for the Keystone XL and adopts it. That language says, in summary, that climate change is real and that climate change is caused by humans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SCHATZ. That language simply states that climate change is real, that climate change is caused by humans and principally by carbon pollution.

So the simple vote in front of us is: Do you agree with the factual evidence? Will you concede to the facts? We have an opportunity to set a new chapter in this climate debate. Today has been good progress.

So I urge my colleagues for a big bipartisan vote on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I urge colleagues to oppose the Schatz amendment. There is a distinct difference between this amendment and what was previously considered in the sense of the Congress, which would refer to human activity that significantly contributes to climate change, and the issue of degrees. And I would suggest to colleagues that the inclusion of that word is sufficient to merit a ''no'' vote at this time.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed (RI)
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Kirk	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall
Collins	Markey	Warner
Coons	McCaskill	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HOEVEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at this time I know Senators are interested in coming to the floor and offering their amendments. We have been discussing a process forward on this side of the aisle.

Earlier in the day Senator FISCHER had been working on an amendment that she has agreed to modify. I understand that the other side has a side-by-side that they will ask for consideration on.

I know the Senator from Louisiana will be on the floor to speak on an amendment he would like considered, and I understand there are a couple of other Senators on the other side who wish to speak as well.

There will be no more votes today on these amendments, but again, given the interest in this subject, I encourage Members to come down and speak to their amendments. We would like to figure out that process to get a series of amendments pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I again thank the Senator from Alaska for working through this process and the due diligence given. I think we are very close to having the side-by-side language, and once that is done, we will give it out to everyone for review. We need to get the Fischer amendment and the side-by-side figured out.

Everybody is asking about the process. If we could get the next set of amendments offered by colleagues, it will give us a chance to proceed on figuring out when the next votes will be scheduled.

With that, I understand Senator SANDERS wishes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL for working on a sensible process.

I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the current amendment and call up my amendment No. 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. MENENDEZ, proposes an amendment numbered 24 to amendment No. 2.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding climate change)

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community that—

(1) climate change is real;

(2) climate change is caused by human activities;

(3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;

(4) a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm; and

(5) it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I especially wish to applaud Republican Senators. I believe, for the very first time, a number of them stood up and said: Climate change is real and climate change is

caused by human activities. This is a significant step forward, and I think that in the months and years to come more and more Republicans will accept that position because that is the position of the scientific community.

What my amendment does is in fact repeat what we heard today and what we voted on; that climate change is real and that it is caused by human activities, but it also has three other provisions in it. It says climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world.

I think it is hard to argue against that. Whether it is drought or flooding—in the United States or around the world—increased forest fires in the Southwestern United States, rising sea levels or extreme weather conditions and the damage that does, it is very hard to argue that climate change has not caused severe and devastating problems in the United States already.

This amendment also says that a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffers irreparable harm. Again, that is what the scientific community is telling us. They are saying that damage is being done today, now, and it will only get worse in years to come. We have a brief window of opportunity to prevent very serious problems. I hope my colleagues will support that provision.

Lastly, and what logically follows from the previous four positions, is the following: It is imperative that the United States transforms its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible. That doesn't mean you close down every coal-burning plant in America tomorrow, but it does mean we move away from fossil fuel to energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

I think in terms of this bill we have already made some good progress. I will look for bipartisan support tomorrow so the Senate goes on record supporting the overwhelming percentage of scientists who are in agreement with what this amendment says.

With that, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

(Purpose: To provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf)

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 80, which I discussed previously today and which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER], for himself and Mr. CASSIDY, proposes an amendment numbered 80 to amendment No. 2.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 80, AS MODIFIED

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING REVENUE

SEC. __01. REVENUE SHARING FROM OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF WIND ENERGY PRODUCTION FACILITIES.

The first sentence of section 8(p)(2)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting after ''27 percent'' the following: '', or, in the case of projects for offshore wind energy production facilities, 37.5 percent''.

SEC. __02. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS.

Section 18(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall make available for leasing and conduct lease sales including at least 50 percent of the available unleased acreage within each outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources (on a total btu basis) based on the most recent national geologic assessment of the outer Continental Shelf, with an emphasis on offering the most geologically prospective parts of the planning area.

''(B) The Secretary shall include in each proposed oil and gas leasing program under this section any State subdivision of an outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that the Governor of the State that represents that subdivision requests be made available for leasing. The Secretary may not remove such a subdivision from the program until publication of the final program, and shall include and consider all such subdivisions in any environmental review conducted and statement prepared for such program under section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

''(C) In this paragraph, the term 'available unleased acreage' means that portion of the outer Continental Shelf that is not under lease at the time of a proposed lease sale, and that has not otherwise been made unavailable for leasing by law.

''(6)(A) In the 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the Secretary shall make available for leasing any outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that—

''(i) is estimated to contain more than 2,500,000,000 barrels of oil; or

''(ii) is estimated to contain more than 7,500,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

''(B) To determine the planning areas described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the document entitled 'Minerals Management Service Assessment of Undiscovered Technically Recoverable Oil and Gas Resources of the Nation's Outer Continental Shelf, 2006'.''.

SEC. __03. DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 102 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (11) as paragraphs (6) through (12), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) COASTAL STATE.—The term 'coastal State' means—

''(A) each of the Gulf producing States; and

''(B) effective for fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, each of the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.'';

(3) in paragraph (10) (as so redesignated), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues' means all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States—

''(i) received on or after October 1, 2016, from leases entered into on or after December 20, 2006, with respect to the Gulf producing States; and

''(ii) from leases entered into on or after October 1, 2015, with respect to each of the coastal States described in paragraph (5)(B).''; and

(4) in paragraph (11) (as so redesignated), by striking ''Gulf producing State'' each place it appears and inserting ''coastal State''.

(b) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.—Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**FROM 181 AREA, 181 SOUTH AREA, AND 2002-2007 PLANNING AREAS OF GULF OF MEXICO**'';

(2) by striking ''Gulf producing State'' each place it appears (other than paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b)) and inserting ''coastal State'';

(3) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

''(A) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to Gulf producing States—

''(i) 75 percent to Gulf producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

''(ii) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title; and

''(B) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to coastal States described in section 102(5)(B), 100 percent to the coastal States in accordance with subsection (b).'';

(4) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''GULF PRODUCING STATES'' and inserting ''COASTAL STATES'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) ALLOCATION AMONG CERTAIN ATLANTIC STATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 AND THEREAFTER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), effective for fiscal years 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be allocated to each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on

the coastline of each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

''(B) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(B).''; and

(D) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B)), by striking ''paragraphs (1) and (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)''; and

(5) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available to coastal States under subsection (a)(2) shall not exceed—

''(A) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(A),

''(i) $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025; and

''(ii) $250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2065; and

''(B) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(B)—

''(i) $500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 though 2025; and

''(ii) $749,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2055.''.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 72 to protect private property from unjust seizure by a foreign corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], for himself and Ms. CANTWELL, proposes an amendment numbered 72 to amendment No. 2.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure private property cannot be seized through condemnation or eminent domain for the private gain of a foreign-owned business entity)

In section 2 of the amendment, strike subsection (e) and insert the following:

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired from willing sellers.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It prohibits TransCanada from using eminent domain proceedings to seize private property in order to build the Keystone XL Pipeline.

As we all know, eminent domain is the power of a governmental entity to take private property and convert it into public use subject to reasonable compensation. Traditionally, property could only be seized for public use, such as a public park or a public road, but increasingly the exercise of eminent domain has been used for private gain.

Many, including some of my most conservative friends on the other side of the aisle, are outraged by the idea that eminent domain proceedings could be used to seize private property for private gain.

President Bush issued an Executive order restricting the use of eminent domain by the Federal Government for ''the purpose of benefitting the general public and not merely for the purpose of advancing the economic interest of private parties.''

The senior Senator from Texas introduced the Protections of Homes, Small Businesses, and Private Property Act of 2005, which would have prohibited the use of eminent domain by Federal, State, or local government entities for private economic development.

I have been working very closely with Senator CANTWELL on this amendment, and we agree with our conservative colleagues that using eminent domain proceedings for private gain is outrageous.

On the issue of Keystone, a foreign-owned company is using eminent domain to seize private property so it can better export Canadian oil. The project is not in the public interest, but it is clearly in the special interest.

I do not begrudge the fact that a Canadian company wants its subsidiary to build this pipeline so it can export foreign oil to distant shores through American infrastructure. They want to make a profit, and I understand that. But I do not think we should allow our sovereignty to be compromised in order to do it.

Right now the U.S. Federal Government is trying to build a ferry terminal in Canada to serve Alaska, but Canadians are protecting their sovereignty and objecting to U.S. steel and other U.S. content from being the sole source for the ferry terminal. I disagree with Canada on that point, but I understand they want to protect their sovereignty. Similarly, we need to protect American sovereignty and American landowners from a Canadian-owned company that wants to seize our private lands for private gain and force Americans to take a risk of Canadian pollution.

Over the weekend landowners along the route of the Keystone XL Pipeline were seeing a pipeline spill on the Yellowstone River in Montana. It is happening now. If we were to see pictures of it, we would see that the efforts to clean up the spill are being hindered by a sheet of ice. Who knows what damage is being done by 50,000 gallons of oil in this river. We might not know until spring. Landowners are wondering if their family farm will be the victim of a similar spill, wondering if property that has been in their family for generations can still be passed on to the next generation.

One landowner who has seen firsthand what can happen when a pipeline is put on your property is Lori Collins. In October of 2012 Lori Collins walked outside her home to find construction workers for a TransCanada contractor trying to clear the way for the southern leg of the Keystone Pipeline. They had dug up the lines to her septic system, completely destroying it. When she asked the workers to repair the damage, they did not. Instead, they piled dirt over the damage and clogged the system. The result was raw sewage flooding back into the Collins' home, staining walls and carpets, leaving a black mold throughout their house, and leaving Lori Collins with severe respiratory problems. The Collins family was eventually forced to move out of their home. While they were able to get a settlement after suing TransCanada, the family says they can never repair the damage to their lives.

Jim Tarnick, a farmer in Nebraska, has heard of TransCanada's track record and fears that he might have to suffer similar damage or, worse, face an oilspill. TransCanada wants to put the pipeline right through his front yard on his property that has been in his family for over 100 years.

Mr. Tarnick's farm sits near the Ogallala Aquifer, which provides critical freshwater for farmers and ranchers in the heart of U.S. farm country. A pipeline spill such as the one on the Yellowstone River over the last few days could damage the aquifer and therefore jeopardize a resource relied on by Nebraskan farms and ranches. Mr. Tarnick fears he will be served with papers invoking eminent domain on his property any day now. TransCanada is asking that he and other Nebraskans trust that they will protect the Ogallala Aquifer and the livelihoods it supports.

Instead of forcing Mr. Tarnick to host the Keystone Pipeline against his will, let's instead let TransCanada work with landowners who are willing to take the risk and will be paid what they feel is fair rather than what TransCanada's lawyers can convince a judge is fair.

Senator CANTWELL and I believe this amendment is one of simple fairness and should be a no-brainer, an easy amendment every Senator can support. In recent years Republicans have insisted on similar language prohibiting the use of eminent domain when we establish national parks. If eminent domain cannot be used to establish a national park in the public interest to conserve our national treasures and preserve America's beauty for future generations, then surely it should not be used to benefit private interests—in this case, in the interest of a foreign-owned oil company seeking to ship its product around the world.

I call on my colleagues to be consistent, stand on principle and logic, protect landowners, and support my amendment to protect private property from seizure by foreign corporations,

preserve our sovereignty, and preserve the rights of U.S. citizens along the way.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for such time as I shall consume.

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

CAP AND TRADE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me address what happened today because I think it is significant. I think a lot of people are a little bit confused over what did happen, and it was somewhat of a surprise.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I have been leading the opposition to this whole idea of cap and trade. It originated way back in 2001. Since that time, we have voted on it many times. I will always remember that back in those days most people believed that manmade gases were contributing to global warming and that the world was going to come to an end because of manmade gases and CO_2 emissions.

At that time, early on, I was on the Environment and Public Works Committee. I think at that time I was not chairman, but I was the chairman of one of the subcommittees, and I thought, it must be true, everybody says it.

Well, some time went by and we got a report. The first one came from the Wharton School where they talked about the fact that if we were to pass cap and trade—at that time there were two bills before the U.S. Senate—not in the House, just in the Senate—and those bills would have been cap-and-trade types of bills. So they calculated what this would cost if we in the United States passed cap and trade. This was way back in 2002, 2003. They said that the range of the cost to the American people would be between $300 billion and $400 billion a year.

I do something that I don't think very many people do, but I always do it. Every time I hear a large number, I go back and get the latest figures from my State of Oklahoma as to how many families file a Federal tax return, and then I do the math to determine how much it is going to cost an average family who pays taxes. It came back in excess of $3,000 a year. I thought, that is a lot of money. Let's be sure there is science behind this idea, knowing it all came from the United Nations. That is what started this whole thing.

By the way, this IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and that is within the United Nations. That is where it all started. If my colleagues remember, that was during the Clinton-Gore administration, when Al Gore went to South America and came back with this idea of the Kyoto Treaty. We were all going to sign it, and if we didn't, then we were all going to die because of manmade gases.

So we started looking at it to see if the science really was there because the only science we had heard about was the IPCC. Well, sure enough, we started getting phone calls from scientists all over the country. This was a long time ago. I started naming the scientists and groups of scientists who were calling in. We got up to 100 and then to 1,000 and then to 4,000. This is all on my Web site even though it was a long time ago. We can see all of these renowned scientists.

Richard Lindzen is with MIT. He is one who is considered by a lot of people to be the foremost authority on this, and he is the one who came out adamantly and said: No, the science is not there. It is not settled.

So several others started calling in.

In fact, I will quote him, if I have it here, what Richard Lindzen actually said at that time. He said: ''Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life.''

That is what bureaucrats would like to do. The Presiding Officer understands that because he has served in the other House and is new here in the Senate.

Lindzen also said, talking about Al Gore—Al Gore at that time was Vice President of the United States. He was the one who was really pushing this. He said: To treat all change as something to fear is bad enough. To do so in order to exploit that fear is much worse.

Of course, what Richard Lindzen of MIT was talking about was the fact that Al Gore at that time—they speculated he would be the first environmental billionaire. That was speculated in the New York Times. Anyway, after that happened, all the other scientists started checking in. These are scientists who cannot be challenged—these individuals. We have hundreds more, and I have a make on each one of these that I would be glad to discuss or debate with anyone. But at the same time, other things were happening.

One of the universities here in Virginia commissioned a poll to be done of all of the weathercasters on TV. They came back with 63 percent of the weathercasters saying that any global warming that occurs is a result of natural variation and not human activities.

So when I hear people—I have good friends on the other side that really believe this, and I think that one sometimes has to open it up and realize there is another side to this story. When they say that 97 percent, 98 percent of the scientists agree, it just isn't true. We have the names and things that have actually been said.

I think one item that people are going to have to remember—let me first of all say what happened today because I know they have been told I would explain what happened today.

My good friend, Senator WHITEHOUSE, had an amendment. The amendment was one sentence. It says that climate change is real and it is not a hoax. There is a ruling against talking about your own votes on the Senate floor, so I can't do that. But that hoax came from a totally different interpretation. The hoax was the idea that this is happening—climate change. That it is due to manmade gases. In other words, man is causing it.

So what I said on the Senate floor today is: How arrogant is it for people to say that man can do something about changing climate? Climate has always changed. I quoted this morning—I said it has changed. Go back and look at the archeological findings. They talk about climate from the beginning of time having changed and changed both ways. The Scriptures talk about it. This is something on which everyone has agreed, and no one would debate that it has always happened. The debate is whether man is causing that to happen.

So here we have a chart that shows—do you remember the hockey stick? The hockey stick was the concept that one of the guys with the IPCC came out with and said that it is like a hockey stick. We had this weather going like this for a long period of time. Then all of a sudden it shot up, and it resembled a hockey stick.

What they forgot was to put these two things in the hockey stick where it is supposed to be level. One is the medieval warming period that is between 1000 and 1500 A.D. We are talking recently. Then that went into the little ice age. Those were left off the chart. We have looked back, and everything you look at talks about how many years in the past we have had this change that is taking place in climate.

I am going to do this from memory. There are—in addition to these major changes such as you are seeing on this chart, which is a chart that—this actually is the IPCC's chart. No one is going to argue with that because they are the ones who dreamed up this whole idea. That is an intergovernmental panel on climate change. But within that—I can remember when I first heard the terms global warming and ice age, it was when they went back and they started tracing not long-term trends in climate change in weather but short term. Starting in 1895, from 1895 to 1918, they had what they referred to as a cooling spell, possibly another little ice age. Then in 1918, it started getting warm again. So from 1918 to 1945 there was a little warming period. That took place kind of every 30 years. Then in 1995, from that period until 1975, for 30 years again, it went into a cooling period.

Here is the key. No one will argue with the fact that 1945 was the year that we had the maximum increase

surge in CO_2 emissions. That precipitated not a warming period but a cooling period. Then, of course, 1975 came along.

Where are the charts that showed that in 1974—Time magazine or one of those? Here it is. This is Time magazine. This is the front. They said: Is another ice age coming? This is 1974. This is making the case. Everybody believed it. They talked about global warming before that and then another ice age. We are all going to die one way or another.

Put up the other chart, which is also Time magazine. This is when they said: Oh, no, here is the last polar bear and all the ice—so we have another global warming period. Both of them are from Time magazine. Both are 30 years apart. This is what has been happening for a long period of time.

Recognizing this, we had a little experience that—getting back, I made a determination that I would not only support the Whitehouse amendment, since it was just one sentence, it said that climate is changing, and it is not a hoax, but that I could clarify that and maybe become a cosponsor to his amendment. So I did that on the floor just a few minutes ago. I said on the floor that, yes, it is changing—no question about that. But the hoax is that there are people who are so arrogant they think they have the power to change climate. That is the hoax—not the fact that climate is changing. So that is what has been happening.

When some of the scientists came out and they started changing back and forth and all of a sudden people realized this whole thing was cooked up by the United Nations—IPCC was part of that group—then they found out that some of the scientists who were behind this were discovering that they had some emails that were sent out saying and proving conclusively that they were cooking the science, that these scientists were lying.

One of the things that was discovered and came out was an email from one of the scientists to another. It was 1999 and it read: I have just completed Mike's nature trick, adding in the real temperatures of each of the series for the last 20 years.

In other words, they were cooking the science at that time. This thing was such a scandal that throughout the world—we didn't hear nearly as much in the United States, but we did throughout the world. The UK Telegraph, which is maybe the largest communication in the UK, said that it is the worst scientific scandal of our generation.

What they are talking about is the scientific scandal. They are trying to make it sound as if man is responsible for all of these things. The Financial Times came out and said the closed-mindedness of these supposed men of science is surprising even to me. The stink of an intellectual corruption is overpowering.

One of the IPCC physicists said that climate-gate was a fraud on a scale I have never seen before. This went on and on, and we could quote Newsweek, the Guardian, and all the rest of them. It was known worldwide as a scandal. What was the scandal? It was that they had a bunch of scientists who were saying we are going to have to pass something like cap and trade because man is causing the world to come to an end.

So that is really what that was all about. We are going to have the debate. We want to do that. I chair the Committee on Environment and of Public Works. I chaired it 8 years ago. Then when the Democrats got control of the Senate—and now I am back in that position. We will have a chance to have hearings. We are going to have hearings with prominent scientists to come in and talk about this issue because all they say now is: Oh, the science is settled; the science is settled.

The science is not settled. That is the reason my good friend Senator WYDEN wants to make some remarks. That is the reason I made that statement today. I think we will have that very healthy debate. But let's keep in mind what the President was suggesting last night. It would cost the American people $479 billion a year, and that would constitute the largest tax increase in the history of America. That is one of his legacies which he is trying during the last part of his presidency and which he announced last night that he is going to put as a top priority. We will be there to be the truth squad in that and make sure that my kids and grandkids—I have 20—are not going to be encumbered with the largest tax increase in the world, particularly when their own director said: If you pass it, it will not reduce CO_2 emissions.

I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up and make pending Wyden amendment No. 27 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. INHOFE. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 27 to amendment No. 2.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CLARIFICATION OF TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL FOR EXCISE TAX PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 4612(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) CRUDE OIL.—The term 'crude oil' includes crude oil condensates, natural gasoline, synthetic petroleum, any bitumen or bituminous mixture, any oil derived from a bitumen or bituminous mixture, and any oil derived from kerogen-bearing sources.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 4612(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''from a well located''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to oil and petroleum products received, entered, used, or exported during calendar quarters beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment closes a tax loophole that currently places Canadian tar sands oil ahead of the American taxpayer. While oil produced here in the United States, in places such as North Dakota and Texas, pays into a cleanup fund for oil spills, tar sands does not. The bottom line here is simple—when Canadian tar sands oil is spilled on American soil, the American taxpayer pays up. In effect, it is possible to state what this is all about in straight forward English: right now, our Tax Code is so out of date that it says that oil from the tar sands isn't actually oil. Put your arms around that for a second. The Tax Code is in a time warp. Under the current policy, what concerns me is a judgment that oil from the tar sands isn't actually oil.

All other crude oil product refiners have to pay an 8-cent-per-barrel tax to support the oilspill liability trust fund that pays for cleaning up the spills.

This puts our own domestic producers at a competitive disadvantage.

I see my colleague from Colorado who cares greatly about these issues. I am saying to myself, in Colorado or Texas or North Dakota—in effect the policy that we have today on tax law—and I am the ranking Democrat on the Senate finance committee—as I looked at it, the first thing that came to mind is we have a tax policy here that, without the amendment I offer with my Senate finance colleagues, Senator MARKEY and others, we are putting domestic American producers—whether it is Colorado, North Dakota or Texas—at a competitive disadvantage. While domestic producers willingly contribute to clean up the oil spills, their Canadian competitors, and the tar sands up north of Edmonton, simply do not. This just defies commonsense.

Oil from the tar sands is just as likely to spill as other kinds of oil. Unfortunately, you don't have to look much beyond today's headlines to get a sense of what an oil spill actually means for communities across our country.

This past weekend an oil pipeline ruptured in Montana, pouring about 50,000 gallons of oil into the Yellowstone River, 5 miles upstream from the city of Glendive. Now local residents are reporting that their water smells like diesel fuel. The officials tested the water in Glendive and found oil in the drinking water and along with it elevated levels of benzene, a cancer-causing agent.

That is what is under consideration with this amendment, making sure that all of the parties responsible—no matter where they are from—would pay their fair share when they put our citizens' health and safety at risk.

The double standard—the standard that is much more exacting on our domestic producers than it is on the Canadian tar sands producers—ought to be fixed.

Tar sands oil producers ought to pay into the same fund as other oil producers to clean up the spills. Because, make no mistake about it, at the end of the day, without this amendment that closes the tar sands loophole, Canadian tar sands oil will keep getting a free ride.

The last point I want to mention, is just to put this issue in context. Before I chaired the Senate Finance Committee in the last Congress, I had the honor of chairing the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. In session after session of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, proponents of the pipeline said: We have got to have this to lower gas prices. If we are really going to lower gas prices, said the proponents—this was session after session after session—we have got to build the pipeline.

Well, we have all seen that prices have fallen dramatically. To a great extent it is due to exciting developments in the Bakken and others. We are now essentially the Saudi Arabia of oil production. This is good news. This is like a tax cut for working-class families across the country.

One of the judgments I reached in making the decision to oppose the pipeline is I did not think it made much sense to tamper with something that was such a promising development as real rate relief at the pump. A fair number of experts—yes, there is a difference of opinion, but a fair number of experts—are concerned that the pipeline, if it is built, could actually raise prices, particularly for vulnerable parts of the country. The Midwest could be one, but certainly there could be others.

So I had reservations about this from a variety of standpoints, including the standpoint that tar sands are a very carbon-dense material. But I am particularly concerned tonight about the inequity of the tar sands loophole, where the Canadians get a free ride at the expense of communities all across the Nation.

My amendment would close this flagrant abuse, close this loophole, help us put our tax priorities in order, and protect American citizens and American communities, rather than giving an undeserved advantage to foreign oil.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, to reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to clarify that those products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum. I hope this amendment will generate bipartisan support. No matter how a Senator feels with respect to the pipeline, I do not see how you can make the case that you should not correct something that defies common sense.

Before the Presiding Officer came in, I made mention that right now the absence of the amendment that I offer puts a disadvantage—a serious disadvantage—on all of America's domestic producers. We did an awful lot to make it possible for Americans to get relief at the pump. That does not make any sense. So I hope my colleagues tomorrow will support this amendment on a bipartisan basis to close a flagrant tax loophole, to end what amounts to an inequity that hurts at a minimum our producers, but puts at risk our communities needlessly.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 71 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 71.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 71 to amendment No. 2.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a procedure for issuing permits to drill)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.

Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.—

'' (A) TIMELINE.—

'' (i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit to drill not later than 30 days after receiving an application for the permit.

''(ii) EXTENSION.—The Secretary may extend the period in clause (i) for up to 2 periods of 15 days each, if the Secretary has given written notice of the delay to the applicant.

''(iii) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Written notice under clause (ii) shall—

''(I) be in the form of a letter from the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary; and

''(II) include the names and titles of the persons processing the application, the specific reasons for the delay, and a specific date a final decision on the application is expected.

''(B) NOTICE OF REASONS FOR DENIAL.—If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

''(i) in writing, clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not accepted and detailed information concerning any deficiencies; and

''(ii) an opportunity to remedy any deficiencies.

''(C) APPLICATION CONSIDERED APPROVED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60–day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the application is considered approved, except in cases in which existing reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) are incomplete.

''(ii) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—Existing reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 180 days after receiving an application for the permit.

''(iii) FAILURE TO COMPLETE.—If all existing reviews are not completed during the 180–day period described in clause (ii), the project subject to the application shall be considered to have no significant impact in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) and section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2)) and that classification shall be considered to be a final agency action.

''(D) DENIAL OF PERMIT.—If the Secretary decides not to issue a permit to drill in accordance with subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

''(i) provide to the applicant a description of the reasons for the denial of the permit;

''(ii) allow the applicant to resubmit an application for a permit to drill during the 10–day period beginning on the date the applicant receives the description of the denial from the Secretary; and

''(iii) issue or deny any resubmitted application not later than 10 days after the date the application is submitted to the Secretary.

''(E) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Actions of the Secretary carried out in accordance with this paragraph shall not be subject to judicial review.''.

Mr. LEE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, let me talk a little bit this evening about amendment No. 77 that I filed. This is an amendment I filed to the bill that is pending that we are now on, what I would call the oil sands pipeline. It has been called a jobs bill, I know, on the other side. But, you know, the reality is, there are good construction jobs here. But as soon as the pipeline is built, the permanent jobs are really very small.

What we need to do—my belief—in terms of energy, is work to where there are larger numbers of jobs. I do not

know whether people know this, but the energy that is being added to the system now worldwide and in the United States is renewable energy. Sometimes it is wind, sometimes it is solar, to a lesser extent biofuels, biomass and things like that. But the renewable sector is growing. The new energy is growing. Some of this is rather dramatic in terms of the numbers and the size. That is the direction clearly we need to head, because we want to in the future be lessening our carbon footprint. There is absolutely no dispute that we need to be moving in that direction. That is where all the scientists are.

We are even seeing today in the amendments that we have on the floor our friends across the aisle agreeing that we have got a real problem with climate change and that human beings are causing this and we need to address this. I applaud them stepping forward and saying that. How do you do this? How do you encourage more of the renewable forms of energy?

Let me say before I get into that, my hope is to have a discussion with the two Senators who are on side who are leading the debate here, Senator BOXER and Senator CANTWELL, about offering this amendment and getting in line in the next tranche of amendments.

But how do you get moving in the direction of more renewable energy? Well, we already know we have got a very good pattern here. We have started in the States and started in the District of Columbia, where more than half of our States in the United States of America have adopted what have been called renewable electricity standards. New Mexico has one. We have 15 percent by 2015. Some of our bigger States have been more aggressive. States such as California and New York are really pushing the envelope. They are saying by about 2025 we are going to have 30 percent or close to 30 percent renewable energy. So, really, what they are doing by putting a standard in place is they are saying to their power companies in their State: This is important to do. We know it is cost effective. Go out and develop your portfolio so that you put more renewable energy in it.

The remarkable thing, looking around the country, is how many States have done this. We have seen 29 States, I believe, including the District of Columbia, for a number of years now that have put a renewable electricity standard in place. So that is something that we know is working at the State level.

In fact, my Senator from New Mexico—who retired just a couple of years ago, Senator Bingaman—one of the things he did was go out to Stanford and study all of these renewable electricity standards that were in place and came up with ideas on the best practices and where there were disadvantages. He has actually published a report with a bunch of other researchers. So there is good wealth of knowledge about what is working and what isn't working.

But the major thing that is working is when we encourage a marketplace in renewable energy. We don't necessarily call out winners and losers. I know that is something that on both sides of the aisle we object to when we said: This is going to be a winning form, that is not going to be a winning form.

What we are doing is saying: Let's try to move toward renewables. Let's put a goal out there and then let's let the marketplace work on that. Let's see innovation. Let's move forward down that road. We have seen the 29 States do it and the District of Columbia.

My proposal in this amendment—and it is one I have worked on—has a good history. One of the things we know is when Senator Bingaman was in the Senate and head of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, he was able to pass through the Senate three times, over his career as chairman, a renewable electricity center out of the Senate.

When I was in the House of Representatives from 1998 to 2008, my cousin Mark Udall and I worked on a renewable electricity standard in the House. For the first time we were able to get a bill through the House of Representatives. So our big challenge always was we were never able to match the House bill and the Senate bill and put in place something that a President can sign and have a national standard. That is where we are today. We have had good support, and really what this amendment would do is set up a national marketplace. Many States across the Nation, and almost every State, have renewable energy. If you go into the South, it may be more biomass than it is of solar. If you go to the West and Midwest, it may be more wind and solar, but it depends on location.

What is clear from all of the experts who looked at this is it is very easy to focus on when you have a goal, and you say, in the case of this amendment, by 2025, let's get 25 percent of our energy from renewable sources. So if we have a goal like that, we could get there.

I am urging everybody to take a look at this amendment to see what it is that we should be doing.

If we are talking about moving down the road with this proposal that we have before us, where we are scavenging, in a way, for the dirtiest forms of energy, these tar sands—which are much dirtier than the environmental impact statement said. Not only are they dirtier by about 17 percent, but when you tear down all those forests, which are taking carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere, you are putting yourself in a position where you are headed down the wrong road in terms of easing our carbon footprint.

I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a look at this amendment. I will visit with the leaders on the floor about this amendment and see if we can't get it in line in terms of being considered.

This is an important debate about our energy future. There is a lot of work to be done. I hope we can work together.

We are at a crossroads in our energy policy. We can lead the world in clean energy production with wind, solar, and advanced biofuels. We can reduce global warming pollution. We can become energy independent—and create permanent American jobs.

That is our future. That should be our priority. We have the technology. We have the resources. We need the commitment. That is why we need a national Renewable Electricity Standard. It takes us forward.

My amendment would require utilities to generate 25 percent of electricity from renewable resources—by 2025.

There are many benefits to a national RES. It would create 300,000 jobs. Over 50 percent of these jobs are in manufacturing. It would save consumers $64 billion by 2025—and $95 billion by 2030—in their utility bills. There would be $263 billion in new capital investment. It would provide over $13 billion to farmers, ranchers, and other landowners in the form of lease payments, creating new economic activity in rural communities across the U.S. It would add more than $11 billion in new local tax revenues—and revitalize communities, especially rural communities.

I have pushed for this ever since I came to Congress. The House passed it. The Senate has passed a version of this three times.

New Mexico and over half the States already have an RES. The States are moving in that direction. The Nation needs to move in that direction.

I have long said we need to do it all, and do it right as an energy policy. That includes traditional energy sources. Oil and gas play an important role in my State. New Mexico is a leading producer of both. We have strong, independent companies. They employ over 12,000 New Mexicans. They help pay for our schools and other public services.

We invested in the oil industry. We also need to invest in wind, solar, and biofuels.

The U.S. has incredible wind energy potential—enough to power the Nation 10 times over. My State has some of the best wind resources in the Nation—enough to meet more than 73 times the State's current electricity needs.

Wind power has almost no carbon pollution. It uses virtually no water. It already saves folks in my State 470 million gallons of water a year.

The U.S. solar industry employs more than 143,000 Americans—more than coal and natural gas combined. Solar jobs grew 10 times faster than the national average.

These are well-paying, local jobs. These are permanent jobs, and they won't be shipped overseas.

Now is the time to build on the momentum and invest in a clean energy economy. Now is the time to create energy at home and jobs at home—now, not later. We can't lose this market to our overseas competitors in Germany, China, and elsewhere. They can see the future too—and they are going after it.

A national Renewable Electricity Standard gives certainty to business, to companies that are looking to invest billions of dollars in our economy, to manufacture wind turbines, solar panels, and other renewable energy components.

We have a great opportunity to grow our manufacturing sector, to create jobs, and to move toward a cleaner energy future.

This is a new Congress. Let's find common ground, and let's move forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator BLUNT, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 78, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. BLUNT, for himself and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 78 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions for the President entering into bilateral or other international agreements regarding greenhouse gas emissions without proper study of any adverse economic effects, including job losses and harm to the industrial sector, and without the approval of the Senate)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING BILATERAL OR OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS REGARDING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) On November 11, 2014, President Barack Obama and President Xi Jinping of the People's Republic of China announced the ''U.S.-China Joint Announcement on Climate Change and Clean Energy Cooperation'' (in this section referred to as the ''Agreement'') reflecting ''the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances''.

(2) The Agreement stated the United States intention to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by one-quarter by 2025 while allowing the People's Republic of China to double its greenhouse gas emissions between now and 2030.

(3) While coal fired electricity remains the least expensive energy alternative, the reduction of coal use because of the Agreement would result in a 25 percent increase in electricity prices in the United States in 2025, according to analysis conducted by the Energy Information Administration.

(4) The people of China will not see similar electricity price increases as they continue to use low cost coal without limit for the foreseeable future, at least until 2030.

(5) Increases in the price of electricity can cause job losses in the United States industrial sector, which includes manufacturing, agriculture, and construction.

(6) The price of electricity is a top consideration for job creators when locating manufacturing facilities, especially in energy-intensive manufacturing such as steel and aluminum production.

(7) Requiring mandatory cuts in greenhouse gas emissions in the United States while allowing nations such as China and India to increase their greenhouse gas emissions results in jobs moving from the United States to other countries, especially to China and India, and is economically unfair.

(8) Imposing disparate greenhouse gas emissions commitments for the United States and countries such as China and India is environmentally irresponsible because it results in greater emissions as businesses move to countries with less stringent standards.

(9) Union members, families, consumers, communities, and local institutions like schools, hospitals, and churches are hurt by the resulting job losses.

(10) The poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes are hurt the most by the President's promised increased electricity rates.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Agreement negotiated between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China has no force and effect in the United States;

(2) the Agreement between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China is a bad deal for United States consumers, workers, families, and communities, and is economically unfair and environmentally irresponsible;

(3) the Agreement, as well as any other bilateral or international agreement regarding greenhouse gas emissions such as the United Nation's Framework Convention on Climate Change in Paris in December 2015, requires the advice and consent of the Senate and must be accompanied by a detailed explanation of any legislation or regulatory actions that may be required to implement the Agreement and an analysis of the detailed financial costs and other impacts on the economy of the United States which would be incurred by the implementation of the Agreement;

(4) the United States should not be a signatory to any bilateral or other international agreement on greenhouse gases if it would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States; and

(5) the United States should not agree to any bilateral or other international agreement imposing disparate greenhouse gas commitments for the United States and other countries.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are wrapped up here for the evening so far as amendments, and I just want to thank colleagues for the discussion we have had today, the opportunity to bring forward some issues that clearly generate their own level of passion and emotion, and again the chance to bring forth issues we have been waiting for some period of time to have before us.

While some may suggest these are hard issues and hard votes to take, nobody ever said voting should be easy here in the Senate. The issues that come before us are issues the Nation considers and that we as their representatives should take seriously. So sometimes there are hard votes, and we will argue and debate over the wording and critically, and that is appropriate.

So again, looking forward to tomorrow, we have an opportunity to have now eight amendments that will be pending tomorrow afternoon, and I look forward to the continued discussion and a new day.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

The Senator from Utah.

REMEMBERING BECKY LOCKHART

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Becky Lockhart, former Speaker of the Utah House of Representatives, who tragically passed away on January 17, after a brief battle with a rare and devastating disease.

Becky Lockhart was the first woman to serve as Speaker of the House in the State of Utah. She did so in a truly extraordinary manner. She established a pattern of leadership that will be a model and a guide for wise legislative leaders in our State and across this great Nation for many, many years to come.

I affectionately yet admiringly refer to Speaker Lockhart as the iron lady of Utah as she possessed so many of the qualities of the original iron lady, Margaret Thatcher. Grounded in conservative principles, passionate about policy, and committed to federalism and local control, she knew where she stood and she stood firm every single time.

She followed the admonition of another great leader in American politics, Abraham Lincoln, who said, ''I will stand with anybody that stands right, stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.''

Professionally trained as a nurse, Speaker Lockhart also understood the

softer yet equally important gifts of compassion and concern, as well as listening and laughter. Even in the most heated discussion, she could change a room with a flash of her charismatic smile, a wink and a grin, or even some well-worded sarcasm to provide a little bit of levity.

Combining her nurse's intuition and strong leadership made her the perfect combination of satin and steel. She could and would and did stand up to any political or business bureaucracy, forcefully correct a colleague, rebuke an inaccurate report, and challenge the small-minded ideas and thinkers. Less reported was her impact and influence as a mentor to new members of the Utah House of Representatives, her work in helping more women become involved in the political process, and how she gave voice to those who did not have a strong voice of their own.

Above all, Speaker Lockhart looked out for, longed to be with, cherished and loved her family. She knew that the work she did in the walls of her own home was the most important work she would or could ever do. Becky also recognized that family is the bulwark of society and the strength of our Nation.

More than the ink of good press and the accolades of others, Speaker Lockhart knew that her most important legacy would not be recorded in history books, it would not be recorded in the Utah State code that has so many of her words written on it. No, it would be written in the hearts of her family and her friends.

I have been lifted by Becky Lockhart's leadership, inspired by her insight and her integrity, and encouraged by her commitment to the U.S. Constitution, and her love of country and am most blessed to call her my friend. Speaker Becky Lockhart, the iron lady of Utah, will indeed be heralded for her satin-and-steel leadership in the Utah House of Representatives. She will indeed be remembered for all that she did, but more significantly she will hold a special place in countless hearts because of who she was.

I pay tribute to this special person, this amazing leader, and this beloved friend, whose loss we mourn this very week, and who some Members of this body were privileged to know. It is my honor to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, let me say to my cousin, my heart goes out to you, and my condolences on what you have talked about here today. I really appreciate you coming down and talking so sincerely about that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to pay tribute to a remarkable woman, a loving wife, and a caring mother—former Utah Speaker of the House Rebecca ''Becky'' Lockhart.

After weeks of battling a rare degenerative disease, Becky quietly passed away on January 17, 2015, with her loving family gathered at her bedside. Becky leaves behind a legacy of leadership and passionate advocacy that will resonate for years to come. It was this same passion and resilience that defined her tenure as Speaker of the Utah House. She was a dedicated public servant who always rose to meet our State's challenges with wisdom and strength.

Becky's career was a model of selfless service. Guided by a desire to help others, she studied nursing at Brigham Young University. Before entering public service, Becky worked as a registered nurse for 7 years, during which time she treated thousands of patients and became intimately familiar with health care issues affecting Utah families. Her experience as a nurse would later shape her career as a legislator, and as Speaker of the House, she became a powerful advocate for State-based health care reform. I had the opportunity to discuss these and many other issues with Becky throughout the years. In doing so, I was always impressed with her eloquence, her intelligence, and her commitment to the State of Utah.

Becky was first elected to the Utah House of Representatives in 1998, and she quickly distinguished herself as a persuasive collaborator, a passionate legislator, and one of the hardest-working representatives in the legislature. Her colleagues recognized her leadership abilities and elected her Assistant Majority Whip in 2008. Just 2 years later, Becky made history when she became the first women to serve as Speaker of the House in Utah. Through her remarkable career, she trail-blazed a path for generations of women to follow and became known as Utah's ''Iron Lady.''

Utah grew under Becky's leadership. She championed legislation that modernized our State's transportation system, strengthened our infrastructure, and promoted technological advancement. During her last year as Speaker, she spearheaded an ambitious education initiative aimed at putting technology directly into the hands of Utah students. Her leadership spurred a much-needed discussion on ways to improve Utah's education system to equip our students with the resources they need to succeed academically.

Many are familiar with Becky's public life, but of even greater importance was her personal life. Before she was House Speaker and even before she became a well-known political figure, Becky was, first and foremost, a wonderful wife and a loving mother. Becky and her husband, Stan, created a strong partnership in politics and in parenthood as they lovingly raised their three children, Hannah, Emily, and Stephen. I know that Stan and his family will miss Becky most of all. During this time of heartrending loss, I pray that they may feel the comforting embrace of God's love and find peace in the memories they share with this remarkable woman.

I, too, will miss Becky dearly. May her memory always serve as a model of compassion, selflessness, and dedicated public service.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the Committee on Environment and Public Works has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Jurisdiction

Rule XXV, Standing Rules of the Senate

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

****

(h)(1) Committee on Environment and Public Works, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Air pollution.
2. Construction and maintenance of highways.
3. Environmental aspects of Outer Continental Shelf lands.
4. Environmental effects of toxic substances, other than pesticides.
5. Environmental policy.
6. Environmental research and development.
7. Fisheries and wildlife.
8. Flood control and improvements of rivers and harbors, including environmental aspects of deepwater ports.
9. Noise pollution.
10. Nonmilitary environmental regulation and control of nuclear energy.
11. Ocean dumping.
12. Public buildings and improved grounds of the United States generally, including Federal buildings in the District of Columbia.
13. Public works, bridges, and dams.
14. Regional economic development.
15. Solid waste disposal and recycling.
16. Water pollution.
17. Water resources.

(2) Such committee shall also study and review, on a comprehensive basis, matters relating to environmental protection and resource utilization and conservation, and report thereon from time to time.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

RULE 1. COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN GENERAL

(a) REGULAR MEETING DAYS: For purposes of complying with paragraph 3 of Senate Rule XXVI, the regular meeting day of the committee is the first and third Thursday of each month at 10:00 a.m. If there is no business before the committee, the regular meeting shall be omitted.

(b) ADDITIONAL MEETINGS: The chair may call additional meetings, after consulting with the ranking minority member. Subcommittee chairs may call meetings, with

the concurrence of the chair, after consulting with the ranking minority members of the subcommittee and the committee.

(c) PRESIDING OFFICER:

(1) The chair shall preside at all meetings of the committee. If the chair is not present, the ranking majority member shall preside.

(2) Subcommittee chairs shall preside at all meetings of their subcommittees. If the subcommittee chair is not present, the ranking majority member of the subcommittee shall preside.

(3) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by paragraphs (1) and (2), any member of the committee may preside at a hearing.

(d) OPEN MEETINGS: Meetings of the committee and subcommittees, including hearings and business meetings, are open to the public. A portion of a meeting may be closed to the public if the committee determines by roll call vote of a majority of the members present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure; or

(3) constitute any other grounds for closure under paragraph 5(b) of Senate Rule XXVI.

(e) BROADCASTING:

(1) Public meetings of the committee or a subcommittee may be televised, broadcast, or recorded by a member of the Senate press gallery or an employee of the Senate.

(2) Any member of the Senate Press Gallery or employee of the Senate wishing to televise, broadcast, or record a committee meeting must notify the staff director or the staff director's designee by 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting.

(3) During public meetings, any person using a camera, microphone, or other electronic equipment may not position or use the equipment in a way that interferes with the seating, vision, or hearing of committee members or staff on the dais, or with the orderly process of the meeting.

RULE 2. QUORUMS

(a) BUSINESS MEETINGS: At committee business meetings, and for the purpose of approving the issuance of a subpoena or approving a committee resolution, seven members of the committee, at least two of whom are members of the minority party, constitute a quorum, except as provided in subsection (d).

(b) SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS: At subcommittee business meetings, a majority of the subcommittee members, at least one of whom is a member of the minority party, constitutes a quorum for conducting business.

(c) CONTINUING QUORUM: Once a quorum as prescribed in subsections (a) and (b) has been established, the committee or subcommittee may continue to conduct business.

(d) REPORTING: No measure or matter may be reported to the Senate by the committee unless a majority of committee members cast votes in person.

(e) HEARINGS: One member constitutes a quorum for conducting a hearing.

3. HEARINGS

(a) ANNOUNCEMENTS: Before the committee or a subcommittee holds a hearing, the chair of the committee or subcommittee shall make a public announcement and provide notice to members of the date, place, time, and subject matter of the hearing. The announcement and notice shall be issued at least one week in advance of the hearing, unless the chair of the committee or subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee, determines that there is good cause to provide a shorter period, in which event the announcement and notice shall be issued at least twenty-four hours in advance of the hearing.

(b) STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES:

(1) A witness who is scheduled to testify at a hearing of the committee or a subcommittee shall file 100 copies of the written testimony at least 48 hours before the hearing. If a witness fails to comply with this requirement, the presiding officer may preclude the witness' testimony. This rule may be waived for field hearings, except for witnesses from the Federal Government.

(2) Any witness planning to use at a hearing any exhibit such as a chart, graph, diagram, photo, map, slide, or model must submit one identical copy of the exhibit (or representation of the exhibit in the case of a model) and 100 copies reduced to letter or legal paper size at least 48 hours before the hearing. Any exhibit described above that is not provided to the committee at least 48 hours prior to the hearing cannot be used for purpose of presenting testimony to the committee and will not be included in the hearing record.

(3) The presiding officer at a hearing may have a witness confine the oral presentation to a summary of the written testimony.

(4) Notwithstanding a request that a document be embargoed, any document that is to be discussed at a hearing, including, but not limited to, those produced by the General Accounting Office, Congressional Budget Office, Congressional Research Service, a Federal agency, an Inspector General, or a nongovernmental entity, shall be provided to all members of the committee at least 72 hours before the hearing.

RULE 4. BUSINESS MEETINGS: NOTICE AND FILING REQUIREMENTS

(a) NOTICE: The chair of the committee or the subcommittee shall provide notice, the agenda of business to be discussed, and the text of agenda items to members of the committee or subcommittee at least 72 hours before a business meeting. If the 72 hours falls over a weekend, all materials will be provided byclose of business on Friday.

(b) AMENDMENTS: First-degree amendments must be filed with the chair of the committee or the subcommittee at least 24 hours before a business meeting. After the filing deadline, the chair shall promptly distribute all filed amendments to the members of the committee or subcommittee.

(c) MODIFICATIONS: The chair of the committee or the subcommittee may modify the notice and filing requirements to meet special circumstances, with the concurrence of the ranking member of the committee or subcommittee.

RULE 5. BUSINESS MEETINGS: VOTING

(a) PROXY VOTING:

(1) Proxy voting is allowed on all measures, amendments, resolutions, or other matters before the committee or a subcommittee.

(2) A member who is unable to attend a business meeting may submit a proxy vote on any matter, in writing, orally, or through personal instructions.

(3) A proxy given in writing is valid until revoked. A proxy given orally or by personal instructions is valid only on the day given.

(b) SUBSEQUENT VOTING: Members who were not present at a business meeting and were unable to cast their votes by proxy may record their votes later, so long as they do so that same business day and their vote does not change the outcome.

(c) PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT:

(1) Whenever the committee conducts a rollcall vote, the chair shall announce the results of the vote, including a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast against the proposition by each member of the committee.

(2) Whenever the committee reports any measure or matter by rollcall vote, the report shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to the measure or matter by each member of the committee.

RULE 6. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Regularly Established Subcommittees: The committee has four subcommittees: Transportation and Infrastructure; Clean Air and Nuclear Safety; Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight; and Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife.

(b) MEMBERSHIP: The committee chair, after consulting with the ranking minority member, shall select members of the subcommittees.

RULE 7. STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS: No project or legislation proposed by any executive branch agency may be approved or otherwise acted upon unless the committee has received a final environmental impact statement relative to it, in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, and the written comments of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in accordance with section 309 of the Clean Air Act. This rule is not intended to broaden, narrow, or otherwise modify the class of projects or legislative proposals for which environmental impact statements are required under section 102(2)(C).

(b) PROJECT APPROVALS:

(1) Whenever the committee authorizes a project under Public Law 89–298, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965; Public Law 83–566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; or Public Law 86–249, the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; the chairman shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record, and the committee shall publish periodically as a committee print, a report that describes the project and the reasons for its approval, together with any dissenting or individual views.

(2) Proponents of a committee resolution shall submit appropriate evidence in favor of the resolution.

(c) BUILDING PROSPECTUSES:

(1) When the General Services Administration submits a prospectus, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, for construction (including construction of buildings for lease by the government), alteration and repair, or acquisition, the committee shall act with respect to the prospectus during the same session in which the prospectus is submitted.

A prospectus rejected by majority vote of the committee or not reported to the Senate during the session in which it was submitted shall be returned to the General Services Administration and must then be resubmitted in order to be considered by the committee during the next session of the Congress.

(2) A report of a building project survey submitted by the General Services Administration to the committee under section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, may not be considered by the committee as being a prospectus subject to approval by committee resolution in accordance with section 7(a) of that Act. A project described in the report may be considered for committee action only if it is submitted as a prospectus in accordance with section 7(a) and is subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this rule.

(d) NAMING PUBLIC FACILITIES: The committee may not name a building, structure or facility for any living person, except

former Presidents or former Vice Presidents of the United States, former Members of Congress over 70 years of age, former Justices of the United States Supreme Court over 70 years of age, or Federal judges who are fully retired and over 75 years of age or have taken senior status and are over 75 years of age.

RULE 8. AMENDING THE RULES

The rules may be added to, modified, amended, or suspended by vote of a majority of committee members at a business meeting if a quorum is present.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator BLUMENTHAL, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS RULES OF PROCEDURE

I. MEETINGS

(A) Unless otherwise ordered, the Committee shall meet on the first Wednesday of each month. The Chairman may, upon proper notice, call such additional meetings as deemed necessary.

(B) Except as provided in subparagraphs (b) and (d) of paragraph 5 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public. The Committee shall prepare and keep a complete transcript or electronic recording adequate to fully record the proceedings of each meeting whether or not such meeting or any part thereof is closed to the public.

(C) The Chairman of the Committee, or the Ranking Majority Member present in the absence of the Chairman, or such other Member as the Chairman may designate, shall preside over all meetings.

(D) Except as provided in rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no meeting of the Committee shall be scheduled except by majority vote of the Committee or by authorization of the Chairman of the Committee.

(E) The Committee shall notify the office designated by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the time, place, and purpose of each meeting. In the event such meeting is canceled, the Committee shall immediately notify such designated office.

(F) Written or electronic notice of a Committee meeting, accompanied by an agenda enumerating the items of business to be considered, shall be sent to all Committee Members at least 72 hours (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) in advance of each meeting. In the event that the giving of such 72-hour notice is prevented by unforeseen requirements or Committee business, the Committee staff shall communicate notice by the quickest appropriate means to Members or appropriate staff assistants of Members and an agenda shall be furnished prior to the meeting.

(G) Subject to the second sentence of this paragraph, it shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee unless a written or electronic copy of such amendment has been delivered to each Member of the Committee at least 24 hours (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) before the meeting at which the amendment is to be proposed. This paragraph may be waived by a majority vote of the Members and shall apply only when 72-hour written notice has been provided in accordance with paragraph (F).

II. QUORUMS

(A) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (B), eight Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the reporting or approving of any measure or matter or recommendation. Five Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of transacting any other business.

(B) In order to transact any business at a Committee meeting, at least one Member of the minority shall be present. If, at any meeting, business cannot be transacted because of the absence of such a Member, the matter shall lay over for a calendar day. If the presence of a minority Member is not then obtained, business may be transacted by the appropriate quorum.

(C) One Member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of receiving testimony.

III. VOTING

(A) Votes may be cast by proxy. A proxy shall be written and may be conditioned by personal instructions. A proxy shall be valid only for the day given.

(B) There shall be a complete record kept of all Committee actions. Such record shall contain the vote cast by each Member of the Committee on any question on which a roll call vote is requested.

IV. HEARINGS AND HEARING PROCEDURES

(A) Except as specifically otherwise provided, the rules governing meetings shall govern hearings.

(B) At least one week in advance of the date of any hearing, the Committee shall undertake, consistent with the provisions of paragraph 4 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make public announcements of the date, place, time, and subject matter of such hearing.

(C)(1) Each witness who is scheduled to testify at a hearing of the Committee shall submit 40 copies of such witness' testimony to the Committee not later than 48 hours (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) before the witness' scheduled appearance at the hearing.

(2) Any witness who fails to meet the deadline specified in paragraph (1) shall not be permitted to present testimony but may be seated to take questions from Committee members, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member determine there is good cause for the witness' failure to meet the deadline or it is in the Committee's interest to permit such witness to testify.

(D) The presiding Member at any hearing is authorized to limit the time allotted to each witness appearing before the Committee.

(E) The Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance of witnesses and the production of memoranda, documents, records, and any other materials. If the Chairman or a Committee staff member designated by the Chairman has not received from the Ranking Minority Member or a Committee staff member designated by the Ranking Minority Member notice of the Ranking Minority Member's non-concurrence in the subpoena within 48 hours (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) of being notified of the Chairman's intention to subpoena attendance or production, the Chairman is authorized following the end of the 48-hour period involved to subpoena the same without the Ranking Minority Member's concurrence. Regardless of whether a subpoena has been concurred in by the Ranking Minority Member, such subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Committee. When the Committee or Chairman authorizes a subpoena, the subpoena may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or of any other Member of the Committee designated by the Chairman.

(F) Except as specified in Committee Rule VII (requiring oaths, under certain circumstances, at hearings to confirm Presidential nominations), witnesses at hearings will be required to give testimony under oath whenever the presiding Member deems such to be advisable.

V. MEDIA COVERAGE

Any Committee meeting or hearing which is open to the public may be covered by television, radio, and print media. Photographers, reporters, and crew members using mechanical recording, filming, or broadcasting devices shall position and use their equipment so as not to interfere with the seating, vision, or hearing of the Committee Members or staff or with the orderly conduct of the meeting or hearing. The presiding Member of the meeting or hearing may for good cause terminate, in whole or in part, the use of such mechanical devices or take such other action as the circumstances and the orderly conduct of the meeting or hearing may warrant.

VI. GENERAL

All applicable requirements of the Standing Rules of the Senate shall govern the Committee.

VII. PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATIONS

(A) Each Presidential nominee whose nomination is subject to Senate confirmation and referred to this Committee shall submit a statement of his or her background and financial interests, including the financial interests of his or her spouse and of children living in the nominee's household, on a form approved by the Committee, which shall be sworn to as to its completeness and accuracy. The Committee form shall be in two parts:

(1) Information concerning employment, education, and background of the nominee, which generally relates to the position to which the individual is nominated and which is to be made public; and

(2) Information concerning the financial and other background of the nominee, to be made public when the Committee determines that such information bears directly on the nominee's qualifications to hold the position to which the individual is nominated.

(B) At any hearing to confirm a Presidential nomination, the testimony of the nominee and, at the request of any Member, any other witness shall be under oath.

(C) Committee action on a nomination, including hearings or a meeting to consider a motion to recommend confirmation, shall not occur until at least five days (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) after the nominee submits with respect to the currently pending nomination the form required by this rule unless the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, waives this waiting period.

VIII. NAMING OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FACILITIES

It is the policy of the Committee that a Department of Veterans Affairs facility may be named only after a deceased individual and only under the following circumstances:

(A) Such individual was:

(1) A veteran who (i) was instrumental in the construction or the operation of the facility to be named, or (ii) was a recipient of

the Medal of Honor or, as determined by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, otherwise performed military service of an extraordinarily distinguished character;

(2) A Member of the United States House of Representatives or Senate who had a direct association with such facility;

(3) An Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, a Secretary of Veterans Affairs, a Secretary of Defense or of a service branch, or a military or other Federal civilian official of comparable or higher rank; or

(4) An individual who, as determined by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, performed outstanding service for veterans.

(B) Each Member of the Congressional delegation representing the State in which the designated facility is located must indicate in writing such Member's support of the proposal to name such facility after such individual. It is the policy of the Committee that sponsoring or cosponsoring legislation to name such facility after such individual will not alone satisfy this requirement.

(C) The pertinent State department or chapter of each Congressionally chartered veterans' organization having a national membership of at least 500,000 must indicate in writing its support of such proposal.

IX. AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES

The rules of the Committee may be changed, modified, amended, or suspended at any time provided, however, that no less than a majority of the entire membership so determine at a regular meeting with due notice or at a meeting specifically called for that purpose. The rules governing quorums for reporting legislative matters shall govern rules changes, modification, amendments, or suspension.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

VERMONT ESSAY FINALISTS

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD finalist essays written by Vermont High School students as part of the Fifth Annual ''What is the State of the Union'' Essay contest conducted by my office. These 20 finalists were selected from over 400 entries.

The essays follow.

LIAM GIBBONS, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

We learn in school and from our parents that America is the land of opportunity. Yet that is not the case. When the wealth gap is steadily increasing, as women earn 70 cents for each dollar a man makes, as the U.S. government spends more on defense than on its disenfranchised, the land of opportunity seems no longer under boot, but instead a distant reality. Equal protection under the laws for every citizen, promoting the general welfare, rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. All of these things are printed on our country's most sacred documents, these things which need to be an attainable reality for every American.

Perhaps one of the most egregiously neglected groups in the U.S. is women. Wage inequality combined with the control of their own bodies in the hands of the government all add to the fact that women are among the most disparaged people within the U.S. Throughout America, women are denied the right to a safe and constitutional abortion. Some of the biggest contenders for the presidency have voiced their belief that women shouldn't have this constitutional right even in the context of rape or incest. Because of Roe v. Wade, because of its constitutionality, a safe abortion should be as accessible to the women in Texas as much as the women in Vermont.

A law needs to standardize how abortion clinics are made and run, and if there is an issue regarding states' rights and federalism, then an amendment must be made. Because not only are women not currently in control of their own bodies, they also lack the ability to earn equal wages as men. In 1977, the Equal rights amendment lost by the votes of three states. Who in their right minds would vote against equal rights in 2015. In order to ensure true equality and civil rights bring back the ERA, and this time ratify it.

Another group of people who lack this promised opportunity is the poor. Most Americans are employed, but many of them aren't earning livable wages. An American shouldn't have to work three jobs to support their family. An American shouldn't have to ride a bus three hours a day in order to work for privatized welfare. An American should be able to work for 40 hours a week, and be able to live comfortably. And this is possible if we raise the minimum wage so that it equates to a livable wage. However, no American should not have to strive for the minimum, each citizen should have a chance at exceeding, each American should be able to go to college.

In Germany, in Sweden, in Norway college is free. In Syria, a week of bombing by the U.S. costs the same as the tuition of 40,000 American students. If we were to take a fraction of our defense budget and give it to the impoverished for higher education, if we were to reallocate the budget, we would be seeing a lot more opportunity.

ELI HULSE, VERMONT COMMONS SCHOOL (FINALIST)

As the United States moves into 2015, we have achieved many things that have furthered the nation, and improved the security of the people economically, socially, and militarily. Some of these advancements include electing Janet Yellen as the first female Chair of the Federal Reserve, reducing the unemployment rate from 6.7 percent to 5.8 percent; the lowest it has been since 2008, and helping foreign forces fight against the militant group ISIS. However, there are many problems that the United States faces and needs to address over the next year.

The single most important issue that the United States needs to recognize and correct is the disparity of income. Although it is true that the gap in income causes problems with equality between the social classes, there are concerns that the percentage of income that the upper class has is causing instability in the United States economy as a whole. People who have more money do not spend as much of percentage of it as poorer people, which means that that money sits in savings accounts, and is not paid to businesses in return for products. As the income gap widens, less money will be introduced into the economy, and it will leave the economy in a precarious position.

Another serious issue that the United States needs to address is the spread of Ebola in Africa. Although domestic cases of Ebola have been isolated and treated, an unstable Africa would allow Ebola to potentially spread to the United States and other countries, and could be catastrophic. It is important that the United States government continues its support of Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and other countries that are struggling to create the infrastructure to treat this deadly disease.

Finally, it is key that the United States continues its resistance to terror threats both domestically and internationally. Although currently not a direct threat to the United States or to the general populous, ISIS has the potential to cause great damage to the European Union and eventually to the United States. A military force this size has not been seen in a long time, and the influence that it has in the countries it overtakes is alarming and needs to be kept in check. The United States needs to keep this in mind when making international policy decisions, and needs to continue supporting countries that are actively fighting ISIS.

The United States continues to be one of the largest influencers on the international playing field. However, policy makers need to keep in mind many domestic problems, and begin working across the aisle in order to keep the government of the United States secure and capable. 2014 has seen a whole array of new policies, and these policies have ensured the security of the American people. In 2015, new policies will be created, that will hopefully fix some of the problems in our society. God bless the United States of America.

KATHY JOSEPH, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

America has undoubtedly grown in the past year, but the many problems plaguing our nation continue to persist. The United States economy is stronger. We added 300 thousand jobs in November, the best in nearly three years. The unemployment rate is at 5.8%, a post-recession low point. President Obama struck a climate change deal with China—the two countries with the largest energy consumptions agreed to curb their carbon emissions by 2030. The war on terror in Afghanistan officially ended. Relations with Cuba have been reopened, which will make educational travel to Cuba easier and is a new approach to dealing with the oppressive regime that is currently leading Cuba.

All of these are steps America has taken in the past year in the right direction. However, we still face many challenges. The US has a growing income gap—the rich are getting richer while the poor are getting poorer. This is highlighted in the spending bill passed in December to prevent the government shutdown. In it there were several provisions to cut welfare spending, such as Medicare and spending on the Women and Children support while there was another provision essentially written by the banks to reverse the Dodd Frank act. That act was written after the recession, but now things will go back to the way they were. Lobbyists for banks and for the wealthy have louder voices in Washington. Over 50% of Congress people are millionaires, while millionaires make up only 5% of the US population. This helps explain why income inequality is only getting worse, and is something that the American people must change.

It is harder for students to afford college. Student loans are not of importance in Washington, which is something that needs to be changed. More people are afraid of the debt they will be in after getting their degree, and would rather start working out of high school. This is not the path we should be going on, and it is time for Congress to start listening to the students and prioritizing education.

The media have recently brought the nation's attention to police brutality, racial discrimination, and our broken criminal justice system. President Obama allocated $263 million for police body cameras and training, which is an acknowledgement of the need for reform but does not solve the root problem. Although there was footage available for the strangling of Eric Garner, the officer had no charges filed against him. These injustices seem to be occurring only more frequently, and Congress should focus its attention on real solutions that will lead to demilitarization of the police and a stop to the criminal

justice system disproportionately affecting minority groups.

We are still moving forward as a nation, but in 2015 we must work to reverse trends such as the growing income gap, increased police brutality, and losing sight of our priorities. There is still hope for a brighter future if we remember what values America really stands for.

EMILY (EMERY) MEAD, MISSISQUOI VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

As a young Vermonter, just getting ready to begin my college journey, there are some concerns that trouble me most about the future of our country. Please consider my advice as you prepare your address on the state of our union. My main concern is about how the transgender community is treated in America. Things have gotten better for them, but there's still quite a bit of discrimination against transgender people. Many people don't think trans folk deserve rights, but they're still just humans. I am a part of this community so I know about its difficulties personally. I am physically female but I identify as male.

One of the difficulties I have is the bathrooms and I'm not the only one, it's one of the biggest problems for us. I am literally terrified to go to the bathroom at school and in other public places because I use the men's bathroom and every time I do I'm afraid I will be ridiculed or kicked out and have been confronted by kids telling me to stay out of the guys bathroom at school. No one should be afraid to pee.

I don't have it that bad, for some people it's a lot worse. A friend of mine came out as transgender to his family and they kicked him out and disowned him. Luckily he has a very supporting girlfriend who he's currently living with and good friends who helped him with his struggles. Some people don't have that kind of support. Some are kicked out of their houses or run away from abusive families to live on the dirty streets and beg for money to pay for food or to buy a blanket to keep them warm on cold nights. An article about gay and transgender youth homelessness on americanprogress.org gives these stats which I have paraphrased; There is an estimated 1.6 million to 2.8 million homeless youth in the United States; 20 to 40 percent of that are gay or transgender kids; an estimated 320,000 to 400,000 gay and transgender youth are facing homelessness each year. Some are lucky enough to find a shelter or housing for transgender people, but not everyone lives near one or knows about one near them. It's not right for these kids to have no place to sleep.

These problems are very serious and need to be addressed and fixed. A possible solution for the bathroom problem is to fund more unisex bathrooms in more public places; I strongly believe this will help reduce the awkwardness and fear of going to the bathroom; even for those who are just uncomfortable with using public bathrooms. As for the shelter problem, putting more of these shelters around the country and making them more advertised and well known these kids won't be forced to live on the streets anymore.

Thank you for your consideration.

ALICIA MUIR, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

As a global powerhouse, the United States is bestowed with a responsibility. This country stands upon its obligation and ability to be innovative, to provide opportunity and to maintain a respectable quality of living for every citizen. I would like to take this moment to address where we stand on these principles and how far we still have to go.

In our current state, economic problems are most apparent. While the economy rests in a steady stage of recovery, many of our neighbors struggle to obtain and secure an adequate standard of living. We can try to justify yearly improvement by pointing out that unemployment rates and gas prices are down. But despite such progress, the standard of living is always increasing. Paired with this fact is the abundant number of citizens who struggle to survive on a wage that is not livable. The obvious action to take is to raise the federal minimum wage, which has been set at $7.25 since 2009. For a single person working 40 hours a week, the basic costs of food, housing, medical care, utilities, and other necessary expenses should be attainable with the lowest margin of pay. As of now, it is not. Starting in 2015, many states have already decided to raise their minimum wage. If we increase the pay benchmark on the federal level, every state will have to do the same.

When high school graduates are launched into adulthood, college is the promising route that comes with a discouraging debt sentence. Higher education is needed to be competitive in the job market. Rather than pouring mass amounts of money into defense spending and other well budgeted programs, legislators should create a larger budget for student loans and grants. I urge the United States to make college more accessible. In addition to the budget, the federal government can offer incentives for universities that will encourage them to administer greater financial aid packages and cut tuition costs. Specific criteria can even be established to provide free education to certain financial groups based on their low incomes.

Transitioning to a problem that is often neglected, I believe that as a country we must address the gender wage gap. To this day, a vast majority of women make on average only 75% of what men make. First, the United States has to establish a paid pregnancy leave at the standard of other industrialized nations. This will allow women to balance earning a sustainable income and raising a family. We can also regulate companies that retaliate against workers who discuss their wages, as well as increase the limitations on gender based pay discrimination. It's time to finally stop employers from paying less for equal work. Let us break down the glass ceiling.

To affirm that these programs will take place, and that these solutions will triumph, it is vital that the Congress disregards the party polarization that has crippled the government for so long. With collaboration and determination, the United States can prosper and prevail.

CURTIS RICHARDSON, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

My country, our country, is something I love and wish that everyone within its borders receives the highest amount of happiness possible and lives a life well fed and secure.

With that said an issue not talked about as much as it should. Homelessness. People spend their nights in cold dark alleyways covered only by the warmth of the Sunday paper. Shelters are full, stomachs empty. There are children who are homeless. There should never be a child without a warm place to sleep. By enacting programs which employ the homeless, and renovating buildings that serve no purpose, transforming them into shelters and low income housing we can find a solution to this problem and make sure that every American does not have to worry where they are going to sleep.

The poverty level in the United States is at 14.5 percent 42,000,000 Americans. A percentage that is entirely too high. A percentage of those Americans may work well over 40 hours a week, put in overtime and are yet still unable to rise above the poverty level. This is because the national minimum wage is at $7.25. The minimum wage is not a livable wage. By raising the national minimum wage to over $10 we can make sure that those hard working Americans are not living below the poverty line.

There is always a need for jobs in America. Many jobs are being outsourced for big business to make more money. By federally regulating how much a company can outsource jobs from America we can make companies open more factories in America and by doing so will open the way for more jobs spread throughout these United States.

While there are many domestic issues that are very important there are international ones as well. With the terrorist group Isis still at large we must ensure the security of citizens in the United States and places overseas. That is why we will have troops ready to be deployed. As long as there is a terrorist presence we will protect the people of the United States and its allies.

Bees are needed in order to pollinate flowers and grow many of the foods we eat. The bees are dying off and without them many of the foods we eat will increase in price and will deplete. Opening bee farms in America and increasing the bee population we can save many crops and flowers that the bees greatly assist with, and the federal government would also be assisting those small bee farmers who may be running low on business and this will be supporting the hard working Americans and not big business.

This cannot be accomplished alone. It will take the country as a whole cooperating with one another to make everything here into a reality. Working past party lines and finding an answer that's the best solution will ensure that these problems are solved.

FRIEDEMANN SCHMIDT, BRATTLEBORO UNION HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

Under the presidency of Ronald Reagan the United States turned within four years from the biggest creditor nation in the world in 1981 to the world's largest debtor in 1985. Supported by numerous foreign assignments of the U.S. Armed forces, the public debt increased constantly, reaching a figure of $18 trillion in recent years. This is a very serious issue for the United States not only because it deepens the dependence on creditor nations like China or Saudi Arabia which neglect values like freedom and equality, but also it directly affects everyone.

In 2013 the interest payments of the U.S. public debt made up 6% of the federal budget excluding an actual debt reduction. With a steadily growing budget deficit, primarily due to outrageous defense spending, that figure will even form a larger part of the annual budget plan. Presumably that will lead to cuts in secondary areas like education, transportation and social as well as scientific endeavors. This symbolizes a threat to the belief of the founding fathers in equality and perhaps makes a myth of the United States offering fair chances for everyone, regardless of status.

By decreasing the governmental funding of social programs, like the free/reduced meal program offering meals to 20% of food insecure students in Vermont, the living status of numerous hard-working middle and lower class would drop. A declining federal funding of universities and colleges throughout the country would further increase the college tuition for individuals, creating an unaffordable higher education for hundreds of thousands of young, talented Americans—a problem America already faces.

The social injustice created by enlarging the gap between rich and poor, would weaken the unity of the United States as much as decreasing the funding of America's world-

leading role in science and innovation, the key to economic success and human progress itself. Former Secretary of Labor Robert Reich states that due to the fact that ''Inequality has become worse, the danger to the economy and democracy had become worse.''

The public debt will be one of the major challenges for United States politics in the near future. Facing it will have to lead to changes of American policies and its lead in world policy. Priorities have to be set and compromises have to be made. Martin Luther King Jr. once said: ''A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death.'' It is the responsibility of every U.S. citizen to prevent that in order to maintain the prosperity and values for which America stands.

SOPHIA SEMAN, ESSEX HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

As our nation ages and evolves, the problems it faces become more complex. Some of the greatest challenges we face today are those of police brutality, a flawed naturalization process, and the daunting cost of higher education.

In the past few months, cities in the US have erupted in protests over police brutality. Starting in Ferguson, marching feet have spread to New York and California. One solution to the spreading mistrust in law enforcement is the use of body cameras that would provide an account of each interaction. While many speculate that this would be an invasion of privacy, the departments that have tested these devices decided the benefits outweigh the risks. Rialto, CA has seen a ''60 percent reduction in officer use of force incidents following camera deployment'' and an ''88 percent reduction in number of citizen complaints''. The federal government should issue categorical grants to any department that opts to implement the use of this technology. The cost to supply all the law enforcers with cameras may seem too high, but eventually, the money saved in lawsuits would counter the initial pay out.

This year, college students returned to school with considerably lighter pockets, as state tuition climbed another 2.9 percent. While many politicians realize the need for a highly educated work force for the future economy, few are willing to throw their weight behind the necessary reforms to make it more affordable. If young adults are expected to pay their way through college, they must have viable options in student loans. Unfortunately, ''private college loans are much cheaper than federal student loans now''. It is the responsibility of our government to help budding adults pay for higher education and mold themselves into conscientious citizens by lowering federal interest rates on loans.

The US has always been a nation of immigrants. However it is the unfortunate American tradition that the newest wave of immigrants is detested by those who have formed roots. Today it is the Latinos who face a wave of prejudice. As much as it pains some lawmakers to admit, we need the fresh faces and new ideas as much as these prospective citizens need refuge from the turmoil of their home country. It is time for a renovation of the naturalization process. Because the US does not have an official language and many new citizens site English as ''one of the biggest obstacles'', the English portion of the test should be eliminated. Questions pertaining to civil rights should be emphasized on the Civics Test, rather than superfluous ones about history, as citizens should be more aware of their rights and responsibilities than the War of 1812.

The most pressing issues facing the Union today are those of police brutality, rising college and university costs and the labyrinthine naturalization process. They demand quick, effective solutions, such as police-worn cameras, lowered interest rates on student loans, and a revised naturalization test.●

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED ON JANUARY 23, 1995, WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—PM 2

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2015.

The crisis with respect to grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 21, 2015.*

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–298. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia; Interstate Movement and Import Restrictions on Certain Live Fish'' (Docket No. APHIS–2007–0038) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–299. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Marketing Assistance Loans, Loan Deficiency Payments, and Sugar Loans'' (RIN0560–AI28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–300. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance From the U.S. Department of Agriculture'' (RIN0503–AA57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–301. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Guard Youth Challenge Program 2014 annual report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–302. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a real estate lease transaction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–303. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities), Department of Defense, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–304. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Logistics and Material Readiness), Department of Defense, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–305. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cuban Assets Control Regulations'' (31 CFR Part 515) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–306. 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 ''Russian Sanctions: Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine'' (RIN0694–AG43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–307. A communication from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a Foreign Policy Report on the imposition of a license requirement on exports,

reexports, and transfers (in-country) to the Crimea region of Ukraine; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–308. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Commerce's 2014 Report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–309. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 13346 of July 8, 2004, the annual certification of the effectiveness of the Australia Group; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–310. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–311. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Proximity Detection Systems for Continuous Mining Machines in Underground Coal Mines'' (RIN1219–AB65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–312. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–313. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of Labor's 2012 and 2013 FAIR Act Inventory of Inherently Governmental Activities and Inventory of Commercial Activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–314. A communication from the Vice President for Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–315. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–440, ''Special Election Reform Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–316. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–458, ''Protecting Pregnant Workers Fairness Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–317. A communication from the Director of the Office of Financial Reporting and Policy, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''FY 2014 Agency Financial Report''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–318. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting proposed legislation relative to data breach notification; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–319. 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 ''Revenue Ruling: 2015 Prevailing State Assumed Interest Rates'' (Rev. Rul. 2015–02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–320. 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 ''Automatic Approval of Change in Funding Method for Takeover Plans'' (Announcement 2015–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–321. 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 ''Reporting Sick Pay Paid by Third Parties'' (Notice 2015–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–322. 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 ''Application of Retroactive Increase in Excludable Transit Benefits'' (Notice 2015–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–323. 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 to Rev. Proc. 2014–4'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–324. 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 ''Revenue Procedure 2015–3'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–325. 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 to Rev. Proc. 2014–6'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–326. 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 to Rev. Proc. 2014–8'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–327. 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 ''Property Qualifying for the Energy Credit under Section 48'' (Notice 2015–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–328. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–329. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Land Acquisitions in the State of Alaska'' (RIN1076–AF23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–330. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Amendment 18 to the Salmon Fishery Management Plan'' (RIN0648–BC95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–331. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Restrictions on the Use of Fish Aggregating Devices in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015; Correction'' (RIN0648–BE36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–332. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2015 Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Specifications and 2015 Commercial Summer Flounder Quota Adjustments'' (RIN0648–XD651) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–333. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries'' (RIN0648–XD653) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–334. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Regulatory Amendment to Pacific Coast Groundfish Fisheries Trawl Rationalization Program for the Start of 2015'' (RIN0648–BE34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–335. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Porbeagle Shark Fishery'' (RIN0648–XD659) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–336. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of

the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Expansion of the Fair Play Viticultural Area'' (RIN1513–AC07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–337. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Steller Sea Lion Protection Measures for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fisheries Off Alaska'' (RIN0648–BE06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–338. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress Under Section 319 of the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–339. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Saab, AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0460)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–340. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0072)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–341. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0981)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–342. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0366)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–343. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0771)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–344. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; GROB–WERKE Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0848)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–345. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Alpha Aviation Concept Limited Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0759)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–346. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0257)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–347. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0566)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–348. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No . FAA–2014–0448)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–349. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0453)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–350. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0057)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–351. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0053)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–352. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Limited Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0717)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–353. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1029)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–354. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2008–0256)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–355. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0450)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–356. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Area Boundary Descriptions; Cape Canaveral, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0875)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–357. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments (4); Amendment No. 517'' (RIN2120–AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–358. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Elimination of the Air Traffic Control Tower Operator Certificate for Controllers Who Hold a Federal Aviation Administration Credential With a Tower Rating'' ((RIN2120–AK40) (Docket No. FAA–2014–1000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–359. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Simferopol (UKFV) and Dnipropetrovsk (UKDV) Flight Information Region (FIR)'' ((RIN2120–AK56) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0225)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–360. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Damascus (OSTT) Flight Information Region

(FIR)'' ((RIN2120–AK61) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0708)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–361. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Harmonization of Airworthiness Standards—Gust and Maneuver Load Requirements'' ((RIN2120–AK12) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0142)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 203. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. Res. 31. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 32. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 200. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of major revenue legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BURR, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 201. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 202. A bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. COATS):

S. 203. A bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 204. A bill to reinstate the 10-year statute of limitations period applicable to collection of amounts paid to Social Security beneficiaries by administrative offset, and prevent recovery of overpayments from individuals under 18 years of age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 205. A bill to provide for the development and dissemination of evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking and respond to such individuals appropriately, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 206. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reauthorize the State infrastructure bank program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KING, Mr. DAINES, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 207. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 208. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 209. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 211. A bill to establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 212. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure that voters in elections for Federal office do not wait in long lines in order to vote; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 213. A bill to improve requirements for entering into commerce of imitation firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 214. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 216. A bill to establish the National Prostate Cancer Council for improved screening, early detection, assessment, and monitoring of prostate cancer, and to direct the development and implementation of a national strategic plan to expedite advancement of diagnostic tools and the transfer of such tools to patients; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 217. A bill to protect a woman's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 218. A bill to facilitate emergency medical services personnel training and certification curriculums for veterans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 219. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 220. A bill to prohibit discrimination and retaliation against individuals and health care entities that refuse to recommend, refer for, provide coverage for, pay for, provide, perform, assist, or participate in abortions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 221. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to authorize additional funding for the pregnancy assistance fund; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 222. A bill to establish the National Prostate Cancer Council for improved screening, early detection, assessment, and monitoring of prostate cancer, and to direct the development and implementation of a national strategic plan to expedite advancement of diagnostic tools and the transfer of such tools to patients; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 223. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program

on awarding grants for provision of furniture, household items, and other assistance to homeless veterans to facilitate their transition into permanent housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 224. A bill to ensure the United States promotes women's meaningful inclusion and participation in mediation and negotiation processes undertaken in order to prevent, mitigate, and resolve violent conflict and implements the United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 225. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from a definition under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 226. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 227. A bill to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 228. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide for congressional and State approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WARNER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 229. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S.J. Res. 4. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restore the rights of the American people that were taken away by the Supreme Court's decision in the Citizens United case and related decisions, to protect the integrity of our elections, and to limit the corrosive influence of money in our democratic process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mrs. Schumer, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. J. Res. 5. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; 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. INHOFE:

S. Res. 31. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

S. Res. 32. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; from the Committee on Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S.48

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 48, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 149, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 165

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 165, a bill to extend and enhance prohibitions and limitations with respect to the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor to S. 166, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 176

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 176, a bill to advance integrated water management and development through innovation, resiliency, conservation, and efficiency in the 21st century, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 182

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 182, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prohibit Federal education mandates, and for other purposes.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Alaska

(Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 19 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 24

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 24 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 27 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 29

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 29 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 30

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 30 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 50

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 50 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 58

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) as added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 58 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 73

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 73 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 74

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 74 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 77

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 77 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 202. A bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 202

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CHANGE TO THE MEDICARE LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL MORATORIUM EXCEPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 114(d) of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Extension Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1395ww note), as amended by sections 3106(b) and 10312(b) of Public Law 111–148, section 1206(b)(2) of the Pathway for SGR Reform Act of 2013 (division B of Public Law 113–67), and section 112 of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–93), is amended, in paragraph (7), by striking ''The moratorium under paragraph (1)(A)'' and inserting ''Any moratorium under paragraph (1)'' in the matter preceding subparagraph (A).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 112 of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–93).

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WARNER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. PETERS).

S. 229. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the DISCLOSE Act of 2015.

Simply put, this bill would end the massive undisclosed spending in elections that is undermining public faith in our democracy, creating what one newspaper called ''a tsunami of slime.''

Today marks the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's disastrous 5–4 decision in Citizens United v. FEC. With that feat of judicial activism, which will likely go down with Lochner v. New York as one of the Supreme Court's worst decisions, the conservative bloc of the Supreme Court overturned the laws of Congress protecting our elections' integrity, thwarted the will of the American people, and allowed unlimited anonymous corporate money to flood into our elections.

Worse still, even though the justices decided 8–1 that laws promoting disclosure of outside spending were necessary and appropriate, everything that has happened since has shown a concerted effort to prevent and frustrate disclosure. So the billionaires and corporations spending tens and even hundreds of millions of dollars on elections can continue to do so with no public knowledge and no accountability.

The Citizens United decision hangs on a series of irretrievably flawed assertions. Among them is the premise that unlimited corporate expenditures would be fine because there would be a regime of ''effective disclosure'' that would ''provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable for their positions and supporters.''

However, following Citizens United, that regime of ''effective disclosure'' has completely broken down, with billionaires and corporations spending unlimited secret money in elections. In the 2014 elections, the most expensive midterm elections in our history, with over $3.6 billion spent, the Washington Post reported that at least 31 percent of all independent spending was spent by groups that are not required to disclose their donors. And that doesn't even count spending on so-called ''issue ads,'' which is also not reported.

The first line of defense for campaign finance laws is supposed to be the Federal Election Commission. However, 5 years after the fact, the FEC just held a public meeting to consider rules to implement the Court's decision in Citizens United, and incredibly, the commissioners did not even consider rules to require disclosure.

That has left the problem largely to the Internal Revenue Service, because so many of the offending organizations are non-profits. And they mangled this. First, they failed to investigate big non-profit groups spending hundreds of millions of dollars on elections making what appeared to be illegal, material

false statements about election spending on these IRS forms. Then the IRS singled out organizations for scrutiny based on words in their names suggesting that they were politically active. Recently, the Treasury Department and the IRS proposed new rules to require disclosure by 501(c)(4) groups. Along with fifteen of my colleagues, I commended the effort to ensure disclosure by these non-profits. However, the IRS withdrew the proposed rules, and the latest reporting says that new rules won't be ready for the 2016 elections, another failure of disclosure.

The DISCLOSE Act would put some transparency into the ''tsunami of slime.'' The bill, which is unchanged from the version introduced last Congress, would require organizations spending money in elections—including super PACS and tax-exempt 501(c)(4) groups—to promptly disclose donors who have given $10,000 or more during an election cycle. The bill includes robust transfer provisions to prevent political operatives from using complex webs of entities to game the system and hide donor identities. This is not a new idea. Many Republicans, including several in the Senate, used to support disclosure.

Senator ALEXANDER has said, ''I support campaign finance reform, but to me that means individual contributions, free speech, and full disclosure.''

''I don't like it when a large source of money is out there funding ads and is unaccountable,'' said Senator SESSIONS. ''To the extent we can, I tend to favor disclosure.''

Or as Senator CORNYN put it, ''I think the system needs more transparency, so people can more easily reach their own conclusions.''

Senator MCCONNELL once summed it up nicely: ''Virtually everybody in the Senate is in favor of enhanced disclosure, greater disclosure. That's really hardly a controversial subject.''

And he was right—until Citizens United. Suddenly Republicans are fighting to keep the American people in the dark to protect their wealthy funders.

The high disclosure threshold and other provisions in the bill protect membership organizations from having to disclose their member lists, and from having to disclose any donor who does not wish his or her contribution to be used for political purposes.

Our campaign finance system is broken. Immediate action is required to fix it. Americans of all political stripes are disgusted by the influence of unlimited, anonymous corporate cash in our elections, and by campaigns that succeed or fail depending on how many billionaires the candidates have in their pockets.

Passing this law would remove the dark cloud of unlimited, anonymous money from our elections, and would prove to the American people that Congress is committed to fairness, equality, and the fundamental principle of a government ''of the people, by the people, and for the people.'' As Republican former Federal Election Commission Chairman Trevor Potter has said, the DISCLOSE Act is ''appropriately targeted, narrowly tailored, clearly constitutional and desperately needed.''

I thank our 35 cosponsors of this bill so far, and Representative VAN HOLLEN for introducing in the House, and I urge my colleagues to support the DISCLOSE Act of 2015.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 229

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Democracy Is Strengthened by Casting Light On Spending in Elections Act of 2015'' or the ''DISCLOSE Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. CAMPAIGN DISBURSEMENT REPORTING.

(a) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED.—

(1) TREATMENT OF FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT OF EXPRESS ADVOCACY AS INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE.—Subparagraph (A) of section 301(17) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(17)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) that expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate, or is the functional equivalent of express advocacy because, when taken as a whole, it can be interpreted by a reasonable person only as advocating the election or defeat of a candidate, taking into account whether the communication involved mentions a candidacy, a political party, or a challenger to a candidate, or takes a position on a candidate's character, qualifications, or fitness for office; and''.

(2) EXPANSION OF PERIOD DURING WHICH COMMUNICATIONS ARE TREATED AS ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 304(f)(3)(A)(i) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(A)(i)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subclause (III) as subclause (IV); and

(B) by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

''(II) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than the President or Vice President, is made during the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year in which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of the general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, during the period beginning on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election);

''(III) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party is held in any State (or, if no such election or caucus is held in any State, the first convention or caucus of a political party which has the authority to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President) and ending on the date of the general election; and''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE; TRANSITION FOR ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS MADE PRIOR TO ENACTMENT.—The amendment made by paragraph (2) shall apply with respect to communications made on or after January 1, 2016, except that no communication which is made prior to such date shall be treated as an electioneering communication under subclause (II) or (III) of section 304(f)(3)(A)(i) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as amended by paragraph (2)) unless the communication would be treated as an electioneering communication under such section if the amendment made by paragraph (2) did not apply.

(b) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR CORPORATIONS, LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, AND CERTAIN OTHER ENTITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30126) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 324. DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS BY COVERED ORGANIZATIONS.

''(a) DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any covered organization that makes campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than $10,000 in an election reporting cycle shall, not later than 24 hours after each disclosure date, file a statement with the Commission made under penalty of perjury that contains the information described in paragraph (2)—

''(A) in the case of the first statement filed under this subsection, for the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the first such disclosure date; and

''(B) in the case of any subsequent statement filed under this subsection, for the period beginning on the previous disclosure date and ending on such disclosure date.

''(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph is as follows:

''(A) The name of the covered organization and the principal place of business of such organization.

''(B) The amount of each campaign-related disbursement made by such organization during the period covered by the statement of more than $1,000, and the name and address of the person to whom the disbursement was made.

''(C) In the case of a campaign-related disbursement that is not a covered transfer, the election to which the campaign-related disbursement pertains and if the disbursement is made for a public communication, the name of any candidate identified in such communication and whether such communication is in support of or in opposition to a candidate.

''(D) A certification by the chief executive officer or person who is the head of the covered organization that the campaign-related disbursement is not made in cooperation, consultation, or concert with or at the request or suggestion of a candidate, authorized committee, or agent of a candidate, political party, or agent of a political party.

''(E) If the covered organization makes campaign-related disbursements using exclusively funds in a segregated bank account consisting of funds that were paid directly to such account by persons other than the covered organization that controls the account, for each such payment to the account—

''(i) the name and address of each person who made such payment during the period covered by the statement;

''(ii) the date and amount of such payment; and

''(iii) the aggregate amount of all such payments made by the person during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the disclosure date;

but only if such payment was made by a person who made payments to the account in an

aggregate amount of $10,000 or more during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the disclosure date.

''(F) If the covered organization makes campaign-related disbursements using funds other than funds in a segregated bank account described in subparagraph (E), for each payment to the covered organization—

''(i) the name and address of each person who made such payment during the period covered by the statement;

''(ii) the date and amount of such payment; and

''(iii) the aggregate amount of all such payments made by the person during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the disclosure date;

but only if such payment was made by a person who made payments to the covered organization in an aggregate amount of $10,000 or more during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the disclosure date.

''(G) Such other information as required in rules established by the Commission to promote the purposes of this section.

''(3) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(A) AMOUNTS RECEIVED IN ORDINARY COURSE OF BUSINESS.—The requirement to include in a statement filed under paragraph (1) the information described in paragraph (2) shall not apply to amounts received by the covered organization in commercial transactions in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments (other than investments by the principal shareholder in a limited liability corporation) in the covered organization.

''(B) DONOR RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The requirement to include in a statement submitted under paragraph (1) the information described in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) shall not apply if—

''(i) the person described in such subparagraph prohibited, in writing, the use of the payment made by such person for campaign-related disbursements; and

''(ii) the covered organization agreed to follow the prohibition and deposited the payment in an account which is segregated from any account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

''(C) AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM AFFILIATES.—The requirement to include in a statement submitted under paragraph (1) the information described in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) shall not apply to any amount which is described in subsection (f)(3)(A)(i).

''(4) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

''(A) DISCLOSURE DATE.—The term 'disclosure date' means—

''(i) the first date during any election reporting cycle by which a person has made campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than $10,000; and

''(ii) any other date during such election reporting cycle by which a person has made campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than $10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such election reporting cycle.

''(B) ELECTION REPORTING CYCLE.—The term 'election reporting cycle' means the 2-year period beginning on the date of the most recent general election for Federal office.

''(C) PAYMENT.—The term 'payment' includes any contribution, donation, transfer, payment of dues, or other payment.

''(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—

''(1) OTHER REPORTS FILED WITH THE COMMISSION.—Information included in a statement filed under this section may be excluded from statements and reports filed under section 304.

''(2) TREATMENT AS SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUND.—A segregated bank account referred to in subsection (a)(2)(E) may be treated as a separate segregated fund for purposes of section 527(f)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(c) FILING.—Statements required to be filed under subsection (a) shall be subject to the requirements of section 304(d) to the same extent and in the same manner as if such reports had been required under subsection (c) or (g) of section 304.

''(d) CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'campaign-related disbursement' means a disbursement by a covered organization for any of the following:

''(1) An independent expenditure consisting of a public communication.

''(2) An electioneering communication, as defined in section 304(f)(3).

''(3) A covered transfer.

''(e) COVERED ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'covered organization' means any of the following:

''(1) A corporation (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

''(2) An organization described in section 501(c) of such Code and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of such Code).

''(3) A labor organization (as defined in section 316(b)).

''(4) Any political organization under section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, other than a political committee under this Act.

''(f) COVERED TRANSFER DEFINED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term 'covered transfer' means any transfer or payment of funds by a covered organization to another person if the covered organization—

''(A) designates, requests, or suggests that the amounts be used for—

''(i) campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

''(ii) making a transfer to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

''(B) made such transfer or payment in response to a solicitation or other request for a donation or payment for—

''(i) the making of or paying for campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

''(ii) making a transfer to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

''(C) engaged in discussions with the recipient of the transfer or payment regarding—

''(i) the making of or paying for campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

''(ii) donating or transferring any amount of such transfer or payment to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

''(D) made campaign-related disbursements (other than a covered transfer) in an aggregate amount of $50,000 or more during the 2-year period ending on the date of the transfer or payment, or knew or had reason to know that the person receiving the transfer or payment made such disbursements in such an aggregate amount during that 2-year period; or

''(E) knew or had reason to know that the person receiving the transfer or payment would make campaign-related disbursements in an aggregate amount of $50,000 or more during the 2-year period beginning on the date of the transfer or payment.

''(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'covered transfer' does not include any of the following:

''(A) A disbursement made by a covered organization in a commercial transaction in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments made by the covered organization.

''(B) A disbursement made by a covered organization if—

''(i) the covered organization prohibited, in writing, the use of such disbursement for campaign-related disbursements; and

''(ii) the recipient of the disbursement agreed to follow the prohibition and deposited the disbursement in an account which is segregated from any account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

''(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS AMONG AFFILIATES.—

''(A) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS AMONG AFFILIATES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered transfer' does not include an amount transferred by one covered organization to another covered organization if such transfer—

''(I) is not made directly into a separate segregated bank account described in subsection (a)(2)(E); and

''(II) is treated as a transfer between affiliates under subparagraph (B).

''(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—If the aggregate amount of transfers described in clause (i) exceeds $50,000 in any election reporting cycle—

''(I) the covered organization which makes such transfers shall provide to the covered organization receiving such transfers the information required under subsection (a)(2)(F) (applied by substituting 'the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the date of the most recent transfer described in subsection (f)(3)(A)(i)' for 'the period covered by the statement' in clause (i) thereof); and

''(II) the covered organization receiving such transfers shall report the information described in subclause (I) on any statement filed under subsection (a)(1) as if any contribution, donation, or transfer to which such information relates was made directly to the covered organization receiving the transfer.

''(B) DESCRIPTION OF TRANSFERS BETWEEN AFFILIATES.—A transfer of amounts from one covered organization to another covered organization shall be treated as a transfer between affiliates if—

''(i) one of the organizations is an affiliate of the other organization; or

''(ii) each of the organizations is an affiliate of the same organization;

except that the transfer shall not be treated as a transfer between affiliates if one of the organizations is established for the purpose of making campaign-related disbursements.

''(C) DETERMINATION OF AFFILIATE STATUS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the following organizations shall be considered to be affiliated with each other:

''(i) A membership organization, including a trade or professional association, and the related State and local entities of that organization.

''(ii) A national or international labor organization and its State or local unions, or an organization of national or international unions and its State and local entities.

''(iii) A corporation and its wholly owned subsidiaries.

''(D) COVERAGE OF TRANSFERS TO AFFILIATED SECTION 501(c)(3) ORGANIZATIONS.—This paragraph shall apply with respect to an amount transferred by a covered organization to an organization described in paragraph (3) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code in the same manner as this paragraph applies to an

amount transferred by a covered organization to another covered organization.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 304(f)(6) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by striking ''Any requirement'' and inserting ''Except as provided in section 324(b), any requirement''.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF DISCLOSURE RULES TO SUPER PACS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30126), as amended by section 2, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) A political committee with an account that accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with the contribution limits or source prohibitions under this Act, but only with respect to such accounts.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (4) of section 324(e) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30126), as amended by section 2, is amended by inserting ''(except as provided in paragraph (5))'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided in section 2(a)(3), the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after January 1, 2016, and shall take effect without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 31—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. INHOFE submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 31

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works (in this resolution referred to as the ''committee'') is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed $3,060,871, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $4,666.67 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $1,166.67 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed $5,247,208, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $8,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $2,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed $2,186,337, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $3,333.33, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $833.33, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for ''Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations'' of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 32—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ISAKSON submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 32

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs (in this resolution referred to as the ''committee'') is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed $1,283,522, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $3,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed $2,200,323, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed $916,801, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $8,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $1,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28. 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for ''Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations'' of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 78. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 79. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 80. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 81. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 82. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 83. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 84. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 85. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 86. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 87. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 88. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 89. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 90. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 91. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 92. Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 93. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 94. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S.1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 95. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 96. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which ordered to lie on the table.

SA 97. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which ordered to lie on the table.

SA 98. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 78. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING BILATERAL OR OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS REGARDING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) On November 11, 2014, President Barack Obama and President Xi Jinping of the People's Republic of China announced the ''U.S.-China Joint Announcement on Climate Change and Clean Energy Cooperation'' (in this section referred to as the ''Agreement'') reflecting ''the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances''.

(2) The Agreement stated the United States intention to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by one-quarter by 2025 while allowing the People's Republic of China to double its greenhouse gas emissions between now and 2030.

(3) While coal fired electricity remains the least expensive energy alternative, the reduction of coal use because of the Agreement would result in a 25 percent increase in electricity prices in the United States in 2025, according to analysis conducted by the Energy Information Administration.

(4) The people of China will not see similar electricity price increases as they continue to use low cost coal without limit for the foreseeable future, at least until 2030.

(5) Increases in the price of electricity can cause job losses in the United States industrial sector, which includes manufacturing, agriculture, and construction.

(6) The price of electricity is a top consideration for job creators when locating manufacturing facilities, especially in energy-intensive manufacturing such as steel and aluminum production.

(7) Requiring mandatory cuts in greenhouse gas emissions in the United States while allowing nations such as China and India to increase their greenhouse gas emissions results in jobs moving from the United States to other countries, especially to China and India, and is economically unfair.

(8) Imposing disparate greenhouse gas emissions commitments for the United States and countries such as China and India is environmentally irresponsible because it results in greater emissions as businesses move to countries with less stringent standards.

(9) Union members, families, consumers, communities, and local institutions like schools, hospitals, and churches are hurt by the resulting job losses.

(10) The poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes are hurt the most by the President's promised increased electricity rates.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Agreement negotiated between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China has no force and effect in the United States;

(2) the Agreement between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China is a bad deal for United States consumers, workers, families, and communities, and is economically unfair and environmentally irresponsible;

(3) the Agreement, as well as any other bilateral or international agreement regarding greenhouse gas emissions such as the United Nation's Framework Convention on Climate Change in Paris in December 2015, requires the advice and consent of the Senate and must be accompanied by a detailed explanation of any legislation or regulatory actions that may be required to implement the Agreement and an analysis of the detailed financial costs and other impacts on the economy of the United States which would be incurred by the implementation of the Agreement;

(4) the United States should not be a signatory to any bilateral or other international agreement on greenhouse gases if it would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States; and

(5) the United States should not agree to any bilateral or other international agreement imposing disparate greenhouse gas commitments for the United States and other countries.

SA 79. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. STUDY ON COMMUNITY AND INDIVIDUAL AFFORDABILITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ACADEMY.—The term ''Academy'' means the National Academy of Public Administration, an independent, nonpartisan, and nonprofit organization chartered by Congress.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall contract with the Academy to conduct an independent study to create a definition of and framework for the term ''community and individual affordability''.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study, the Academy shall—

(A) consult with—

(i) the Administrator;

(ii) State and local governments;

(iii) organizations that specialize in affordability issues; and

(iv) popularly elected governance organizations such as the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, and the United States Conference of Mayors;

(B) review existing studies of the costs associated with major regulations under such laws as—

(i) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(ii) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(iii) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(iv) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); and

(v) the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) (commonly known as the ''Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976''); and

(C) recommend a new affordability threshold and describe how different localities can effectively fund municipal projects.

(3) TIMING.—The Administrator shall contract with the Academy not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after entering into an arrangement with the Administrator under subsection (b)(1), the Academy shall submit to Congress and the Administrator a report that includes the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Academy.

SA 80. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION B—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING

TITLE I—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING REVENUE

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the Draft Proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2010–2015 issued by the Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) shall be considered to be the final oil and gas leasing program under that section for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2020.

(b) FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Secretary is considered to have issued a final environmental impact statement for the program applicable to the period described in subsection (a) in accordance with all requirements under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Lease Sales 214, 232, and 239 shall not be included in the final oil and gas leasing program for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2020.

(d) EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO NOT INCLUDED.—Nothing in this section affects restrictions on oil and gas leasing under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432).

SEC. 102. REVENUE SHARING FROM OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF WIND ENERGY PRODUCTION FACILITIES.

The first sentence of section 8(p)(2)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting after ''27 percent'' the following: '', or, in the case of projects for offshore wind energy production facilities, 37.5 percent''.

SEC. 103. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS.

Section 18(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall make available for leasing and conduct lease sales including at least 50 percent of the available unleased acreage within each outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources (on a total btu basis) based on the most recent national geologic assessment of the outer Continental Shelf, with an emphasis on offering the most geologically prospective parts of the planning area.

''(B) The Secretary shall include in each proposed oil and gas leasing program under this section any State subdivision of an outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that the Governor of the State that represents that subdivision requests be made available for leasing. The Secretary may not remove such a subdivision from the program until publication of the final program, and shall include and consider all such subdivisions in any environmental review conducted and statement prepared for such program under section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

''(C) In this paragraph, the term 'available unleased acreage' means that portion of the outer Continental Shelf that is not under lease at the time of a proposed lease sale, and that has not otherwise been made unavailable for leasing by law.

''(6)(A) In the 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the Secretary shall make available for leasing any outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that—

''(i) is estimated to contain more than 2,500,000,000 barrels of oil; or

''(ii) is estimated to contain more than 7,500,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

''(B) To determine the planning areas described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the document entitled 'Minerals Management Service Assessment of Undiscovered Technically Recoverable Oil and Gas Resources of the Nation's Outer Continental Shelf, 2006'.''.

SEC. 104. DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 102 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (11) as paragraphs (6) through (12), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) COASTAL STATE.—The term 'coastal State' means—

''(A) each of the Gulf producing States; and

''(B) effective for fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter—

''(i) the State of Alaska; and

''(ii) each of the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.'';

(3) in paragraph (10) (as so redesignated), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues' means all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States from leases entered into on or after—

''(i) December 20, 2006, with respect to the Gulf producing States; and

''(ii) October 1, 2015, with respect to—

''(I) the State of Alaska; and

''(II) each of the coastal States described in paragraph (5)(B)(ii).''; and

(4) in paragraph (11) (as so redesignated), by striking ''Gulf producing State'' each place it appears and inserting ''coastal State''.

(b) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.—Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**FROM 181 AREA, 181 SOUTH AREA, AND 2002-2007 PLANNING AREAS OF GULF OF MEXICO**'';

(2) by striking ''Gulf producing State'' each place it appears (other than paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b)) and inserting ''coastal State'';

(3) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

''(A) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to Gulf producing States—

''(i) 75 percent to Gulf producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

''(ii) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title; and

''(B) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to coastal States described in section section 102(5)(B), 100 percent to the coastal States in accordance with subsection (b).'';

(4) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''GULF PRODUCING STATES'' and inserting ''COASTAL STATES'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) ALLOCATION AMONG CERTAIN ATLANTIC STATES AND THE STATE OF ALASKA FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 AND THEREAFTER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), effective for fiscal years 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be allocated to each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

''(B) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(B).''; and

(D) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B)), by striking ''paragraphs (1) and (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)''; and

(5) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available to coastal States under subsection (a)(2) shall not exceed—

''(A) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(A)—

''(i) $500,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

''(ii) $699,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2054;

''(B) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(B)(ii)—

''(i) $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 though 2025; and

''(ii) $200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2065; and

''(C) in the case of the State of Alaska, $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2065.''.

TITLE II—OFFSET

SEC. 201. FEDERAL WORKFORCE REDUCTION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency''—

(A) means an Executive agency, as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) does not include the Government Accountability Office.

(2) APPLICABLE MAXIMUM.—The term ''applicable maximum'' means—

(A) in the case of a quarter before the target-attainment quarter, the difference obtained by subtracting—

(i) the product obtained by multiplying—

(I) the number of Federal employees separating from agencies during the period—

(aa) beginning on the first day following the baseline quarter; and

(bb) ending on the last day of the quarter to which the applicable maximum is being applied; by

(II) ⅔; from

(ii) the total number of Federal employees determined for the baseline quarter; and

(B) in the case of the target-attainment quarter and any quarter thereafter, the number equal to 90 percent of the total number of Federal employees as of September 30, 2014.

(3) BASELINE QUARTER.—The term ''baseline quarter'' means the quarter in which occurs the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) FEDERAL EMPLOYEE.—The term ''Federal employee'' means an employee, as defined under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) QUARTER.—The term ''quarter'' means a period of 3 calendar months ending on March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31.

(6) TARGET-ATTAINMENT QUARTER.—The term ''target-attainment quarter'' means the earlier of—

(A) the first quarter occurring after the baseline quarter for which the total number of Federal employees does not exceed 90 percent of the total number of Federal employees as of September 30, 2014; or

(B) the quarter ending on September 30, 2018.

(7) TOTAL NUMBER OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—The term ''total number of Federal employees'' means the total number of Federal employees in all agencies.

(b) WORKFORCE LIMITS AND REDUCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President, through the Office of Management and Budget (in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management), shall take appropriate measures to ensure that, effective with respect to each quarter beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, the total number of Federal employees determined for such quarter does not exceed the applicable maximum for such quarter.

(2) METHOD FOR ACHIEVING COMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any reductions necessary in order to achieve compliance with paragraph (1) shall be made through attrition.

(B) EXCEPTION.—If, for any quarter, the total number of Federal employees exceeds the applicable maximum for such quarter, until the first succeeding quarter for which such total number is determined not to exceed the applicable maximum for such succeeding quarter, reductions shall be made through both attrition and a freeze on appointments.

(3) COUNTING RULES.—For purposes of this section—

(A) any determination of the total number of Federal employees or the number of Federal employees separating from agencies shall be made—

(i) on a full-time equivalent basis; and

(ii) under subsection (d); and

(B) any determination of the total number of Federal employees for a quarter shall be made as of such date or otherwise on such basis as the Office of Management of Budget (in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management) considers to be representative and feasible.

(4) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive any provision of this subsection, with respect to an individual appointment, upon a determination by the President that such appointment is necessary due to—

(i) a state of war or for reasons of national security; or

(ii) an extraordinary emergency threatening life, health, safety, or property.

(B) NONDELEGATION.—The authority under this paragraph may not be delegated.

(c) LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OF SERVICE CONTRACTS.—The President, through the Office of Management and Budget (in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management), shall take appropriate measures to ensure that there is no increase in the procurement of service contracts by reason of the enactment of this section, except in cases in which a cost comparison demonstrates that such contracts would be to the financial advantage of the Government.

(d) MONITORING AND NOTIFICATION.—The Office of Management and Budget (in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management) shall—

(1) continuously monitor all agencies and, for each quarter to which the requirements of subsection (b)(1) apply, determine whether or not such requirements have been met; and

(2) not later than 14 days after the end of each quarter described in paragraph (1), submit to the President and each House of Congress, a written determination as to whether or not the requirements of subsection (b)(1) have been met.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The President may promulgate any regulations necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 202. FEDERAL DEFICIT REDUCTION.

Any savings generated as a result of section 201 that are not needed to offset the costs of carrying out title I (including any amendments made by title I) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction or, if there is no Federal budget deficit, for reducing the Federal debt in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

SA 81. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. APPLICATION.

This Act shall not apply until the date on which the President (or a designee) determines, in consultation with the Chief of the Forest Service and other relevant Federal agencies, that increased greenhouse gas emissions, including emissions from the pipeline described in section 2(a), will not contribute to any of the following:

(1) An increased frequency of wildfires in the United States.

(2) An increased range of wildfires in the United States.

(3) An increased severity of wildfires in the United States.

(4) An increased prevalence or frequency of invasive pests, including the spruce beetle, the bark beetle, and the hemlock woolly adelgid.

SA 82. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr.

BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. APPLICATION.

This Act shall not apply until the date on which the President (or a designee) determines, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, and other relevant Federal agencies, that increased greenhouse gas emissions, including emissions from the pipeline described in section 2(a), will not have a significant negative impact on farmers and ranchers due to any of the following:

(1) An increased frequency or severity of drought in the United States.

(2) An increased risk of invasive agricultural pests in the United States.

(3) A decrease in available irrigation water from reduced snowpack in the United States.

SA 83. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. ENHANCED PROTECTIONS FROM RETALIATION.

(a) APPLICABILITY TO WORKERS IN THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY.—Section 11 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 660) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO WORKERS IN THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No person shall discharge or cause to be discharged, or in any manner discriminate against or cause to be discriminated against, any employee because—

''(A) such employee has filed any complaint or instituted or caused to be instituted any proceeding under or related to this Act;

''(B) such employee has testified or is about to testify before Congress or in any Federal or State proceeding related to safety or health;

''(C) such employee has refused to violate any provision of this Act; or

''(D) of the exercise by such employee on behalf of himself or others of any right afforded by this Act, including the reporting of any injury, illness, or unsafe condition to the employer, agent of the employer, safety and health committee involved, or employee safety and health representative involved.

''(2) PROHIBITION OF RETALIATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No person shall discharge, or cause to be discharged, or in any manner discriminate against, or cause to be discriminated against, an employee for refusing to perform the employee's duties if the employee has a reasonable apprehension that performing such duties would result in serious injury to, or serious impairment of the health of, the employee or other employees.

''(B) GOOD-FAITH BELIEF.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the circumstances causing the employee's good-faith belief that performing such duties would pose a safety or health hazard shall be of such a nature that a reasonable person, under the circumstances confronting the employee, would conclude that there is such a hazard. In order to qualify for protection under this paragraph, the employee, when practicable, shall have communicated or attempted to communicate the safety or health concern to the employer and have not received from the employer a response reasonably calculated to allay such concern.

''(3) COMPLAINT.—Any employee who believes that the employee has been discharged, disciplined, or otherwise discriminated against by any person in violation of paragraph (1) or (2) may seek relief for such violation by filing a complaint with the Secretary under paragraph (5).

''(4) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An employee may take the action permitted by paragraph (3) not later than 180 days after the later of—

''(i) the date on which an alleged violation of paragraph (1) or (2) occurs; or

''(ii) the date on which the employee knows or should reasonably have known that such alleged violation occurred.

''(B) REPEAT VIOLATION.—Except in cases when the employee has been discharged, a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) shall be considered to have occurred on the last date an alleged repeat violation occurred.

''(5) INVESTIGATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An employee may, within the time period required under paragraph (4), file a complaint with the Secretary alleging a violation of paragraph (1) or (2). If the complaint alleges a prima facie case, the Secretary shall conduct an investigation of the allegations in the complaint, which—

''(i) shall include—

''(I) interviewing the complainant;

''(II) providing the respondent an opportunity to—

''(aa) submit to the Secretary a written response to the complaint; and

''(bb) meet with the Secretary to present statements from witnesses or provide evidence; and

''(III) providing the complainant an opportunity to—

''(aa) receive any statements or evidence provided to the Secretary;

''(bb) meet with the Secretary; and

''(cc) rebut any statements or evidence; and

''(ii) may include issuing subpoenas for the purposes of such investigation.

''(B) DECISION.—Not later than 90 days after the filing of the complaint, the Secretary shall—

''(i) determine whether reasonable cause exists to believe that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred; and

''(ii) issue a decision granting or denying relief.

''(6) PRELIMINARY ORDER FOLLOWING INVESTIGATION.—If, after completion of an investigation under paragraph (5)(A), the Secretary finds reasonable cause to believe that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred, the Secretary shall issue a preliminary order providing relief authorized under paragraph (14) at the same time the Secretary issues a decision under paragraph (5)(B). If a de novo hearing is not requested within the time period required under paragraph (7)(A)(i), such preliminary order shall be deemed a final order of the Secretary and is not subject to judicial review.

''(7) HEARING.—

''(A) REQUEST FOR HEARING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A de novo hearing on the record before an administrative law judge may be requested—

''(I) by the complainant or respondent within 30 days after receiving notification of a decision granting or denying relief issued under paragraph (5)(B) or paragraph (6), respectively;

''(II) by the complainant within 30 days after the date the complaint is dismissed without investigation by the Secretary under paragraph (5)(A); or

''(III) by the complainant within 120 days after the date of filing the complaint, if the Secretary has not issued a decision under paragraph (5)(B).

''(ii) REINSTATEMENT ORDER.—The request for a hearing shall not operate to stay any preliminary reinstatement order issued under paragraph (6).

''(B) PROCEDURES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A hearing requested under this paragraph shall be conducted expeditiously and in accordance with rules established by the Secretary for hearings conducted by administrative law judges.

''(ii) SUBPOENAS; PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE.—In conducting any such hearing, the administrative law judge may issue subpoenas. The respondent or complainant may request the issuance of subpoenas that require the deposition of, or the attendance and testimony of, witnesses and the production of any evidence (including any books, papers, documents, or recordings) relating to the matter under consideration.

''(iii) DECISION.—The administrative law judge shall issue a decision not later than 90 days after the date on which a hearing was requested under this paragraph and promptly notify, in writing, the parties and the Secretary of such decision, including the findings of fact and conclusions of law. If the administrative law judge finds that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred, the judge shall issue an order for relief under paragraph (14). If review under paragraph (8) is not timely requested, such order shall be deemed a final order of the Secretary that is not subject to judicial review.

''(8) ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of notification of a decision and order issued by an administrative law judge under paragraph (7), the complainant or respondent may file, with objections, an administrative appeal with an administrative review body designated by the Secretary (referred to in this paragraph as the 'review board').

''(B) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In reviewing the decision and order of the administrative law judge, the review board shall affirm the decision and order if it is determined that the factual findings set forth therein are supported by substantial evidence and the decision and order are made in accordance with applicable law.

''(C) DECISIONS.—If the review board grants an administrative appeal, the review board shall issue a final decision and order affirming or reversing, in whole or in part, the decision under review by not later than 90 days after receipt of the administrative appeal. If it is determined that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred, the review board shall issue a final decision and order providing relief authorized under paragraph (14). Such decision and order shall constitute final agency action with respect to the matter appealed.

''(9) SETTLEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—At any time before issuance of a final order, an investigation or proceeding under this subsection may be terminated on the basis of a settlement agreement entered into by the parties.

''(B) PUBLIC POLICY CONSIDERATIONS.—Neither the Secretary, an administrative law judge, nor the review board conducting a hearing under this subsection shall accept a settlement that contains conditions conflicting with the rights protected under this

Act or that are contrary to public policy, including a restriction on a complainant's right to future employment with employers other than the specific employers named in a complaint.

''(10) INACTION BY THE REVIEW BOARD OR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The complainant may bring a de novo action described in subparagraph (B) if—

''(i) an administrative law judge has not issued a decision and order within the 90-day time period required under paragraph (7)(B)(iii); or

''(ii) the review board has not issued a decision and order within the 90-day time period required under paragraph (8)(C).

''(B) DE NOVO ACTION.—Such de novo action may be brought at law or equity in the United States district court for the district where a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) allegedly occurred or where the complainant resided on the date of such alleged violation. The court shall have jurisdiction over such action without regard to the amount in controversy and to order appropriate relief under paragraph (14). Such action shall, at the request of either party to such action, be tried by the court with a jury.

''(11) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(A) TIMELY APPEAL TO THE COURT OF APPEALS.—Any party adversely affected or aggrieved by a final decision and order issued under this subsection may obtain review of such decision and order in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit where the violation, with respect to which such final decision and order was issued, allegedly occurred or where the complainant resided on the date of such alleged violation. To obtain such review, a party shall file a petition for review not later than 60 days after the final decision and order was issued. Such review shall conform to chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subparagraph shall not, unless ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the final decision and order.

''(B) LIMITATION ON COLLATERAL ATTACK.—An order and decision with respect to which review may be obtained under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to judicial review in any criminal or other civil proceeding.

''(12) ENFORCEMENT OF ORDER.—If a respondent fails to comply with an order issued under this subsection, the Secretary or the complainant on whose behalf the order was issued may file a civil action for enforcement in the United States district court for the district in which the violation was found to occur to enforce such order. If both the Secretary and the complainant file such action, the action of the Secretary shall take precedence. The district court shall have jurisdiction to grant all appropriate relief described in paragraph (14).

''(13) BURDENS OF PROOF.—

''(A) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINATION.—In making a determination or adjudicating a complaint pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary, administrative law judge, review board, or court may determine that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred only if the complainant demonstrates that any conduct described in paragraph (1) or (2) with respect to the complainant was a contributing factor in the adverse action alleged in the complaint.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a decision or order that is favorable to the complainant shall not be issued in any administrative or judicial action pursuant to this subsection if the respondent demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the respondent would have taken the same adverse action in the absence of such conduct.

''(14) RELIEF.—

''(A) ORDER FOR RELIEF.—If the Secretary, administrative law judge, review board, or a court determines that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred, the Secretary or court, respectively, shall have jurisdiction to order all appropriate relief, including injunctive relief and compensatory and exemplary damages, including—

''(i) affirmative action to abate the violation;

''(ii) reinstatement without loss of position or seniority, and restoration of the terms, rights, conditions, and privileges associated with the complainant's employment, including opportunities for promotions to positions with equivalent or better compensation for which the complainant is qualified;

''(iii) compensatory and consequential damages sufficient to make the complainant whole, (including back pay, prejudgment interest, and other damages); and

''(iv) expungement of all warnings, reprimands, or derogatory references that have been placed in paper or electronic records or databases of any type relating to the actions by the complainant that gave rise to the unfavorable personnel action, and, at the complainant's direction, transmission of a copy of the decision on the complaint to any person whom the complainant reasonably believes may have received such unfavorable information.

''(B) ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS.—If the Secretary or an administrative law judge, review board, or court grants an order for relief under subparagraph (A), the Secretary, administrative law judge, review board, or court, respectively, shall assess, at the request of the employee against the employer—

''(i) reasonable attorneys' fees; and

''(ii) costs (including expert witness fees) reasonably incurred, as determined by the Secretary, administrative law judge, review board, or court, respectively, in connection with bringing the complaint upon which the order was issued.

''(15) PROCEDURAL RIGHTS.—The rights and remedies provided for in this subsection may not be waived by any agreement, policy, form, or condition of employment, including by any pre-dispute arbitration agreement or collective bargaining agreement.

''(16) SAVINGS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to diminish the rights, privileges, or remedies of any employee who exercises rights under any Federal or State law or common law, or under any collective bargaining agreement.

''(17) ELECTION OF VENUE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An employee of an employer who is located in a State that has a State plan approved under section 18 may file a complaint alleging a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) by such employer with—

''(i) the Secretary under paragraph (5); or

''(ii) a State plan administrator in such State.

''(B) REFERRALS.—If—

''(i) the Secretary receives a complaint pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall not refer such complaint to a State plan administrator for resolution; or

''(ii) a State plan administrator receives a complaint pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii), the State plan administrator shall not refer such complaint to the Secretary for resolution.

''(18) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'employee' means an individual employed by—

''(A) an operator of an oil well, as described in the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 213111;

''(B) a petrochemical manufacturing plant assigned the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 213112, 324, or 32511; or

''(C) an entity assigned the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 23712 or 486.''.

(b) RELATION TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 17(j) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 666(j)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: '', including the history of violations under section 11(d)''.

SA 84. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPORTING REQUIREMENT REGARDING SAFETY FOR OIL WELLS, PETROCHEMICAL MANUFACTURING PLANTS, AND PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION OR TRANSPORTATION ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each issuer that is required to file reports pursuant to section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a) or 78o(d)) and that is, or that has a subsidiary that is, an operator of an oil well or an operator of a petrochemical manufacturing plant or pipeline construction or transportation entity shall include, in each periodic report filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the securities laws on and after the date of enactment of this Act, the following information for the time period covered by such report:

(1) For each oil well, petrochemical manufacturing plant, or pipeline construction or transportation entity of which the issuer or a subsidiary of the issuer is an operator—

(A) the total number of serious violations of mandatory health or safety standards at an oil well, a petrochemical manufacturing plant, or a pipeline transportation or construction entity, including health hazard violations under section 9 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 658);

(B) the total number of citations issued, including serious, willful, and repeated violations, under such section;

(C) the total dollar value of proposed penalties to be applied under such Act (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.); and

(D) the total number of oil well, petrochemical manufacturing plant, or pipeline construction or transportation entity related fatalities involved.

(2) A list of oil wells, petrochemical manufacturing plants, or pipeline construction or transportation entities of which the issuer, or a subsidiary of the issuer, is an operator, that receive written notice from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration of willful, serious, and repeated violations of mandatory health or safety standards at an oil well, a petrochemical manufacturing plant, or a pipeline construction or transportation entity, including safety hazards under section 9 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 658).

(3) Any pending legal action before the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, established under section 12 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 661), involving an oil well, a petrochemical manufacturing plant, or a pipeline construction or transportation entity.

(b) REPORTING SHUTDOWNS AND PATTERNS OF VIOLATIONS.—Beginning on the effective date of this section, each issuer that is, or that has a subsidiary that is, an operator of

an oil well or an operator of a petrochemical manufacturing plant or pipeline construction or transportation entity shall file a current report with the Securities and Exchange Commission on Form 8-K (or any successor form) disclosing the following with respect to each oil well, petrochemical manufacturing plant, or pipeline construction or transportation entity of which the issuer or subsidiary is an operator:

(1) The receipt of a citation issued under section 9 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 658).

(2) The receipt of a citation from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration that the oil well, petrochemical manufacturing plant, or pipeline construction or transportation entity has—

(A) willfully or repeatedly violated mandatory health or safety standards at an oil well, a petrochemical manufacturing plant, or a pipeline construction or transportation entity under such section; or

(B) the potential to have such a pattern or willful or repeated violations.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any obligation of a person to make a disclosure under any other applicable law in effect before, on, or after the effective date of this section.

(d) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—

(1) ENFORCEMENT.—A violation by any person of this section, or any rule or regulation of the Securities and Exchange Commission issued under this section, shall be treated for all purposes in the same manner as a violation of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) or the rules and regulations issued thereunder, consistent with the provisions of this section, and any such person shall be subject to the same penalties, and to the same extent, as for a violation of such Act or the rules or regulations issued thereunder.

(2) RULE AND REGULATIONS.—The Securities and Exchange Commission is authorized to issue such rules or regulations as are necessary or appropriate for the protection of investors and to carry out the purposes of this section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ISSUER; SECURITIES LAWS.—The terms ''issuer'' and ''securities laws'' have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

(2) OPERATOR OF AN OIL WELL.—The term ''operator of an oil well'' means an operator as described in the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 213111.

(3) PETROCHEMICAL MANUFACTURING PLANT.—The term ''petrochemical manufacturing plant'' means any entity assigned the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 324, 213112, or 32511.

(4) PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION OR TRANSPORTATION ENTITY.—The term ''pipeline construction or transportation entity'' means an entity described in the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 23712 or 486.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the day that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 85. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. _____. LOCAL TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.

Section 610 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) 10 percent of the funds apportioned to the State for each of fiscal years 2015 and 2016 under each of sections 104(b)(1), 104(b)(2), and 144; and'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2005 through 2009'' and inserting ''2015 and 2016'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''2005 through 2009'' and inserting ''2015 and 2016''; and

(D) in paragraph (5), by striking ''section 133(d)(3)'' and inserting ''section 133(d)(4)'';

(2) in subsection (h)(2)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''shall not''; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''shall not''; and

(3) in subsection (k), by striking ''2005 through 2009'' and inserting ''2015 and 2016''.

SA 86. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. AMERICAN BRIDGE FUND.

(a) AMERICAN BRIDGE FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ''American Bridge Fund'', consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated to such fund as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—There is hereby appropriated to the American Bridge Fund an amount equivalent to the increase in revenue received in the Treasury by reason of the amendments made by subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate).

(3) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the American Bridge Fund shall be made available by the Secretary of Transportation for the purpose of making grants to States for the repair or maintenance of any bridges classified as deficient in the National Bridge Inventory, as authorized under section 144(b) of title 23, United States Code.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer's Social Security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the Social Security number of either spouse is included on such return.''.

(2) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct Social Security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN'' after ''IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT'' in the heading thereof.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 87. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the ''FSEIS''):

(1) ''The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route'' (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) ''The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project'' (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) ''. . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios'' (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 88. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ENERGY EXPORTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) competitive and open markets facilitate lower prices for consumers, increase private investment, and foster economic growth and opportunities for workers in the United States;

(2) technological innovations have made the United States the largest oil and natural gas producer in the world, creating millions of high-paying jobs in the United States and billions in revenues to Federal and State governments; and

(3) leveraging energy resources of the United States in the global marketplace will provide greater energy security to allies of the United States and increase the geopolitical power of the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should realize its full potential as an energy superpower, by expanding trade of energy resources to spur economic growth, increase jobs in the United States, and strengthen the national security of the United States.

SA 89. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. AMERICAN BRIDGE FUND.

(a) AMERICAN BRIDGE FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ''American Bridge Fund'', consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated to such fund as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—There is hereby appropriated to the American Bridge Fund an amount equivalent to the increase in revenue received in the Treasury by reason of the amendments made by subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate).

(3) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the American Bridge Fund shall be made available by the Secretary of Transportation for the purpose of making grants to States for the repair or maintenance of any bridges classified as deficient in the National Bridge Inventory, as authorized under section 144(b) of title 23, United States Code.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(e) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no credit shall be allowed under this section to a taxpayer with respect to any qualifying child unless the taxpayer includes the name and taxpayer identification number of such qualifying child on the return of tax for the taxable year.

''(2) REFUNDABLE PORTION.—Subsection (d)(1) shall not apply to any taxpayer with respect to any qualifying child unless the taxpayer includes the name and social security number of such qualifying child on the return of tax for the taxable year.''.

(2) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct TIN under section 24(e)(1) (relating to child tax credit) or a correct Social Security number required under section 24(e)(2) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 90. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

TITLE II—ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2015''.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

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

(2) DIRECT COSTS.—The term ''direct costs'' has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the report of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses'' and dated December 17, 2010.

(3) ENERGY-RELATED RULE THAT IS ESTIMATED TO COST MORE THAN $1,000,000,000.—The term ''energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than $1,000,000,000'' means a rule of the Environmental Protection Agency that—

(A) regulates any aspect of the production, supply, distribution, or use of energy or provides for such regulation by States or other governmental entities; and

(B) is estimated by the Administrator or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to impose direct costs and indirect costs, in the aggregate, of more than $1,000,000,000.

(4) INDIRECT COSTS.—The term ''indirect costs'' has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the report of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses'' and dated December 17, 2010.

(5) RULE.—The term ''rule'' has the meaning given to the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 203. PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES THAT WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may not promulgate as final an energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than $1,000,000,000 if the Secretary determines under section 204(b)(3) that the rule will cause significant adverse effects to the economy.

SEC. 204. REPORTS AND DETERMINATIONS PRIOR TO PROMULGATING AS FINAL CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before promulgating as final any energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than $1,000,000,000, the Administrator shall carry out the requirements of subsection (b).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Administrator shall submit to Congress and the Secretary a report containing—

(A) a copy of the rule;

(B) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

(C) an estimate of the total costs of the rule, including the direct costs and indirect costs of the rule;

(D)(i) an estimate of the total benefits of the rule and when such benefits are expected to be realized;

(ii) a description of the modeling, the calculations, the assumptions, and the limitations due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information associated with the estimates under this subparagraph; and

(iii) a certification that all data and documents relied upon by the Environmental Protection Agency in developing the estimates—

(I) have been preserved; and

(II) are available for review by the public on the Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency, except to the extent to which publication of the data and documents would constitute disclosure of confidential information in violation of applicable Federal law;

(E) an estimate of the increases in energy prices, including potential increases in gasoline or electricity prices for consumers, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule; and

(F) a detailed description of the employment effects, including potential job losses and shifts in employment, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule.

(2) INITIAL DETERMINATION ON INCREASES AND IMPACTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall prepare an independent analysis to determine whether the rule will cause any—

(A) increase in energy prices for consumers, including low-income households, small businesses, and manufacturers;

(B) impact on fuel diversity of the electricity generation portfolio of the United States or on national, regional, or local electric reliability;

(C) adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use due to the economic or technical infeasibility of implementing the rule; or

(D) other adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use, including a shortfall in supply and increased use of foreign supplies.

(3) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION ON ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.—If the Secretary determines under paragraph (2) that the rule will cause an increase, impact, or effect described in that paragraph, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall—

(A) determine whether the rule will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, taking into consideration—

(i) the costs and benefits of the rule and limitations in calculating the costs and benefits due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information; and

(ii) the positive and negative impacts of the rule on economic indicators, including those related to gross domestic product, unemployment, wages, consumer prices, and business and manufacturing activity; and

(B) publish the results of the determination made under subparagraph (A) in the Federal Register.

SEC. 205. PROHIBITION ON USE OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON IN ANALYSIS.

(a) DEFINITION OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON.—In this section, the term ''social cost of carbon'' means—

(1) the social cost of carbon as described in the technical support document entitled ''Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 (or any successor or substantially related document); or

(2) any other estimate of the monetized damages associated with an incremental increase in carbon dioxide emissions in a given year.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON IN ANALYSIS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any Executive order, the Administrator may not use the social cost of carbon to incorporate social benefits of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, or for any other reason, in any cost-benefit analysis relating to an energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than $1,000,000,000 unless a Federal law is enacted authorizing the use.

SA 91. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REVIEW OF CERTAIN FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES.

If, by the date that is 45 days after the date on which a State Bureau of Land Management office has submitted a Federal Register notice to the Washington, DC, office of the Bureau of Land Management for Department of the Interior review, the review has not been completed—

(1) the notice shall consider to be approved; and

(2) the State Bureau of Land Management office shall immediately forward the notice to the Federal Register for publication.

SA 92. Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 200302 of title 54, United States Code, is amended —

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''During the period ending September 30, 2015, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''through September 30, 2015''.

(b) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Not less than 1.5 percent of amounts made available for expenditure in any fiscal year under section 200303 shall be used for projects that secure recreational public access to existing Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes.''.

SA 93. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION— ___ REBUILDING AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Rebuilding America's Infrastructure Act of 2015''.

TITLE I—REPEAL OF OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

Subtitle A—Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes

SEC. 101. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

''(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer which is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

''(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

''(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

''(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

''(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

''(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'dual capacity taxpayer' means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

''(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

''(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

''(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'generally applicable income tax' means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

''(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

''(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHELD.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

SEC. 102. LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) for the taxable year, the term 'domestic production gross receipts' shall not include gross receipts from the production, refining, processing, transportation, or distribution of oil, gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 103. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS; AMORTIZATION OF DISALLOWED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(c) INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS IN THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS AND GEOTHERMAL WELLS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (i), regulations shall be prescribed by the Secretary under this subtitle corresponding to the regulations which granted the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells and which were recognized and approved by the Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 50, Seventy-ninth Congress. Such regulations shall also grant the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of wells drilled for any geothermal deposit (as defined in section 613(e)(2)) to the same extent and in the same manner as such expenses are deductible in the case of oil and gas wells. This subsection shall not apply with respect to any costs to which any deduction is allowed under section 59(e) or 291.

''(2) EXCLUSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

''(B) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of subparagraph (A) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred. For purposes of section 1254, any deduction under this subparagraph shall be treated as a deduction under this subsection.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—In the case of any taxable year in which the taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)), the allowance for percentage depletion shall be zero.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 105. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR TERTIARY INJECTANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 193 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

''(2) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER PARAGRAPH (1).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of paragraph (1) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 106. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) CERTAIN SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'major integrated oil company' includes any successor in interest of a company that was described in subparagraph (B) in any taxable year, if such successor controls more than 50 percent of the crude oil production or natural gas production of such company.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 167(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''except as provided in subparagraph (C),'' after ''For purposes of this paragraph,''.

(2) TAXABLE YEARS TESTED.—Clause (iii) of section 167(h)(5)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''does not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d)'' and inserting ''did not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d) for any taxable year after 2004'', and

(B) by striking ''does not apply'' in subclause (II) and inserting ''did not apply for the taxable year''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

Subtitle B—Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Natural Gas

SEC. 111. REPEAL OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DEEP WATER AND DEEP GAS ROYALTY RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 344 and 345 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15904, 15905) are repealed.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to provide for royalty relief in the lease sale terms beginning with the first lease sale held on or after the date of enactment of this Act for which a final notice of sale has not been published.

TITLE II—INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

SEC. 201. INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TRANSFERS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer an amount equal to the net amount of any savings realized as a result of the enactment of this Act and the amendments made by this Act (after any expenditures authorized by this Act and the amendments made by this Act)—

(A) in accordance with subsections (b) and (c); and

(B) in the case of any additional savings after the application of such subsections, into the Highway Trust Fund in the following manner:

(i) 75 percent of such additional savings shall be transferred into the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account).

(ii) 25 percent of such additional savings shall be transferred into the Mass Transit Account.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Subsection (f) of section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8) and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

''(7) 2015 INCREASE.—Out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is hereby appropriated to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) and the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund amounts equal to the amounts determined under section 201(a)(1)(B) of the Rebuilding America's Infrastructure Act of 2015.''.

(b) WATER INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATIVE FINANCING PILOT PROJECTS.—Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency jointly, $2,000,000,000 to carry out the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) through 2019.

(c) TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANT.—In this section, the term ''TIGER discretionary grant'' means a grant awarded and administered by the Secretary of Transportation using funds made available for—

(A) supplemental discretionary grants for a national surface transportation system under title XII of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 203);

(B) the national infrastructure investments discretionary grant program under title I of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–17; 123 Stat. 3035);

(C) national infrastructure investments under section 2202 of division B of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10; 125 Stat. 191);

(D) national infrastructure investments under title I of division C of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–55; 125 Stat. 641);

(E) national infrastructure investments under title VIII of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6; 127 Stat. 432);

(F) national infrastructure investments under title I of division L of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76; 128 Stat. 574); or

(G) national infrastructure investments under title I of division K of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235).

(2) APPROPRIATION.—Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of Transportation, $2,000,000,000 to provide TIGER discretionary grants for fiscal year 2016.

(d) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.—The funding provided under this section shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding for the programs and accounts funded under this section.

SEC. 202. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE III—STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

SEC. 301. STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUNDS.

Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, $1,500,000,000 for State water pollution control revolving funds established in accordance with title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.).

SEC. 302. STATE DRINKING WATER TREATMENT REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS.

Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, $1,000,000,000 for State drinking water treatment revolving loan funds established in accordance with section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–12).

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

The Office of Management and Budget shall not include amounts made available under subsections (b) or (c) of section 201 or title III during a fiscal year in determining whether there has been a breach of the discretionary spending limits under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) during the fiscal year.

SA 94. (Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING RENEWABLE ENERGY AND CARBON CAPTURE RESEARCH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the energy policy of the United States is based on an all-of-the-above approach to production sources;

(2) an all-of-the-above approach reduces dependence on foreign oil, increases national security, and creates jobs;

(3) smart research investments are critical to increase the energy independence of the United States, combat climate change, reduce emissions, and create jobs;

(4) Department of Energy funding for research and development for renewable energy is not currently adequate; and

(5) research regarding carbon capture use and sequestration has decreased almost 30 percent since fiscal year 2012.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that research and development and loan and grant program funding for renewable energy and carbon capture systems should be increased in order to reduce United States emissions, combat climate change, provide energy security, and maintain energy diversity.

SA 95. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. 5-YEAR EXTENSION OF CREDITS WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES PRODUCING ENERGY FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions of section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code

of 1986 are each amended by striking ''January 1, 2015'' each place it appears and inserting ''January 1, 2020'':

(1) Paragraph (1).
(2) Paragraph (2)(A).
(3) Paragraph (3)(A).
(4) Paragraph (4)(B).
(5) Paragraph (6).
(6) Paragraph (7).
(7) Paragraph (9).
(8) Paragraph (11)(B).

(b) EXTENSION OF ELECTION TO TREAT QUALIFIED FACILITIES AS ENERGY PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 48(a)(5)(C) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2015'' and inserting ''January 1, 2020''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

SA 96. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S.1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. STUDY ON RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ENSURE SAFE TRANSPORTATION BY PIPELINE AND RAIL OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation and the Administrator of Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) shall conduct a study on the resources necessary to ensure the safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products, including by rail and pipeline. The study shall focus on the following priorities:

(A) Ensuring the safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(B) Ensuring PHMSA has the necessary personnel and other resources, including access to new and emerging technologies, to properly monitor and regulate the transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(2) SCOPE.—The study required under this subsection shall include the following elements:

(A) An examination of the current and projected resources and personnel at the Department of Transportation and PHMSA that are or will be dedicated to regulating, monitoring, and ensuring the overall safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(B) A determination of the appropriate manpower personnel, resources, and funding requirements for all Department and Administration elements that do or are expected to play a significant role in regulating, monitoring, and ensuring the overall safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(C) An assessment and description of the personnel, resources, and funding needs for each State, and a description of the State, local, and tribal resources and personnel that are dedicated to performing the tasks described in subparagraph (B).

(D) The development and use of technology for each of the Department and Administration elements involved in regulating, monitoring, or otherwise ensuring the overall safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline, including whether the elements need additional technological assets and how best to acquire needed additional technological assets.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation and the PHMSA Administrator, in conjunction with the heads of other Federal agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) The findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(B) Input from other Federal agencies that have any significant role in the safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(C) A description of any impending changes to regulations or policy that may have an effect on personnel, resources, or funding or that would otherwise impact the ability of the Department and the Administration to meet the basic standards necessary to properly monitor and regulate the transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(D) Recommendations for enhancing safety for the transport of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline, and what resources, personnel, and funding would be required to implement such recommendations.

(E) An explanation of why the Department or the Administration is not already implementing any of such recommendations.

(F) Recommendations for additional legislation necessary to implement recommendations contained in the report.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. ___. RAILROAD AND PIPELINE EMERGENCY SERVICES PREPAREDNESS, OPERATIONAL NEEDS, AND SAFETY EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE.

Section 508 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 318) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) RAILROAD AND PIPELINE EMERGENCY SERVICES PREPAREDNESS, OPERATIONAL NEEDS, AND SAFETY EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act, the Administrator shall establish, as a subcommittee of the National Advisory Council, the Railroad and Pipeline Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation Subcommittee (referred to in this subsection as the 'Subcommittee').

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Subcommittee shall be composed of the following:

''(A) The Deputy Administrator for Protection and National Preparedness of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or designee.

''(B) The Director of the Office of Emergency Communications of the Department of Homeland Security, or designee.

''(C) The Director for the Office of Railroad, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Investigations of the National Transportation Safety Board, or designee, only in an advisory capacity.

''(D) The Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety of the Federal Railroad Administration, or designee.

''(E) The Assistant Administrator for Security Policy and Industry Engagement of the Transportation Security Administration, or designee.

''(F) The Assistant Commandant for Response Policy of the Coast Guard, or designee.

''(G) The Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response of the Environmental Protection Agency, or designee.

''(H) The Associate Administrator for Hazardous Materials Safety of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or designee.

''(I) The Chief Safety Officer and Assistant Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, or designee.

''(J) The Director of the Office of Energy Infrastructure Security of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or designee.

''(K) Such other qualified individuals as the Administrator shall appoint as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act from among the following:

''(i) Members of the National Advisory Council that have the requisite technical knowledge and expertise to address rail and pipeline emergency response issues, including members from the following disciplines:

''(I) Emergency management and emergency response providers, including fire service, law enforcement, hazardous materials response, and emergency medical services.

''(II) State, local, and tribal government officials with expertise in preparedness, protection, response, recovery, and mitigation, including Adjutants General.

''(III) Elected State, local, and tribal government executives.

''(IV) Such other individuals as the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

''(ii) Individuals who have the requisite technical knowledge and expertise to serve on the Subcommittee, including representatives of—

''(I) the rail industry;

''(II) the pipeline industry;

''(III) the oil industry;

''(IV) the communications industry;

''(V) emergency response providers, including individuals nominated by national organizations representing local governments and personnel;

''(VI) representatives from national Indian organizations;

''(VII) technical experts; and

''(VIII) vendors, developers, and manufacturers of systems, facilities, equipment, and capabilities for emergency responder services.

''(iii) Representatives of such other stakeholders and interested and affected parties as the Administrator considers appropriate.

''(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The Deputy Administrator for Protection and National Preparedness shall serve as the Chairperson of the Subcommittee, or designee.

''(4) MEETINGS.—

''(A) INITIAL MEETING.—The initial meeting of the Subcommittee shall take place not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

''(B) OTHER MEETINGS.—After the initial meeting, the Subcommittee shall meet at least twice annually, with at least 1 meeting conducted in person during the first year, at the call of the Chairperson.

''(5) CONSULTATION WITH NONMEMBERS.—The Subcommittee and the program offices for emergency responder training and resources shall consult with other relevant agencies and groups, including entities engaged in Federally funded research and academic institutions engaged in relevant work and research, which are not represented on the Subcommittee to consider new and developing technologies and methods that may be beneficial to preparedness and response to rail and pipeline incidents.

''(6) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Subcommittee shall develop recommendations, for improving emergency responder training and resource allocation, including the following:

''(A) Quality and application of training for local emergency first responders related to rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents, with a particular focus on local emergency responders and small communities near railroads and pipelines, including the following:

''(i) Ease of access to relevant training for local emergency first responders, including an analysis of—

''(I) the number of individuals being trained;

''(II) the number of individuals who are applying;

''(III) whether current demand is being met;

''(IV) current challenges; and

''(V) projected needs.

''(ii) Modernization of course content related to rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents, with a particular focus on response to the exponential rise in oil shipments by rail.

''(iii) Training content across agencies and the private sector to provide complementary opportunities for rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents courses and materials to avoid overlap, including the following:

''(I) Overlap of course content among agencies.

''(II) The need for integrated course content through public-private partnerships.

''(III) Regular and ongoing evaluation of course opportunities, adaptation to emerging trends, agency and private sector outreach, effectiveness and ease of access for local emergency responders.

''(iv) Online training platforms, train-the-trainer and mobile training options.

''(B) Effectiveness of funding levels related to training local emergency responders for rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents, with a particular focus on local emergency responders and small communities, including the following:

''(i) Minimizing overlap in resource allocation among agencies.

''(ii) Minimizing overlap in resource allocation among agencies and private sector.

''(iii) Maximizing public-private partnerships where funding gaps exists for specific training or cost-saving measures can be implemented to increase training opportunities.

''(iv) Adaptation of priority settings for agency funding allocations in response to emerging trends.

''(v) Historic levels of funding across agencies and private sector for rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents.

''(vi) Current funding resources across agencies for rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents.

''(C) Strategy for integration of commodity flow studies, mapping, and access platforms for local emergency responders and how to increase the rate of access to the individual responder in existing or emerging communications technology.

''(D) The need for emergency response plans for rail, similar to existing law related to maritime and stationary facility emergency response plans for hazardous materials, including the following:

''(i) The requirements of such emergency plans on each train and the format and availability of such emergency plans to emergency responders in communities through which the materials travel.

''(ii) How the industry would implement such plans.

''(iii) The thresholds that require emergency plans for each train related to hazardous materials in its cargo.

''(iv) Gaps in existing regulations across agencies.

''(E) The need for a rail and pipeline hazardous materials incident database, including the following:

''(i) An assessment of the appropriate entity to host the database.

''(ii) A definition of 'rail hazardous materials incident' and 'pipeline hazardous materials incident' that would constitute the level of reporting from the industry.

''(iii) The projected cost of such a database and how that database would be maintained and enforced.

''(F) Increasing access to relevant, useful, and timely information for the local emergency responder for training purposes and in the event of a rail or pipeline hazardous materials incident, including the following:

''(i) Existing information that the emergency responder can access, what the current rate of access and usefulness is for the emergency responder, and what current information should remain and what should be reassessed.

''(ii) Utilization of existing technology in the hands of the first responder to maximize delivery of useful and timely information for training purposes or in the event of an incident.

''(iii) Assessment of emerging communications technology that could assist the emergency responder in the event of an incident.

''(G) Determination of the most appropriate agencies and offices for the implementation of the recommendations, including—

''(i) recommendations that can be implemented without congressional action and appropriate time frames for such actions; and

''(ii) recommendations that would require congressional action.

''(7) REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act, the Subcommittee shall submit a report containing the recommendations developed under paragraph (6) to the National Advisory Council.

''(B) REVIEW.—The National Advisory Council shall take up the Subcommittee's report within 30 days for review and deliberation. The National Advisory Council may ask for additional clarification, changes, or other information from the Subcommittee to assist in the approval of the recommendations.

''(C) RECOMMENDATION.—Once the National Advisory Council approves the recommendations from the Subcommittee, the National Advisory Council shall submit the report to—

''(i) the Administrator;

''(ii) the head of each agency represented on the Subcommittee;

''(iii) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

''(iv) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

''(v) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

''(vi) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

''(8) INTERIM ACTIVITY.—

''(A) UPDATES AND OVERSIGHT.—After the submission of the report by the National Advisory Council under paragraph (7), the Administrator shall—

''(i) provide quarterly updates to the congressional committees referred to in paragraph (7) regarding the status of the implementation of the recommendations developed under paragraph (6); and

''(ii) coordinate the implementation of the recommendations described in paragraph (6)(G)(i).

''(B) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—After submitting the report required under paragraph (7), the Subcommittee shall submit additional reports and recommendations in the same manner and to the same entities identified in paragraph (7) if needed or requested from Congress or from the Administrator.

''(9) TERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Subcommittee shall terminate not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

''(B) EXTENSION.—The Administrator may extend the duration of the Subcommittee, in 1-year increments, if the Administrator determines that additional reports and recommendations are needed from the Subcommittee after the termination date set forth in subparagraph (A).''.

SA 97. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S.1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _. INDIAN ENERGY OFFICE.

Section 2602(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3502(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) INDIAN ENERGY REGULATORY OFFICE.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—To assist the Secretary in carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall establish within the office of the Deputy Secretary an Indian Energy Regulatory Office (referred to in this paragraph as the 'Office'), to be located in Denver, Colorado.

''(B) EXISTING RESOURCES.—The Office shall use the existing resources of the Division of Energy and Mineral Development of the Office of Indian Energy and Economic Development.

''(C) DIRECTOR.—The Office shall be led by a Director who shall—

''(i) be compensated at a rate equal to that of level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code; and

''(ii) report directly to the Deputy Secretary.

''(D) FUNCTIONS.—The Office shall serve as a new Regional Office within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which an energy-producing Indian tribe may select to replace the existing Regional Office of the Indian tribe—

''(i) notwithstanding any other law, to oversee, coordinate, process and approve all Federal leases, easements, rights-of-way, permits, policies, environmental reviews, and any other authorities related to energy development on Indian land;

''(ii)(I) to support review and evaluation by Agency Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian tribes of—

''(aa) energy proposals, permits, mineral leases, and rights-of-way; and

''(bb) Mineral Agreements entered into under section 3 of the Indian Mineral Development Act of 1982 (25 U.S.C. 2102) for final approval; and

''(II) to conduct environmental reviews and surface monitoring for the activities described in items (aa) and (bb) of subclause (I);

''(iii) to review and prepare Applications for Permits to Drill, communitization agreements, and well spacing proposals for approval;

''(iv) to provide production monitoring, inspection, and enforcement;

''(v) to oversee drainage issues;

''(vi) to provide energy-related technical assistance and financial management training to Agency Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian tribes;

''(vii) to develop best practices in the area of Indian energy development, including standardizing energy development processes, procedures, and forms among Agency and Regional Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

''(viii) to minimize delays and obstacles to Indian energy development; and

''(ix) to provide technical assistance to Indian tribes in the areas of energy-related engineering, environmental analysis, management, and oversight of energy development, assessment of energy development resources, proposals and financing, and development of conventional and renewable energy resources.

''(E) RELATIONSHIP TO BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS REGIONAL AND AGENCY OFFICES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall have the authority to review and approve all energy-related matters for Indian tribes that select to use the Office under subparagraph (D), without subsequent or duplicative review and approval by other Agency or Regional Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or other agencies of the Department of the Interior.

''(ii) NON-ENERGY RELATED MATTERS.—Nothing in this paragraph affects the authority or duty of Regional Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to oversee, support, and provide approvals for non-energy related matters.

''(iii) REGIONAL AND LOCAL SERVICES.—Nothing in this paragraph affects the authority or duty of Agency Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and State and Field Offices of the Bureau of Land Management to provide regional and local services related to Indian energy development, including local realty functions, on-site evaluations and inspections, direct services as requested by Indian tribes and individual Indians, and any other local functions related to energy development on Indian land.

''(iv) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Office shall provide technical assistance and support to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Land Management in all areas related to energy development on Indian land.

''(F) DESIGNATION OF INTERIOR STAFF.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate and transfer to the Office existing staff and resources from—

''(I) the Division of Energy and Mineral Development of the Office of Indian Energy and Economic Development and other applicable offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

''(II) the Bureau of Land Management;

''(III) the Office of Valuation Services;

''(IV) the Office of Natural Resources Revenue;

''(V) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

''(VI) the Office of Special Trustee;

''(VII) the Office of the Solicitor;

''(VIII) the Office of Surface Mining, including mining engineering and minerals realty specialists; and

''(IX) any other agency or office of the Department of the Interior involved in energy development on Indian land.

''(ii) FUNCTIONS.—Staff and resources transferred under clause (i) shall provide for—

''(I) review, processing, and approval of permits and regulatory matters under—

''(aa) the Act of February 5, 1948 (commonly known as the 'Indian Right-of-Way Act') (25 U.S.C. 323 et seq.);

''(bb) the Act of May 11, 1938 (commonly known as the 'Indian Mineral Leasing Act of 1938') (25 U.S.C. 396a et seq.);

''(cc) the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415);

''(dd) the Indian Mineral Development Act of 1982 (25 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.);

''(ee) this title;

''(ff) the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.);

''(gg) part 162 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to leases and permits) (or successor regulations); and

''(hh) part 169 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to rights-of-way over Indian lands) (or successor regulations); and

''(II) consultations and preparation of biological opinions under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536);

''(III) preparation of environmental impact statements or similar analyses required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

''(IV) technical assistance and training for various forms of energy development on Indian land.

''(G) MANAGEMENT OF INDIAN LAND.—The Director shall ensure that—

''(i) all environmental reviews and permitting decisions—

''(I) comply with the unique legal relationship between the United States and Indian tribal governments (as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, treaties, statutes, Executive orders, and court decisions); and

''(II) are exercised in a manner that promotes tribal authority over Indian land, consistent with the policy of the Federal Government supporting Indian self-determination; and

''(ii) Indian land shall not be—

''(I) considered to be Federal public land or part of the public domain; or

''(II) be managed in accordance with Federal public land laws and policies.

''(H) INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION.—Programs and services operated by the Office shall be provided pursuant to contracts and grants awarded under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.).

''(I) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—To fund the Office for a period not to exceed 2 years, the Secretary shall transfer such funds as are necessary from the annual budgets of—

''(I) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

''(II) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

''(III) the Bureau Land Management;

''(IV) the Office of Surface Mining;

''(V) the Office of Natural Resources Revenue; and

''(VI) the Office of Mineral Valuation.

''(ii) BASE BUDGET.—At the end of the period described in clause (i), the combined total of the funds transferred under that clause shall serve as the base budget for the Office.

''(J) APPROPRIATIONS OFFSET.—All fees generated from Applications for Permits to Drill, inspection, nonproducing acreage, or any other fees related to energy development on Indian land—

''(i) shall, beginning on the date the Office is opened, be transferred to the budget of the Office; and

''(ii) may be used to advance or fulfill any of the stated duties and purposes of the Office.

''(K) REPORT.—The Office shall—

''(i) keep detailed records documenting the activities of the Office; and

''(ii) annually submit to Congress a report detailing—

''(I) the number and type of Federal approvals granted;

''(II) the time taken to process each type of application;

''(III) the need for additional similar offices to be located in other regions; and

''(IV) proposed changes in existing law to facilitate the development of energy resources on Indian land and improve oversight of energy development on Indian land.

''(L) COORDINATION WITH ADDITIONAL FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Not later than 1 year after establishing the Office, the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to coordinate and streamline energy-related permits with—

''(i) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

''(ii) the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; and

''(iii) the Secretary of Agriculture.''.

SA 98. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S.1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed $3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Protecting the Internet and Consumers through Congressional Action.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 10:30 a.m. in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Iran Nuclear Negotiations: Status of Talks and the Role of Congress.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Fixing No Child Left Behind: Testing and Accountability.''

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on January 21, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, January 22; 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; I further ask that the Senate then be in a period of morning business for up to 1 hour with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; and that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. We were able to process several amendments to the Keystone bill today, and there are now seven more in the queue and pending. Senators should expect votes related to amendments to this bill throughout the day tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator WHITEHOUSE for up to 15 minutes.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this week marks a somewhat dark milestone, which is the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's, in my view, reprehensible decision in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission. This was some fete of activism by the conservative bloc of the Supreme Court. It overturned the laws of Congress, it overturned the will of the American people, and it gave wildly outside influence over our elections to corporations and big-money interests, creating what one newspaper in Kentucky called a ''tsunami of slime.''

Well, 5 years on and the evidence is in. The evidence is in our elections, where this dam burst of outside cash that has wiped out previous campaign spending records, and the evidence is in this Chamber, where we once had a thriving bipartisan conversation on climate change, and instead of that we have now been reduced to this Keystone XL Pipeline bill—a show of force from the fossil fuel industry and virtual silence from the other side of the aisle on climate change.

I will say that today marked an unusually bright spot in that darkness when 98 out of 99 Senators voting voted that climate change was real and not a hoax and when we came so close to an amendment that stated that climate change was real and caused by human activity that the sponsor of the amendment had to vote against his own amendment in order to keep the number under 60 because there were enough votes at one stage in the vote count for that bill to have passed even the filibuster threshold. So that made it an interesting day today. But normally we are in blockade.

The purpose of the effort that we have been on has been to fast-track the Keystone XL Pipeline—a tar sands pipeline that may, at the present oil price, be an economic zombie, basically a dead pipeline walking.

Canadian authorities say that the tar sands can't be extracted profitably at under $85 a barrel. The report from the State Department said that the break price where they could take it out by train as an alternative to the pipeline was at $75 per barrel, and the price today is around $50 per barrel. So we really don't know whether this pipeline has an economic future. What we do know is that if it were to operate, it would pass enough tar sands through it to unleash additional carbon pollution equal to 6 million added cars on the road each year for 50 years.

If we take a look at this conversation here, other than the votes we forced today, the effect of Citizens United on our politics is pretty plain to see. Citizens United has not expanded debate in the Senate; it has crushed debate in the Senate. Why? Because since the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United, the big fossil fuel polluters and their network of associated interests have become among the biggest spenders—relying heavily, by the way, on undisclosed, untraceable dark money.

According to the Center for American Progress, oil, gas, and coal companies and electric utilities alone reported spending more than $84 million on the 2014 elections. And that is just what they reported. The industry's undisclosed spending in that election through groups not required to disclose their donors or on so-called issue ads that don't need to be disclosed—the total is estimated to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Well, money talks, and in politics it talks plenty loud, and $100 million has a lot to say.

One example is Americans for Prosperity—a Koch brothers' venture—disclosed election spending of $6.4 million to the FEC for last year's midterm elections, but that group's own officials have boasted that the real number is as much as $130 million—$130 million in just one election by just one group. It is that kind of extravagant spending which has bought the Koch brothers a vast political network, with employees in critical States, with voter bases tied into our consumer data, with advertising and media-buying specialists. Indeed, that sophisticated Koch brothers electioneering capacity has now been reported in the general media to rival or exceed that of the Republican National Committee. Think about that. A few very wealthy individuals in the fossil fuel business—huge polluters—are now such big players in our politics that they rival our national parties. It is small wonder that it is hard to have an honest conversation about carbon pollution in the Senate.

Most of it is hidden. The Washington Post has reported that at least 31 percent of all independent spending in the 2014 elections—which were, by the way, the most expensive midterm elections in American history. At least 31 percent of that was spent by groups not required to disclose their donors. The Washington Post also noted that the 31 percent doesn't even include those issue ads. They are also not disclosed. So we don't know fully how bad the influence of the fossil fuel polluters is, but we sure know it is bad.

Interestingly, the same Supreme Court that decided Citizens United as a part of that decision decided by a margin of 8 to 1 that disclosure of outside spending was necessary and appropriate. The majority said this, and I will quote the decision:

> Prompt disclosure of expenditures can provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable . . .

These intervening 5 years have seen a concerted effort to prevent and frustrate disclosure. Dark money spending by so-called independent groups with no disclosure requirements has more than doubled since 2010.

Ludicrous factfinding by the Court's five conservative activists concluded that corporate spending could not ever corrupt elections. It is laughable on its face, but that laughable conclusion also overlooks a very clear fact: limitless, untraceable political money doesn't even have to be spent to corrupt our democracy. It can corrupt through the threat of spending or through the promise of spending. What Citizens United gave corporations and their political instruments the power to do, it also gave them the power to threaten or promise to do, and we in the public will never see those backroom corporate threats and promises or the deals that result. The candidate will know, the special interests will know, but the public will be the ones left in the dark.

Some lobby groups are a little bolder. The Koch-backed Americans for Prosperity openly promised to wipe out candidates who support curbs on carbon pollution. The group's president said if the Republicans support a carbon tax or climate regulations, they would ''be at a severe disadvantage in the Republican nomination process. . . . We would absolutely make that a crucial issue.''

The threat is plain. Step out of line and here come the attack ads and the primary challengers—all funded by the deep pockets of the fossil fuel industry, enabled by Citizens United and largely protected from disclosure, so the public cannot see what is going on.

The effect of Citizens United has been particularly clear in the Senate. There once was an active heartbeat of Republican activity on climate change. Senator MCCAIN ran for President on an active, robust program of addressing climate change. Senator COLLINS did a bipartisan bill on climate change. Senator KIRK voted in the House for the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill. Senator FLAKE wrote articles supporting a carbon fee as long as the taxes were reduced elsewhere to offset the increased revenue from the carbon fee and on and on. My first exposure to this was the Warner-Lieberman bill and the Warner was Republican Senator John Warner.

That has been a while. Since 2010, the year Citizens United was decided, this honest debate about how we address this problem for the benefit of the American people has flat-lined. Since 2010 the climate evidence has only become stronger. NASA and NOAA just officially declared 2014 the hottest year ever recorded—ever—easily breaking the previous records, the agencies say.

But as the climate alarm bells grow louder, as the Earth sends her signals to us through our scientists' measurements about what has happened to the oceans, measuring the acidification of the oceans, about what is happening in our atmosphere, measuring the carbon concentrations in the atmosphere—as all that information has advanced, there has been just silence in this building since then. Instead of talking about what carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and oceans, instead, No. 1, the first agenda of the new majority: We are talking about letting polluters pump more tar sands crude, one of the most toxic fossil fuels on the planet, out onto the global market. Citizens United did not enhance speech in our democracy. Instead it allowed wealthy special interests to suppress and silence real debate.

So I have filed an amendment to the Keystone bill to see what corporate influence pervades this effort. My amendment would require any company that stands to make over $1 billion from the pipeline or from the development of the tar sands to disclose its campaign spending over $10,000 from the last election cycle and going forward. The public needs to be able to connect the dots.

I am also reintroducing the general disclosure act, called the DISCLOSE Act, to require all groups spending on elections to report their large expenditures and their high-dollar donors. The Supreme Court has said we cannot keep corporate interests from meddling in our popular elections. They are people, too, now. So now that the corporations are people, too, let's at least show the voters who it is who is trying to sway their votes. It is a pretty simple idea. It is what the Supreme Court Justices themselves prescribed, and it is an idea that Republicans over and over and over have supported in the past.

The fact we must face in the Senate is that polluter money has polluted our democracy, just as their carbon pollution has polluted our atmosphere and oceans. So it is time to disclose. On climate change where we have an overwhelming scientific consensus, where we have the American people, majorities of Democrats and Republicans, supporting strong congressional action on climate, where we have American businesses small and large that see the folly of ignoring the looming risk, and where we have the national security community, our Armed Forces actively preparing to face the threat climate change poses to American safety and international stability—here, by the way, just as an example, is the Department of the Army's high-level climate change vulnerability assessment. I don't think they are kidding us and I don't think they are part of a hoax.

Mr. President, I thank you for your patience this evening and I will conclude with the remark that I ordinarily conclude these speeches with: It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:58 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING MS. KATIA STEINBECK FOR BECOMING KRCG 13 AND MISSOURI RETIRED TEACHERS ASSOCIATION EXCELLENT EDUCATOR FOR 2014

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Katia Steinbeck for winning the KRCG 13 and Missouri Retired Teachers Association Excellent Educator Award for 2014.

Ms. Steinbeck is a 3rd grade teacher at St. Elizabeth Elementary School, which is located in my hometown of St. Elizabeth, MO. She won the Excellent Educator Award for the month of March earlier in 2014, and then proceeded to receive the Excellent Educator Award Teacher of the Year for 2014 in May of last year.

Providing a quality education for the nation's youth is a top priority of mine, and I commend educators like Ms. Steinbeck who take steps to enhance the classroom experience for their students, and recognize the amount of personal time all teachers spend to create a better learning environment for our nation's schoolchildren. Outside of the home, our teachers have the most impact on our children's development. By supporting our schools, and most importantly our teachers, both at home and in Washington, we come closer to ensuring that our children are prepared for the future.

Ms. Steinbeck's dedication and commitment to the students of the St. Elizabeth community is exemplary, and I applaud Ms. Steinbeck for her outstanding success thus far in the field of teaching.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating Katia Steinbeck for a job well done.

HONORING LEMONT POLICE CHIEF KEVIN SHAUGHNESSY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lemont Police Chief Kevin Shaughnessy who is retiring from the force after 11 years as Chief of Police.

Chief Shaughnessy received his Bachelor's Degree in criminal justice from Arizona State University and his Master's Degree in criminal justice from Chicago State University. His first position in law enforcement was with the Illinois State Police and he served with that force for 25 years. During this time Chief Shaughnessy was selected to be Commander of the South Suburban Major Crimes Task Force. With this position, he worked closely with area police chiefs to establish one of the largest and most successful violent crime task forces in the nation. In 2003, Chief Shaughnessy was selected from over 60 qualified candidates to lead the Lemont Police Department.

As chief, Kevin Shaughnessy has overseen various programs offered to Lemont residents including Neighborhood Watch, 911 Emergency Cell Phones, Prescription and OTC Drug Disposal, and his personal favorite—Kops n Kidz Day. Chief Shaughnessy is committed to the concept of community policing and he considers the citizens served as partners in providing meaningful police service.

Friends and colleagues of Chief Shaughnessy say that he is a great mentor and friend, and someone who can be depended on. I know this also from my experiences with the chief since I have served as Lemont's representative in the House. He is a true example of a leader and has brought stability to the Lemont Police Department. I know that Chief Shaughnessy will truly be missed for he has greatly contributed to the department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Chief Kevin Shaughnessy for his many years of service to his community and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER DANIEL FRIESON

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Navy veteran Daniel Frieson of New Jersey's Third Congressional District, who passed away this week, and express my deepest condolences to his family and friends.

Chief Warrant Officer Frieson served our country for twenty-two years as a member of the United States Navy, and rose to the rank of Chief Warrant Officer 3 upon his retirement. He was stationed aboard the USS *Pennsylvania* during the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. At the time of his death, CWO Frieson was among the last surviving Pearl Harbor veterans in New Jersey.

CWO Frieson went on to serve aboard the USS *Burke*, and ashore at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard and Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst.

After his retirement he settled in Marlton, New Jersey and became an active member of the community. CWO Frieson will be remembered for his involvement in his local church and as a Commander of VFW Medford Post No. 7677.

Mr. Speaker, South Jersey is tremendously grateful for Chief Warrant Officer Daniel Frieson's service to our nation. It is my honor to recognize his service and achievements before the United States House of Representatives.

CRAIG BIGGIO

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement of Houston Astros legend Craig Biggio's entrance into the Baseball Hall of Fame is an achievement long in the making. In his franchise record 20 seasons with the Houston Astros organization, Biggio was loved by fans for his work on and off the field.

On the field, Biggio holds Houston Astros franchise records in games played, at-bats, runs scored, hits, doubles, and extra base hits. Biggio has played in seven all-star games, won five Silver Sluggers awards, and four Gold Gloves.

However, off the field is where Biggio has really shined. He's a supporter of the Sunshine Kids Foundation, an organization dedicated to providing positive group activities and emotional support for kids receiving cancer treatment. In 2007, Biggio received the Roberto Clemente award for best exemplifying the game of baseball, sportsmanship, community involvement, and individual contribution to his team. A dedicated family man, Biggio has been married to his wife, Patty, for 22 years. He also has two sons, Conor and Cavan, and a daughter, Quinn. Biggio is currently a baseball coach at St. Thomas High School in Houston and has led the Eagles to back-to-back TAPPS 5A State Championships.

His achievements speak for themselves. I'm proud to have known him and proud to be able to call him a fellow Houstonian.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING ROTARY INTERNATIONAL

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Rotary International, one of the world's largest non-profit humanitarian service organizations, for its 110 years of service. The Rotary motto, "Service Above Self," inspires members to serve their communities, maintain high ethical standards and promote goodwill and peace. Rotary clubs are active in meeting the needs of their local communities, using funds and volunteer members to provide medical supplies, clean water, food, job training and education to millions in need.

In 1985, Rotary launched PolioPlus in partnership with the World Health Organization, U.S. Center for Disease Control and UNICEF with the goal of immunizing children across the globe against polio. The campaign has been tremendously successful; polio cases have decreased by 99 percent since 1988, and the world stands on the threshold of eradicating the disease.

It is my pleasure to recognize the Rotary clubs of Central Florida as they prepare for ''Light Up Rotary to End Polio Now'' on March 13–14, 2015, with Rotary International President Gary C. K. Huang. I am grateful to the Rotarians of Central Florida for their service and dedication to strengthening our community.

TRIBUTE TO SISTER ANN KEEFE

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sister Ann Keefe, who passed away on Sunday, January 18, 2015 after a long and courageous battle against cancer.

In 1982 Sister Ann joined the ministry at St. Michaels Church in Providence and began her life long fight for those who had no voice and those particularly vulnerable and marginalized.

Recognizing the challenges that faced our city and Rhode Island, Sister Ann took action to help the poor, empower workers, advocate non-violence and promote justice for all. Over thirty years of service to our community, she cofounded the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence, which is credited with helping to sharply cut the city's murder rate. She started Providence ¡CityArts! to help at-risk youth. And, she was involved in creating nearly two dozen other organizations that continue to create opportunity for so many.

I had the extraordinary honor of working with Sister Ann over many years and treasured our friendship. As Mayor, I was especially proud to work with Sister Ann to support the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence to make Providence safe for kids and future generations of young Rhode Islanders. During this time, I witnessed her leadership skills, dedication and profound commitment to the youth of our city. Last year, even though she was battling cancer, Sister Ann was still fighting for those without a voice and helped my office secure Saint Michaels Church as the location for a comprehensive immigration reform rally and attended the event to show her support. There are so many examples of when she would connect those in need with those that could help.

She was a remarkable and strong woman who served as an inspiration for all of us and she leaves behind a great legacy. Her passing is a tremendous loss for Rhode Island, but her presence will continue to be felt in the community through the many organizations she helped found and run, and the positive impact she has had on so many.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family and loved ones. Rest in peace, Sister Ann.

HONORING COMMISSIONER TOM FREEMAN FOR HIS SERVICE TO OUR NATION, THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND RIVERSIDE COUNTY

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Commissioner Tom Freeman as he's retiring after 35 years in service to our nation, state, and the County of Riverside, California. While serving the County of Riverside Tom has served as the Commissioner of Foreign Trade, Commissioner of Defense and Military Services, Commissioner of the Office of Film and Television, Chief of Staff, Board of Supervisors, 4th district, Executive Officer for the Sheriff's Department, Chief Public Information Officer and Emergency Services Coordinator for the CDF-County Fire, and first Chairman of the Workforce Development Board. His extraordinary service with the County of Riverside in key posts has been of great benefit to the county and its 2.3 million residents.

Tom began serving his nation in the United States Air Force in 1979, enlisting during the Iranian Hostage Crisis and later served in the Inaugural Honor Guard of President Ronald Reagan, The Homecoming Honor Guard for the Iranian Hostages, and the Funeral and Repose of General of the Army Omar Bradley. In 1981, Tom was selected for Marine Corps and Naval Parachutist Training, which he completed, earning the prestigious Paratrooper Badge. He went on to complete Instructor School and receive his Air Training Command Instructor Badge. He then served the House and Senate, teaching selected members of the Armed Services Committee escape, evasion, survival, and parachute training at nearby Andrews Air Force Base. Later in 1984, then Staff Sargent-Select Freeman, was honored by the U.S. Senate, having his enlistment oath administered by the late Senator Quentin S. Burdick on in the Senate Chamber, thus becoming the first member of the active duty armed forces to have his enlistment oath administered on the Senate Floor by a seated member of the Senate of the United States.

Tom returned to his native California with assignment to the Undergraduate Navigator Instructor School, United States Air Force, Mather Air Force Base and served as the Non Commissioned Officer In Charge of Training for future Air Force Navigators. He excelled in this assignment and was named Non Commissioned Officer of the Year. Later he was honorably discharged and joined the Military Department, State of California and was called to Active Duty again thru 1990. While serving on active duty with the State of California he was again named Non Commissioned Officer of the Year, this time for the entire state, and he was also honored as Non Commissioned Officer of the Year by the Air Force Association and the Air Force Sargent's Association. He was also honored by the National Guard Bureau, here in Washington, D.C., two years in a row with the Rookie Recruiter of the Year Award and Recruiter of the Year Award the following year. During this same period of time Tom received a Commendation Medal for rendering lifesaving first aid to an injured motorist. Other awards received include four more commendation medals, an achievement medal, meritorious service medal, and the Air Force Recognition Ribbon, amongst many others.

On January 10, 1990 Tom began his service with the County of Riverside-CDF, Office of Emergency Services. Over his almost 5 years in this post he responded to major quakes, floods, and fires earning three awards from the Governor of California for his service and Emergency Manager of the Year honors from the City of Indian Wells, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert. Later he was promoted to the post of Legislative, Information, and Marketing Officer at the Economic Development Agency. After 6 years as Vice President of Government Affairs and Marketing with WMI, the world's largest environmental service provider, Tom returned to serve as Chief of Staff for his mentor and friend, the late County Supervisor Roy Wilson. Tom served with distinction as Chief of Staff and accepted a promotion as Executive Officer for Riverside County Sheriff Larry Smith. He excelled in this position and received awards for his work from the Secret Service, FBI, The International Association of Chiefs of Police, State Attorney General, and United States Army. He was the Agency Representative to the Ford Family during the Funeral & Repose of the 38th President of the United States. After serving the Sheriff's Department with distinction he returned to the Economic Development Agency as Commissioner of the Office of Foreign Trade, spokesman, and custodian of records.

Tom has decided to retire at the age of 55 and spend time with his wife, Brenda Salas Freeman, enjoy their grandson Robert III, and enjoy time with sons Joel, Robert II, and daughter in-law Lindsay. His career as the Foreign Trade Commissioner was remarkable, crafting three bilateral trade agreements with Canada, Japan, and Croatia, and helping take Riverside County Exports from 47th in the nation to 24th in the nation. He also served with the National Association of Counties, achieving the post of Vice Chairman of the International Task Force on Economic Development, supporting global trade agreements in South Korea, the EU, and pacific rim, and helping businesses create jobs through the Great Recession. Tom was frequently consulted by elected leaders in the state and nation's capital to discuss trade issues and Military & Defense programs and policies. In addition to these accomplishments, Colonel Tom Freeman retired in November 2007, 28 years after enlisting in the United States Air Force, from the Military Department of the State of California and is the recipient of the Distinguished Service Medal-Order of California Medal by the Governor and our Adjutant General. Freeman also chaired numerous charitable boards and organizations including the United Way, Breath of Life, Junior Diabetes Foundation, and served as Treasurer of the John F. Kennedy Foundation 7 Law Enforcement Appreciation Committee in the City of Riverside, raising millions for charity. He is the recipient of the Jefferson Award for Public Service presented by the 38th President of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, Tom's talent and leadership exemplify the very best of Riverside County and my state. Our nation, state, and county are a better place because of the efforts of Commissioner Freeman and his devotion to duty and commitment to serve the people. I congratulate Commissioner Freeman on his 35 years of service to our nation, state, and County of Riverside and wish him well in retirement and all future endeavors.

PEARLAND LEGACY CONTINUES

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate high school student Brooke

Botkin for being named to the Texas Sports Writers Association (TSWA) first team and the 2014 Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA) Class 6A all-state volleyball teams. Brooke is a sophomore at Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. These honors recognize her hard work and outstanding athletic achievements.

The TSWA and TGCA selected Brooke for her skill and sportsmanship, which have made her a top prospect for collegiate volleyball programs. Her dedication to the sport ensures her place in an elite class of competitors and continues Pearland's legacy of producing some of the nation's best student athletes.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Brooke Botkin for being selected as a first team athlete on the TSWA and TGCA Class 6A all-state volleyball teams. We look forward to her continued success both on and off the court.

CONGRATULATING LOGAN GULEFF ON WINNING ''MASTERCHEF JUNIOR''

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Memphian Logan Guleff on winning the second season of ''MasterChef Junior.'' At age 11, Logan was among thousands of children ages 8 through 13 who auditioned for the show. His culinary experience helped him to not only be selected as a show participant but to also triumph over his competitors and take home the grand prize.

When Logan was nine, he traveled to New York to compete in a Jif peanut butter contest as a semifinalist and at age 10, he had lunch at the White House and a meeting with President Barack Obama after winning a state contest. Additionally, Logan has already become a culinary entrepreneur, offering his own line of seasonings called Logan's Rub and providing dining reviews on his blog, orderupwithlogan.blogspot.com.

For Logan's final competitive meal on ''MasterChef Junior'', he chose to highlight his talents by preparing all seafood dishes, including grilled spot prawn with a smoked saffron aioli and olive tapenade for his appetizer and a salt crusted branzino with a chimichurri sauce for his entŕee. ''MasterChef Junior'' host Gordon Ramsay commented that Logan's dishes were the most unusual ones the show has ever seen, to which Logan replied, ''Go big or go home.'' His vision, creativity and all-or-nothing spirit certainly paid off.

Logan's accomplishments are significant for a young man of only 12 years of age, and he represents the Memphis culinary community well. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Logan Guleff on winning the title of MasterChef Junior.

HONORING THE MOORPARK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Moorpark Chamber of Commerce's 100th anniversary. I commend the Moorpark Chamber for their dedication and leadership in promoting a business friendly community and strengthening the economic environment in Moorpark that contributes to Ventura County's diverse and dynamic economy.

The Moorpark Chamber of Commerce was established in 1915 surrounded by a pastoral community and chartered in 1950. The success of the Chamber is mirrored in the success of the City of Moorpark, a product of determined citizens coming together to accomplish a common goal, and creating a better way of life for residents.

The service that the Moorpark Chamber has provided for the City of Moorpark has been invaluable to the community. Successful ventures included the business directory that began in 1963, and the publication of the Community Link Newspaper in 2009. The Moorpark Chamber supports cooperation, and collaborative relationships among citizens, businesses, and community organizations. Through strong membership, inclusive programs, and special committees, the Moorpark Chamber of Commerce honors the history and diversity of the community.

The Moorpark Chamber of Commerce supports a strong vibrant community, rich in civic engagement, hosting events that facilitate community inclusion, recognizing outstanding residents of Moorpark through the Citizen of the Year recognition event and Annual Community Awards, and continuing to foster new generations of community leaders.

I am honored to recognize the Moorpark Chamber of Commerce's centennial anniversary. I congratulate the Chamber in reaching this historic milestone, and would like to extend my sincere gratitude for their continued success, and service to the City of Moorpark and our community.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES E. CRIDER

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of James E. Crider, a great man of faith and the father of my good friend, Indiana State Senator Michael Crider.

Jim was a loving and devoted husband to his wife of 63 years, Janet. Together, they were the proud parents of six children, 13 grandchildren, and 19 great-grandchildren. As traveling song evangelists for many years, Jim and his family valued their faith and were diligent leaders at the Shirley Church of the Nazarene. He spent an impressive 27 years at Chrysler and in retirement enjoyed hunting and spending time with his family.

Jim taught his son Michael the value of hard work and the importance of being a man of integrity. He raised a great son who has become a valued leader in our state.

I am very grateful for the friendship that I share with Michael and his wife Sherri. Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of Michael's father, James E. Crider.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,080,794,842,225.47. We've added $7,453,917,793,312.39 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING FRED T. NOLAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Fred T. Nolan, a native of Dyer, Tennessee, but raised in Paducah, Kentucky, and has lived in Jackson, Mississippi since his graduation from Tougaloo College in the early 1960s. One of his early career choices was teaching in the Jackson Public School District (JPS).

Mr. Nolan taught two years at the then Brinkley High School located on Livingston Road and was a ninth grade teacher of Social Studies and Mathematics. He left JPS to pursue other career options and worked briefly for the Urban League of Jackson as director. The majority of his career spanned 25 years as the executive director of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, a division of Housing Urban Development (HUD).

After fully retiring from HUD in 1996, Mr. Nolan rejoined the JPS family as a substitute and limited service teacher. He worked three years in a limited service capacity at Siwell Middle, Lanier High, and Forest Hill High schools.

Mr. Fred Nolan is married to Mrs. Kisiah Nolan, a former JPS Board member and president. His son, Fredrick Nolan, is coordinator of the JPS WATCH D.O.G.S. program. The Nolan's also have two daughters: Renee Nolan Johnson of Huntsville, Alabama, and Adrienne Nolan Colar of Smyrna, Georgia. All three of their children are graduates of the Jackson Public School District.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Fred T. Nolan for his dedication to serving others.

LEADING THE WAY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jillian Ross for being elected to the Columbia University senate for a two-year term through 2016. Jillian is a 2012 graduate of Clements High School in Sugar Land, Texas and a chemical/biomedical engineering junior at Columbia University.

Ms. Ross is the first African-American woman elected to represent Columbia's Fu Foundation School of Engineering in the department's 150-year history. Through her position in the university's senate, Jillian will work with the school's president and faculty to shape policy on issues that affect the student body and greater Columbia University community.

I commend Jillian Ross for her dedication to serving the interests of her fellow students and taking on the responsibilities that leadership brings. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Jillian for winning a seat in the Columbia University Senate.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF RECORD PRODUCER JOHN FRY

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and accomplishments of Memphis record producer, John Fry. Fry, a son of Memphis, was an example of the innovation, creativity and daring that is uniquely Memphis, as embodied in such Memphians as Abe Plough, founder of Plough Inc. and creator of St. Joseph's aspirin for children and the Coppertone skin care line; Fred Smith, founder of Federal Express; Kemmons Wilson, founder of Holiday Inn; Clarence Saunders, founder of Piggly Wiggly—the first self service grocer; and Sam Phillips, the father of rock and roll and founder of Sun Studio and Sun Records—the recording home of Elvis Presley.

Born on New Year's Eve in 1944, Fry became a well-known and respected member of the Memphis music community, having founded the Ardent record label in the late 1950s and early 1960s along with John King and Fred Smith. Ardent was a unique studio for the region that brought high technical standards to recording, which Fry used to father a multitude of music from rock and roll and punk to soul, power pop and gospel. Under his leadership, Fry helped launch the careers of local musicians and guide the works of others from around the country.

John began recording music out of his family's garage in 1959 while he was still in high school. He committed to spending countless hours remodeling the space by building the equipment needed and inter-connecting equipment that could not be built. Out of his self-made recording studio, he recorded and released singles that were favored by locals, including The Ole' Miss Downbeats' Slewfoot and The Hucklebuck. These were the first recordings for the Ardent label. In 1962 after graduating high school, Fry and a friend built a radio station in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and in 1964, he worked with recording artist Jim Dickinson, who had also worked with Elvis and power pop singer Alex Chilton, to begin reviving the Ardent label.

In 1966, Ardent Studios opened on National Street, where it stayed for five years before moving to its current location on Madison in Midtown Memphis. In its first four years, John invested in the studio, furnishing it with four- and sixteen-track equipment, outboard and Dolby noise reduction equipment. The technologically-advanced studio soon had a console that was the same make used by Stax Records, which enable Ardent to become a companion studio for Stax recording artists, including Isaac Hayes, the Staple Singers, the Bar-Kays, Sam and Dave and Albert King. Ardent also recorded albums for The Replacements, The Clits, The Scruffs and Elvis Presley.

One band that was close to John's heart was Big Star. Made up of Memphians Chris Bell, Andy Hummel, Jody Stephens and lead singer/songwriter Alex Chilton, Big Star recorded three albums at Ardent Studios—#1 Record, Radio City and Third—and viewed John largely as a mentor. John showed them ins and outs of the industry and drummer Jody Stephens commented that he was "a person who could help you make your dreams come true." While Big Star received little national recognition at the time, over the next four decades, the group's three albums eventually were listed among Rolling Stone magazine's "500 Greatest Albums of All Time" and a variation of their song In The Street was used as the theme song for the popular Fox-TV sitcom, That 70s Show.

In the late 70s, John began to focus more on the business side of Ardent Studios, but talents including Led Zeppelin, ZZ Top, R.E.M., Bob Dylan, Leon Russell, the Replacements, Freddie King, the Gin Blossoms and many others traveled to and recorded at the Memphis studio throughout the 70s, 80s and 90s. In 1995, John launched a Christian rock label, releasing 36 albums and receiving seven Grammy nominations from artists including Big Tent Revival, Skillet, Jonah33 and others. He also began operating Ardent as a learning ground for future award winning producers and engineers, including Jim Dickinson, Terry Manning, John Hampton and others.

Today, Ardent Studios continue to attract musicians both local and national from all genres. Memphis rap group and Oscar winner Three 6 Mafia has recorded at the studio as well as Memphis rapper, Al Kapone. Three Doors Down, the North Mississippi Allstars, the White Stripes and the Raconteurs are among the studio's roster of artists. Additionally, filmmakers for Hustle and Flow, Black Snake Moan and 40 Shades of Blue—all movies featuring and filmed in Memphis—went to Ardent Studios for recording their soundtracks. The studio has amassed 70 gold and platinum albums and singles.

John Fry was a recording visionary and helped propel Memphis music and that of others from around the world to a higher level. His contributions to the industry are numerous and will continue to inspire future generations. In 2006, he said, "If you acquire knowledge or skill or even wisdom, and you just keep it, then when you die, that dies with you. But if you share that with other generations—who in turn will share it and share it and share it—you're doing something that lasts."

John Fry passed away on December 18, 2014 in Memphis at 69 years of age, and is survived by his wife, Betty Fry. He and Betty were advocates for laws concerning humane treatment of animals, and they treasured and cared for horses, dogs and cats with the dignity that people who respect all life would. He will be remembered by all who came in contact with him and whose careers and success benefited from his mentorship. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing his life, accomplishments and contributions to American music. His was a life well-lived.

COMMENDING DR. WINSLOW SARGEANT, CHIEF COUNSEL OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S OFFICE OF ADVOCACY FOR HIS SERVICE UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respect to Dr. Winslow Sargeant who is retiring as Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the U.S. Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy.

Appointed in August of 2010, I had the pleasure of working with Dr. Sargeant during the last three Congressional Sessions while a member of the House Small Business Committee. He has brought his expertise to bear in helping solve issues facing small businesses and entrepreneurs in my district and across the country as they navigated the most difficult economy our country has experienced in nearly a century.

Dr. Sargeant knows the challenges of starting and building a small firm. He enrolled in a PhD. Program at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in 1988 and left in 1992 to work at IBM in Rochester, Minnesota. He received his PhD in electrical engineering in 1995, and worked at ATT/Bell Labs in Allentown, Pennsylvania. In 1997, Dr. Sargeant and partners co-founded Aanetcom, a "fabless" semiconductor integrated circuit design company. The company designed state-of-the-art computer circuits for telecom and broadband applications. In March 2000, Aanetcom was acquired by PMC-Sierra, a publicly traded company.

Prior to becoming chief counsel, Dr. Sargeant served as managing director of Venture Investors, LLC, in Madison, Wisconsin. The firm provided seed and early-stage money to high-potential health care and IT companies. There, he specialized in computer software, hardware, and materials, and worked with technology transfer offices.

As Chief Counsel, he brought years of experience as a federal partner to small firms. From 2001 to 2005, he was program manager in electronics for the National Science Foundation's Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program, while also serving as adjunct professor at the University of Pennsylvania. The NSF is one of the federal agencies with the largest extramural research and development budgets that are required in the SBIR

program to dedicate a portion of their awards to small firms.

On behalf of the small business community of the 9th District of Brooklyn, I'd like to thank and congratulate Dr. Sargeant, his wife Ikanyeng and three children, Kgosi, Lorato, and Marang and wish them many blessings in the future.

''BLACK JANUARY'' SOVIET INVASION OF AZERBAIJAN

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in remembrance of the over 130 innocent men, women, and children who were killed by the Red Army in the days following its invasion of Azerbaijan 23 years ago.

On January 20, 1990, the Soviet Union, in a brutal attempt to end the growing independence movement in Azerbaijan, sent in 26,000 troops under the pretext of restoring public order, while actually aiming to forcefully end peaceful demonstrations for independence.

The invasion and subsequent massacre, which resulted in over 130 killed, 611 injured, and 841 arrests, is remembered as ''Black January'' in the Republic of Azerbaijan today and has left an indelible mark on that nation's memory.

It was the overt oppression of innocent people by the Soviet government that further inspired the Azerbaijani people to regain its independence after 70 years of foreign rule.

Less than two years later, on October 18, 1991, Azerbaijan gained its independence from the Soviet Union and was soon recognized by the international community.

Today, the United States and Azerbaijan enjoy a close and important relationship, built on trust, understanding, and mutual support. It is important on this day that America remembers the trials and tribulations our friends in Azerbaijan have had to endure for the cause of freedom and continue to support their vital role as a beacon of democracy and prosperity in the Caspian Region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to please join me in remembering the tragic events of Black January and honor those who gave their lives in order to give birth to their country.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF TREVOR COLBOURN

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding member of the Central Florida community, Trevor Colbourn. Trevor passed away on January 13, 2015 at the age of 87 and will be deeply missed.

Born in Armindale, New South Wales, Australia on February 24, 1927, Trevor became the second President of, what was then known as, the Florida Technological University in 1978. Recognizing that the University had grown beyond being just ''Florida's Space University,'' Trevor renamed the institution the University of Central Florida. In addition to the high-profile name change, Trevor also established the University's honors program and a football program that went on to earn national rankings. Trevor nurtured Orlando's fledgling research park, and developed a partnership with Orange County that has created thousands of high tech jobs and helped transform the region's economy.

Under Trevor's leadership, the University introduced the state's first stand-alone doctoral program in computer science, and expanded its Ph.D. offerings to include civil, computer, electrical, mechanical, industrial and environmental engineering. Trevor also spearheaded a long effort to create equitable funding for the state's newer universities to put them on the same financial footing as the well-established state universities.

Known as the ''Scholar President,'' Trevor held degrees from the University of London, the College of William and Mary, and the Johns Hopkins University, where he earned his doctorate in American History in 1953. An expert on the American Revolution and Thomas Jefferson, Trevor penned a number of books and articles, including The Lamp of Experience, Fame and the Founding Father, and The Americans: A Brief History.

Trevor was an active member of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Metro Orlando Economic Development Commission, the Orlando Crime Prevention Association, the Board of Visitors of the Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base, the United Way, the Greater Orlando Sports Organizing Committee, the Kiwanis Club, the boards of the local opera company and public television station and the Organization of American Historians.

A lifelong Episcopalian, Trevor is survived by Beryl, his wife of 66 years, his daughters, Katherine ''Kit'' Wrye and Elinor Colbourn, and four grandchildren.

I am saddened by the loss of such a valuable member of the Central Florida community and extend my heartfelt condolences to his family.

2014 BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Vince Finnegan for being named the 2014 Business Person of the Year by the Central Fort Bend Chamber. Finnegan is the owner and operator of Finnegan Auto Group in Rosenberg, Texas. He fills critical workforce needs by financially supporting workforce development courses for high school students in Lamar Consolidated Independent School District. These workforce development courses help prepare students for skilled jobs after they graduate.

Finnegan is also a steward of the local business community, and serves as treasurer and board member of the Central Fort Bend Chamber. I commend him for his community support. He serves as a model businessman in Rosenberg and Fort Bend County.

I thank Vince Finnegan for his dedication to serving the interests of his community and expanding their opportunities for personal growth and prosperity. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Vince for being named the Central Fort Bend Chamber's 2014 Business Person of the Year.

TCU & BAYLOR FOOTBALL

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for years, Texas college football has been dominated by Texas and Texas A&M, both of which are large public universities. So how have a couple of small, private, Christian institutions like Baylor and TCU dethroned the kings of Texas football and become the top two programs in the state? It's simple really—their success has been built on good coaching. While the Longhorns and Aggies consistently bring in top ranked recruiting classes, Baylor and TCU typically bring in much less heralded players, yet have had more success. This means that these two programs have coaches who can turn what most consider to be ''lesser'' talent into better football players.

They each hired relative unknowns to guide their programs. Baylor put its faith in Art Briles while TCU put its in Gary Patterson. Both Briles and Patterson come from similarly humble backgrounds and have developed strong work ethics and good attitudes.

Briles hails from a small town in West Texas called Rule, where his father was the head football coach at the local high school. Briles played for his father and went on to become an all-state quarterback, earning a scholarship to the University of Houston where he played wide receiver for legendary Coach Bill Yeoman. On their way to watch Art play in the 1977 Cotton Bowl, his parents and aunt died in a tragic car crash. Though Coach Yeoman knew about this before the game started, he didn't tell Art until after the game was over. Briles went on to transfer to Texas Tech so that he could be closer to his girlfriend who was a student there at the time. They are now happily married. Prior to his coaching career, Briles earned his master's in education from Abilene Christian University, my alma mater. He would go on to become one of the most successful high school coaches in Texas history, winning four state titles at Stephenville. After coaching at Stephenville, Briles moved on to Texas Tech as an assistant and to Houston as its head coach. Then, in 2008, after a remarkable turnaround at Houston, he was hired by Baylor in hopes that he could do the same for their program. Flash forward to 2015, and Briles has just finished coaching the team to its second straight Big XII conference title, which seemed virtually unimaginable before he arrived.

TCU's Coach Gary Patterson also comes from humble roots. He grew up in a small town in Kansas called Rozel and played football at Dodge City Community College before transferring to Kansas State. After graduating from Kansas State, Patterson became a grad assistant there before moving up the ranks at several small schools around the country. In 1998 he was hired as TCU's defensive coordinator and would be named the head coach just two years later.

Briles and Patterson have each enjoyed huge amounts of success, but got there through different means. Patterson is known as a defensive mastermind and is one of the only coaches in history to win the national Coach of the Year award more than once. Briles, oppositely, is an offensive tactician and has engineered one of the greatest program turnarounds in recent memory. Both Baylor and TCU were low level football programs when Briles and Patterson arrived. Baylor was considered one of the worst football programs in the country, regularly winning only one or two games per season. TCU had just been left out of the Big 12 and were now members of the Western Athletic Conference, which isn't even a football conference anymore. Now, both are considered two of the top coaches in America and have brought back respect to these once forgotten programs.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING PROFESSOR PERRY WALLACE FOR OVERCOMING ADVERSITY IN SPORTS DURING THE CIVIL RIGHTS ERA

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Professor Perry Wallace, a Vanderbilt University graduate who integrated basketball for the Southeastern Conference (SEC) and current professor at American University, for overcoming the racism and violence he experienced as an African-American collegiate athlete during the Civil Rights era. While Wallace never viewed himself as a pioneer or a change agent for civil rights, he nonetheless helped break the color-barrier in the SEC as the first African-American basketball player in the Conference.

Like many African-American college athletes at the time, Wallace faced tremendous challenges, both physical and emotional, that highlighted the ugly reality of race relations in America. One significant memory Wallace has when his health and life were threatened was during a 1968 game between Vanderbilt and the University of Mississippi that was played in Oxford. During this game, Wallace—who was the only African-American player on the team—was subjected to racial epithets, taunting, threats of lynching, and physical violence when he received a swollen eye due to a thrown elbow just before halftime. Perry eventually returned to the game after tending to his injury, but he was mindful of the fact that after halftime, no members of his team stayed behind to accompany him back to the court. He went on to help his team win 90–72.

Unfortunately, the incident at Oxford was not the only time when he had to endure racism at an away game. Wallace and his teammates have recounted a noose being dangled near the Vanderbilt bench at a game in Knoxville and items being thrown at him, including Cokes, coins, ice and even a dagger. Perhaps adding insult to injury, many of the venues were very small and the sounds of racism could be easily picked up and broadcast over the radio for all to hear, including his mother who listened to the game against Ole Miss from her hospital bed. Despite the intolerance he experienced, Wallace remained steadfast in his resolve to not succumb to those who wished to see him fail. He was fortunate, in this manner, to have such mental strength to survive. Others, including Henry Harris, who also played in the SEC, and Nat Northington, one of the first two African-Americans to play football at the University of Kentucky, found the pressures all too great.

In a stand against the injustices of the Jim Crow laws that made segregation legal and gave protection for acts of violence and death toward African-Americans, in his last game played in Nashville against Mississippi State, Wallace ended his college basketball career with a slam dunk—a play that was deemed illegal at the time. The illegal play was allowed to stand and he finished the game scoring 28 points and 27 rebounds. He dedicated the game to his mother who passed away a year earlier.

Perry Wallace graduated from Vanderbilt and was drafted by the Philadelphia 76ers in 1970. He earned his Juris Doctorate from Columbia University in 1975 and moved to Washington, DC where he worked in the Executive Office of then-mayor Walter E. Washington before becoming an adjunct professor of law at George Washington University. Professor Wallace then served as a trial attorney at the U.S. Department of Justice and later rejoined academia as an associate professor of law at the University of Baltimore School of Law.

Today, Perry Wallace is a professor at American University Washington College of Law where he specializes in environmental, corporate and international economic law, business and environmental studies, and is the Director of the JD/MBA Joint Degree Program. Perry has received numerous awards for his accomplishments in academia and his list of publications and writings is extensive. In 2003, he was inducted into the Tennessee Sports Hall of Fame and in 2004, his Vanderbilt jersey, number 25, was retired. In 2014, Andrew Maraniss, a Vanderbilt alum and former associate director of media relations at the school's athletic department, published Wallace's biography entitled ''Strong Inside: Perry Wallace and the Collision of Race and Sports in the South.''

Vanderbilt University has a program called VUcept where freshmen students are paired with upperclassmen to make their transition to the school easier. As a freshman there, I was fortunate to have Wallace as my VUceptor. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Perry Wallace for his tenacity in the face of adversity and for his many professional accomplishments and contributions to academia.

HONORING COLONEL DAVID ARTHUR LERPS, USMC (RET)

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Colonel David Arthur Lerps, USMC (RET), who died on October 21, 2014 after a long and valiant struggle with Parkinson's disease, and his career of service to our nation.

Born in Chicago, Illinois on June 28, 1931, he spent his early years in Eastchester, New York and was an honors graduate of Duke University where he was Commandant of the Naval Battalion and participated in every sport, winning distinction as quarterback of the 1954 Blue Demons Football Team. His flight training at NAS Pensacola prepared him for many years in the Marine Air Wing. During his 30-year military career, he served three tours in Japan and flew 312 missions in Vietnam in 1968, where he was awarded 23 Air Medals and nominated for a Distinguished Flying Cross for valor in an especially dangerous mission to the DMZ.

He later served in strategic planning at the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, DC; was both student and teacher at the Marine Corps Command and Staff College; and attended the Industrial College of the Armed Forces while gaining his MBA at George Washington University. He concluded his active duty as Chief of Staff, LFTC Pacific Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado.

Upon retiring from active duty in 1984, he was appointed Chief of Staff at the Academy of the Pacific, a post he held for 18 years. After retiring from AOP, he became a student once again, studying Shakespeare and music at the University of Hawaii.

Col. Lerps was a board member of Hawaii Opera Theater and member of the Hawaii Wagner Society. He was an ardent ocean canoe paddler, a board member of the Lanikai Canoe Club and coordinator of the Duke Kahanamoku Long Distance Canoe Race for four years.

Even with the decline in mobility and speech and the loss of the ability to swallow, he never lost his deep love for opera, sports, for his family, Catholic faith and Marine Corps. As life-long friend John Schwarz wrote, ''Dave never really left the Corps . . . 'once a Marine always a Marine.' He was 'SEMPER FI,' a Marine to his final breath!''

Dave is survived by Mary, his wife of 55 years, his children Kathy Lerps, Karen Pittman, Robert Lerps, six grandchildren: Vito and Dylan Higgins, Ashley Snow, Amber Lerps, Kylie and Kassidy Barker; and a sister Ann Falkenberg and brother Kurt Lerps. I learned of Col. Lerps' life of service from his brother-in-law and my good friend Father Robert Oldershaw.

HONORING BISHOP GORDON ARLESTER HUMPHREY, JR.

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Bishop Gordon Arlester Humphrey, Jr. Bishop Humphrey was a beloved pastor, husband, father, and friend. With his passing on Sunday, December 14, we look to Bishop Humphrey's personal legacy of leadership, service, and the outstanding quality of his life's work.

Born to Gordon Humphrey, Sr. and Helen Humphrey, in Ohio, Bishop Humphrey was educated in the public schools of Chicago and graduated from Hirsch High School. He went on to attend Morehouse College in Atlanta, and then went on to follow in his father's footsteps, entering the ministry with his wife, First Lady Diane and their two children, Gordon III and Cha'Rena.

Bishop Humphrey was noted for establishing ''Sunday Night Live,'' a service where all are welcome to attend without any condemnation or judgment, aimed at those who otherwise may not have attended a church service. This model proved so successful that it was replicated across the nation. He was also a powerful singer and a talented musician, using his gifts to minister through music and song. He was the executive producer of an acclaimed album entitled, ''Olivet Oakland, Sunday Night Live! You're in the Right Place at the Right Time.'' The album was nationally and internationally recognized for its inspirational message.

After the passing of his father, Bishop Humphrey moved to Chicago, away from his 30-year ministry at Olivet Institutional Missionary Baptist Church in Oakland. Upon his return to Chicago, Bishop Humphrey assumed the position of senior pastor at Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church, the church his father once led for more than 40 years.

Eventually, Bishop Humphrey would become the Senior Pastor at three churches: Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church in Chicago, Olivet Institutional Missionary Baptist Church in Oakland, and Olivet's sister church of the same name in Stockton, California.

Bishop Humphrey was known as a bridge-builder, and he opened the doors of Olivet to the community for the Oscar Grant Forums, which took place weekly for more than three years. He was noted for his prolific urban message and was in great demand as an evangelist, preaching the Gospel across the nation. For years, he was known to walk the streets and meet with drug addicts and gang members, and was able to bring them together and begin the healing process.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding individual, Bishop Gordon Arlester Humphrey, Jr. His dedication and efforts have impacted so many lives throughout the state of California and the nation. I join all of Bishop Humphrey's loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed, but his life, legacy, and spirit will live in our hearts and our community forever.

HONORING LT. COLONEL ALLEN KIRKSEY

HON. RUBEN GALLEGO

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, as he begins the transition to civilian life, I rise today to salute Lieutenant Colonel Allen Kirksey for his distinguished military career and years of dedicated service to our nation.

Lt. Colonel Kirksey most recently served as the Wing Chief of Staff in Phoenix, Arizona, a position he has held since June of 2013. He began his military career in the United States Air Force from 1979 to 1983, during which time he completed two operational assignments with the 92nd Bomb Wing and the 435th Tactical Air Wing. He enlisted in the Arizona Air National Guard in 1984 as a drill status guardsman Combat Crew Communications Specialist. In 1998, he assumed command of the 161st Security Forces Squadron. Lt. Colonel Kirksey has deployed as the Wing Senior Intelligence Officer in support of Operation Desert Shield, Deny Flight, Phoenix Scorpion, and Southern Watch.

In 2001, as the Security Forces Commander, he was mobilized in support of Operation Noble Eagle and Enduring Freedom and was designated as the 201st Mission Support Squadron Detachment Commander. In 2005, he served as the 161st Deputy Mission Support Commander, and in 2006 he assumed command of the 161st Logistics Readiness Squadron. In 2010, as the Logistics Readiness Squadron Commander, he was mobilized in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation New Dawn.

Throughout his years of service, Lt. Col. Kirksey has won numerous awards and distinctions, including the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Humanitarian Service Medal, and the Meritorious Service Medal, twice. In addition, he was named the Arizona National Guard Diversity Champion in 2008 and the National Guard Diversity Award Winner—Air National Guard Individual Category in 2011.

Incredibly, on top of his outstanding service in uniform, Lt. Colonel Kirksey also volunteers over 100 hours each year at Phoenix-area schools and is a motivational speaker in the community. In 2014, he was awarded the City of Phoenix Calvin Goode Lifetime Achievement award in recognition of his outstanding leadership and dedication to civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Allen Kirksey and thank him for his many years of exceptional service.

MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Regina Crafter of Missouri City, Texas for being awarded the Ms. Texas America 2015 title by the Ms. America Pageant. Regina is a health teacher at Quail Valley Middle School in Missouri City, Texas. This award recognizes her exceptional contributions to her community as an educator, youth mentor and champion of health initiatives.

Regina has led several successful fundraising drives for the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center and the American Diabetes Association (ADA). She is also a breast cancer survivor who has been an outspoken awareness ambassador for the disease. She is committed to promoting a healthy lifestyle for her students. Regina is the Health Club sponsor and the ADA coordinator at Quail Valley Middle School. She has helped her students raise more than $10,000 for ADA, the largest donation among secondary schools in Texas. She goes on to compete in the 2015 Ms. America Pageant finals.

I commend Regina Crafter for the outstanding difference she has made in her community as a role model and leader. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Regina for being selected to represent our state as Ms. Texas America 2015. We wish her well as she competes on the national stage. I know she will make Texas proud.

CONGRATULATING DR. BRIAN D. SMITH OF THE DALLAS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor Dr. Brian D. Smith. On November 1, 2014, Dr. Smith began serving as the eleventh president of Dallas Christian College in Farmers Branch, Texas. He will be formally inaugurated this Saturday, January 24, 2015.

Dallas Christian College was founded in 1950 and maintains a mission to educate and mentor students to be ''People of Influence, Under God's Influence, for a Life of Influence.'' I have no doubt that the strong work of the College toward this end will continue to excel under Dr. Smith's new leadership.

Dr. Brian D. Smith has a remarkable career in Christian higher education. He received a Bachelor's degree in Biblical Studies and Christian Ministry from Florida Christian College (FCC) in 2003. Two years later he earned his Master's from Lincoln Christian University in Contemporary Christian Theology and Philosophy. Smith received his Ph.D. in Theology from the University of Exeter in England in 2011. He has published several chapters in academic works.

During his initial working years, Smith remained with FCC, which eventually merged with another school to become Johnson University Florida. He quickly advanced from serving as registrar to Associate Dean of Academics and Institutional Effectiveness, then Vice President of Academics and ultimately Assistant Provost. During his time there, Smith led the university through the process of accreditation with the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the Association for Biblical Higher Education.

His strong and faithful professional life made him the top contender when the Board of Trustees for Dallas Christian College took up the task of searching for a replacement for their preceding president, Dusty Rubeck. The chair of the search committee, Dr. Keith Keeran, reported that the applicant pool was remarkable and seven well-qualified candidates were interviewed, but only one reached the final interview before the Board. Keeran further commented that ''the Lord's hand was on the search process from the beginning.''

Dr. Smith has always prayerfully desired to spread the Gospel and loves serving that cause through the work of Christian higher education. He and his wife, Samantha, have four children together. I welcome them to the 24th District of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating and wishing well Dr. Brian D. Smith as he begins to serve as President of Dallas Christian College.

IN RECOGNITION OF THOMAS J. KEENEY FOR HIS DEDICATION AND SERVICE TO THE WILKES-BARRE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Thomas J. Keeney, past Grand Knight of the Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania Knights of Columbus Council 302. Mr. Keeney was born on July 3, 1946. His father, a Major in the army, was stationed in Arkansas, Japan, and New Jersey and took the Keeney family with him as he traveled around the world. In 1964, Thomas graduated from Coughlin High School in Wilkes-Barre and currently resides in Plains with his wife, Karen.

After finishing high school, Thomas Keeney joined the air force in the winter of 1965. He was trained as an aircraft mechanic at Lackland Air Force Base and Sheppard Air Force Base. Upon completing his training, he was stationed at RAF Lakenheath Air Base in England. At Lakenheath, Thomas served as a Crew Chief on F–100D & F aircraft. While in England, Thomas married Irene V. Tucker. In the summer of 1968, they were blessed with their first son Patrick. Thomas finished his service with the air force in 1969, leaving with the rank of Sergeant.

When he returned to the United States, Thomas settled back in Wilkes-Barre and had his second child, Maurita. He took a job as a laborer at the Pressed Steel Plant on Penn Avenue. Thomas entered the apprentice program for Plumbers with Pipe Fitters Local 147 of Wilkes-Barre in 1970. He completed his apprenticeship in 1974 with Scranton's Local 90. As a journeyman plumber, he worked with many contractors in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Thomas left the construction industry to work for the City of Wilkes-Barre, as a member of the city's sewer department. In 1985, he returned to the construction industry where he worked for Penn State Mechanical as a plumber, welder, and foreman. While working with Penn State Mechanical, he obtained his Masters Certificate in Plumbing and Heating with the cities of Wilkes-Barre and Scranton. In 1995, as a Plumbing Trade Instructor for the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, Thomas helped prepare inmates for a job in the plumbing trade after rehabilitation. After working for the Department of Corrections, he went on to be a caretaker for Camp Raninu and then took a position with the VA, before he retired in 2011.

Thomas Keeney also served his country with distinction as an army reservist in the 79th Army Regional Command. Starting in 1974, Thomas was a Specialist 4 Welder with the 365th Engineers of Wilkes-Barre. When he left the Engineers, Thomas had attained the rank of Sergeant. Thomas then joined the 300th Field Hospital Unit and was retrained as a combat medic. He was then promoted to Sergeant First Class and reassigned to the NCOIC of the 338th Medical Group Headquarters in Folsom, Pennsylvania. At Folsom, Thomas was responsible for the care and training of the soldiers assigned to the Medical Group Headquarters. After serving at Folsom, Thomas returned to Wilkes-Barre, where he served with the 424th Military Police Liaison Team as the Senior Medic and Instructor. While with the 424th, Thomas was responsible for all medical and environmental issues for setup and operation of military POW camps in the U.S. and overseas. After being promoted to Master Sergeant, he was sent to the Regional Command Headquarters at Willow Grove, Pennsylvania to be a Senior Medic for the 79th ARCOM. Thomas retired from the army reserves when the 79th ARCOM was disbanded in spring 1996.

Additionally, Thomas has served as a member of the Knights of Columbus for a number of years. He has been the Grand Knight twice, first from 1998 to 2000 and recently from 2012 until 2014. He was also a District Deputy for the Pennsylvania Knights of Columbus and Faithful Navigator of the Bishop Hafey Assembly Fourth Degree Knights.

In addition, Thomas has been involved with many organizations. He was the past President of the Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick, where he currently holds the position of Secretary. He has also served as the President of Council 302 Home Association and was a former Trustee of the Plumbers Local 90.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Keeney for his service to the Knights of Columbus and all of his achievements. He is a true patriot, and I applaud him for his dedication to his country and the work he has done for his community.

DEDICATION TO CHARACTER AND SERVICE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ruben Ruiz and Shelby Lowe for being named Pearland's 2014 Employees of the Year by Pearland city management. This award is given to the public servants who best exemplify the city's core mission—to provide those who live in Pearland with the best quality of life.

Mr. Ruiz, a utility billing specialist, and Ms. Lowe, a recreation attendant, went above and beyond in performing their duties and improving the systems on which the city runs. Their dedication to service and character provide a shining example of public service and set an example we can all follow. The residents of Pearland, Texas already know what a great place they live, work and raise their families. These dedicated city employees are part of what makes Pearland special.

I thank Ruben Ruiz and Shelby Lowe for their tireless work in ensuring the Pearland community gets the customer service it deserves. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Mr. Ruiz and Ms. Lowe for being named Pearland's 2014 Employees of the Year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 12, 2015, I was unable to be present for a recorded vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on roll call vote No. 17, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 203, "yes" on roll call vote No. 18, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 33, and "yes" on roll call vote No. 19, on approving the Journal.

HONORING THE WORK OF CASCO BAYKEEPER JOE PAYNE

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, from my District Office in Portland, Maine, I am fortunate to have a beautiful view of Portland Harbor and Casco Bay. On a typical day, one might see cruise ships carrying thousands of visitors to our city, lobster boats setting and pulling their traps, kayakers paddling to Fort Gorges, and harbor seals popping their heads out of the water.

What's remarkable about this scene is that the bay's many uses—as a place for recreation, a source of jobs and economic activity, and habitat for marine life—coexist in a way that is not possible in many other places in the country. The bay is healthy enough to balance the needs of our community with the needs of the environment.

I rise today to recognize and celebrate a man who has worked tirelessly to strike that careful balance and maintain it. Joe Payne is the Casco Baykeeper, placing him in the very difficult job of improving and safeguarding the health of our bay. After nearly 25 years of doing that job remarkably well—as a scientist, advocate, and relationship builder—he is retiring.

Joe's accomplishments during his tenure as Baykeeper are too many to list in full, but here are some highlights. During a 1996 oil tanker spill, he pushed successfully for a quicker and more thorough response than what was initially given, preventing what could have been a disastrous impact on the bay. He launched a groundbreaking water-quality monitoring program that has mobilized 650 volunteers. He helped move 35,000 lobsters that would have been harmed or displaced by a harbor dredge. And he fought for state legislation that has kept cruise ships from dumping their wastewater into the bay.

I have had the pleasure of working with Joe over the years. Most recently, I appeared with him at a press conference where he used dye, a bowl of seawater, and a chunk of dry ice to demonstrate how climate change is making our ocean more acidic and less habitable for shellfish. The dramatic reaction was a great example of Joe's ability to draw attention to critical issues in ways that make people understand and care.

I wish my very best to Joe in retirement, though I will miss him in the role of Baykeeper. If I need any reminder of his leadership and legacy, however, all I have to do is look out the window.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. GAIL WARREN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to a great friend and outstanding public servant, Ms. Gail Warren. Ms. Warren has served as the Congressional Liaison Representative, Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison for the United States Army since March 2000. She will be retiring on Wednesday, January 21, 2015.

Ms. Warren, a native of Bedford, Virginia, has lived and worked in the DC-Maryland-Virginia area for the majority of her career. Indeed, she has built quite an impressive career which began in 1976 when she commenced her civil service serving in the Pentagon as a Department of Defense Telephone Operator. She then moved on to the office of the Army Board for Corrections of Military Records.

In 1982, Ms. Warren began serving in the Congressional Inquiry Division, Office of the Chief, Legislative Liaison, where she served for fifteen years as a Congressional Liaison Assistant. She was promoted to a Congressional Liaison Representative before she left briefly in 1998 to join the Army Inspector General's Office as a FOIA Specialist/Records Manager. In 2000, Ms. Warren returned to the Office of the Chief, Legislative Liaison as a Congressional Liaison Representative working in the Army House Liaison Division, where she has excelled for the last fifteen years.

During her tenure as a Congressional Liaison Representative, Ms. Warren responded to countless telephone inquiries and handled many last-minute coordination requests. She consistently went above and beyond the call of duty to ensure that Congressional offices had the information needed to respond to congressional and constituent inquiries. She provided expert advice on complex and unusual inquiries to the Army Leadership as well as to Members of Congress and their staffs. Her high standard of excellence and attention to detail ensured the trust and confidence of those with whom she worked.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get, you make your life by what you give." We are so grateful that Ms. Warren has given her time and talents to serving as a connection between the Army and the Congress of the greatest nation in the world. A woman of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise are unparalleled. Capitol Hill shined a little brighter because of Ms. Gail Warren.

Ms. Warren has accomplished much in her life but none of it would be possible without the love and support of her three children, Crystal, Kevin and Courtney, and her four grandchildren Javon, Derrick, Jabarie, and Diego.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Ms. Gail Warren upon the occasion of her retirement from an outstanding career in civil service.

EXCELLING IN THE CLASSROOM AND ON THE COURT

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate high school student Cassidy Nussman for being named to the 2014 Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA) Class 6A all-state and academic all-state volleyball teams. Nussman is a senior at Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. These prestigious awards recognize her hard work and exemplary performance as a scholar-athlete.

Nussman earned a spot on the academic all-state team by maintaining a GPA of 3.9 or higher while competing on the court at an elite level throughout her high school career. She was also named an honorable mention selection on the Under Armour Girls High School All-America Team by the American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA) and competed on the 2014 TGCA Blue All-Star team for Class 5A/6A as one of the division's top 12 college-bound players. She has committed to play volleyball for Northwestern University next year.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Cassidy Nussman for being named to the 2014 Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA) Class 6A all-state and academic all-state volleyball teams. We look forward to her continued success both on and off the court.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 22, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 27

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine global challenges and U.S. national security strategy.

SD–G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine perspectives on the strategic necessity of Iran sanctions.

SD–538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine President Obama's 2015 trade policy agenda.

SD–215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine No Child Left Behind, focusing on supporting teachers and school leaders.

SD–430

JANUARY 28

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of the "Budget Control Act of 2011" and sequestration on national security.

SD–106

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine MAP–21 reauthorization, focusing on Federal and state perspectives.

SD–406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress, committee rules of procedure, subcommittee assignments, S. 192, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, an original bill entitled, "Strengthening Education Through Research Act", and any pending nominations.

SD–430

10 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) budget and economic outlook for fiscal years 2015–2025.

SD–608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine freight rail transportation, focusing on enhancing safety, efficiency, and commerce.

SR–253

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine articulating the case for American leadership in the world, focusing on the national interest.

SD–419

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress, and committee rules of procedure.

SR–428A

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine protecting America from cyber attacks, focusing on the importance of information sharing.

SD–342

Committee on Indian Affairs

Organizational business meeting to consider selection of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, committee rules of procedure, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine Indian country priorities for the 114th Congress.

SD–628

4 p.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee, rules of procedure for the 114th Congress, and subcommittee assignments.

SR–328A

JANUARY 29

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act of 2015''.

SD–538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 33, to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas.

SD–366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine employer wellness programs, focusing on better health outcomes and lower costs.

SD–430

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S301–S366

Measures Introduced: Thirty-one bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 200–230, S.J. Res. 4–5, and S. Res. 31–32. **Pages S347–48**

Measures Reported:

H.R. 203, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. Res. 31, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

S. Res. 32, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. **Page S347**

Measures Considered:

Keystone XL Pipeline—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S311–38**

Adopted:

By 98 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 10), Whitehouse Amendment No. 29 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having achieved 60 affirmatives votes, be agreed to.) **Pages S311, S325–26, S330**

Rejected:

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 7), Murkowski (for Lee) Amendment No. 33 (to Amendment No. 2), to conform citizen suits under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S320–23, S327**

By 41 yeas to 58 nays (Vote No. 8), Durbin Amendment No. 69 (to Amendment No. 2), to ensure that the storage and transportation of petroleum coke is regulated in a manner that ensures the protection of public and ecological health. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S326–27, S328–29**

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 9), Murkowski (for Toomey) Amendment No. 41 (to Amendment No. 2), to continue cleaning up fields and streams while protecting neighborhoods, generating affordable energy, and creating jobs. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S329–30**

By 59 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 11), Hoeven Modified Amendment No. 87 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S328, S330–31**

By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 12), Schatz Amendment No. 58 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S311, S317, S331**

Pending:

Murkowski Amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S311**

Fischer Amendment No. 18 (to Amendment No. 2), to provide limits on the designation of new federally protected land. **Pages S311, S323–25**

Sanders Amendment No. 24 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change. **Pages S331–32**

Vitter/Cassidy Modified Amendment No. 80 (to Amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf. **Pages S332–33**

Menendez/Cantwell Amendment No. 72 (to Amendment No. 2), to ensure private property cannot be seized through condemnation or eminent domain for the private gain of a foreign-owned business entity. **Pages S333–35**

Wyden Amendment No. 27 (to Amendment No. 2), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum. **Pages S335–36**

Lee Amendment No. 71 (to Amendment No. 2), to require a procedure for issuing permits to drill. **Pages S336–38**

Murkowski (for Blunt/Inhofe) Amendment No. 78 (to Amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions for the President entering into bilateral or other international agreements regarding greenhouse gas emissions without proper study of any adverse economic effects, including job losses and harm to the industrial sector, and without the approval of the Senate. **Page S338**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, January 22, 2015. **Page S365**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared on January 23, 1995, with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–2) **Page S344**

Executive Communications: **Pages S344–47**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S348–49**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S349–53**

Additional Statements: **Pages S342–44**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S353–64**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S365**

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—12) **Pages S328–31**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:58 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 22, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S365.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine global challenges and United States national security strategy, after receiving testimony from Brent Scowcroft, The Scowcroft Group, and Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, Center for Strategic and International Studies, both a former U.S. National Security Advisor, both of Washington, DC.

PROTECTING THE INTERNET AND CONSUMERS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting the Internet and consumers through Congressional action, after receiving testimony from Meredith Attwell Baker, CTIA—The Wireless Assocation, Gene Kimmelman, Public Knowledge, Robert M. McDowell, Wiley Rein LLP, Paul Misener, Amazon.com, and Nicol E. Turner-Lee, Multicultural Media, Telecom and Internet Council, all of Washington, DC; and W. Tom Simmons, Midcontinent Communications, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution (S. Res. 31) authorizing expenditures by the Committee, and adopted its rules of procedure for the 114th Congress.

IRAN NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Iran nuclear negotiations, focusing on the status of talks and the role of Congress, after receiving testimony from Antony Blinken, Deputy Secretary of State; and David S. Cohen, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine No Child Left Behind, focusing on testing and accountability, after receiving testimony from Paul Leather, New Hampshire Department of Education Deputy Commissioner of Education, Concord; Martin R. West, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Tom Boasberg, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado; Jia Lee, The Earth School, and Stephen Lazar, Harvest Collegiate High School, both of New York, New York; and Wade Henderson, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Washington, DC.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Michelle K. Lee, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Daniel

Henry Marti, of Virginia, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President, and Alfred H. Bennett, George C. Hanks, Jr., and Jose Rolando Olvera, Jr., all to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, who were all introduced by Senator Cornyn, and Jill N. Parrish, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, who was introduced by Senator Lee, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original resolution (S. Res. 32) authorizing expenditures by the Committee, and adopted its rules of procedure for the 114th Congress; and

H.R. 203, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 41 public bills, H.R. 7, 20, 423–461; 1 private bill, H.R. 462; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 23–25; H. Con. Res. 8; and H. Res. 39–41, 43 were introduced. **Pages H477–82**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H482**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 42, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions (H. Rept. 114–4). **Page H477**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative McClintock to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H433**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H440**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Most Reverend Richard Pates Bishop of the Diocese of Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa. **Page H440**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 39, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H443**

Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act: The House passed H.R. 161, to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, by a yea-and-nay vote of 253 yeas to 169 nays, Roll No. 41. **Pages H453–60**

Rejected the Pallone motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 182 yeas to 241 nays, Roll No. 40. **Pages H458–59**

H. Res. 38, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 161) and (H.R. 36), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 39, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 38. **Pages H443–53**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 40, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H460**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, January 22. **Page H462**

Governing Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics—Reappointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's reappointment of the following individuals to serve as the Governing Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics, pursuant to section 4(d) of H. Res. 5, 114th Congress, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015: Nominated by the Speaker with the concurrence of the Minority Leader: Mr. Porter J . Goss of Florida, Chairman; Mr. James M. Eagen III of Colorado; Ms. Allison R. Hayward of Virginia; and Ms. Judy Biggert of Illinois, Alternate. Nominated by the Minority Leader with the concurrence of the Speaker: Mr. David Skaggs of Colorado, Co-Chairman; Brigadier General (retired) Belinda Pinckney of Virginia; Ms. Karan English of Arizona; and Mr. Mike Barnes of Maryland, Alternate. **Page H462**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:36 p.m. and reconvened at 9:50 p.m. **Page H472**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2015 ''referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–5).

Page H460

Quorum Calls Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H452, H452–53, H459 and H459–60. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee rules and oversight plan were adopted.

PROTECTING THE INTERNET AND CONSUMERS THROUGH CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Protecting the Internet and Consumers Through Congressional Action''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

A PERMANENT SOLUTION TO THE SGR: THE TIME IS NOW

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health began a hearing entitled ''A Permanent Solution to the SGR: The Time Is Now''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee adopted its oversight plan.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee adopted its rules, oversight plan, and list of Committee professional staff.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee adopted its rules, oversight plan, and staff hiring resolution.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 399, the ''Secure Our Borders First Act of 2015''. H.R. 399 was ordered reported, as amended.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING; MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress and a markup on H.R. 181, the ''Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015''; H.R. 350, to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes; H.R. 159, the ''Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015''; and H.R. 285, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts. The committee adopted its rules and subcommittee assignments. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 159; H.R. 181; H.R. 285; H.R. 350.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 7, the ''No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2015''. The committee granted, by record vote of 7–1, a closed rule for H.R. 7. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Representative Smith of New Jersey.

UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Unmanned Aerial Systems Research and Development''. Testimony was heard from Ed Waggoner, Director, Integrated Systems Research Program, Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; James Williams, Manager, UAS Integration Office, Aviation Safety Organization, Federal Aviation Administration; and public witnesses.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION: REFORMING AND STREAMLINING THE FAA'S REGULATORY CERTIFICATION PROCESSES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''FAA Reauthorization: Reforming and Streamlining the FAA's Regulatory Certification Processes''. Testimony was heard from Chris Hart, Acting Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board; Dorenda Baker, Director, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration; Gerald Dillingham, Director of Civil Aviation Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING; BUILDING A BETTER VA: ASSESSING ONGOING MAJOR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress and a hearing entitled ''Building a Better VA: Assessing Ongoing Major Construction Management Problems within the Department''. The committee adopted resolutions to approve: committee rules; ratio of subcommittees; majority subcommittee chairmen and vice-chairman; ranking members of each subcommittee; majority membership of the subcommittees; minority membership of the subcommittees; committee staff; and the committee oversight plan. Testimony was heard from Sloan D. Gibson, Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; Lloyd C. Caldwell, P.E. Director of Military Programs, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; David Wise, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 114th Congress. The committee adopted its rules and oversight plan.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to receive a closed briefing on training and equipping the vetted Syrian opposition, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine jobs and a healthy economy; to be immediately followed by an organizational business meeting to consider committee rules of procedure, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine job-based health insurance and defining full-time work, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress, committee rules of procedure, and the nominations of Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Management, Earl L. Gay, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and Michael D. Kennedy, of Georgia, and David Avren Jones, of Connecticut, both to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress, subcommittee assignments, committee rules of procedure, and the nominations of Michael Greco, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York, and Ronald Lee Miller, to be United States Marshal for the District of Kansas, both of the Department of Justice, Michael P. Botticelli, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy, and Jeanne E. Davidson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 9:30 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing entitled ''EPA's 2014 Final Rule: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''A Permanent Solution to the SGR: The Time Is Now'', 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing entitled ''Veterans' Dilemma: Navigating the Appeals System for Veterans Claims'', 10:30 a.m., 340 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, January 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of S. 1, Keystone XL Pipeline.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, January 22

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 7—Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E95
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E89
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E94
Cicilline, David N., R.I., E88
Clarke, Yvette D., N.Y., E90
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E89
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E89, E90, E92
Gallego, Ruben, Ariz., E93
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E91
Green, Gene, Tex., E91
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E92
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E87
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E87
MacArthur, Thomas, N.J., E87
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E93
Messer, Luke, Ind., E89
Olson, Pete, Tex., E88, E90, E91, E93, E94, E95
Pingree, Chellie, Me., E94
Poe, Ted, Tex., E87, E91
Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E88
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E92
Smith, Adam, Wash., E94
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E89
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E87

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.