United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2015 No. 47

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 19, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT R. TIPTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, thank You for giving us another day.

Send Your Spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. Especially during this season of budget deliberations, give them wisdom and an accurate understanding of the needs of the citizens of this country, most particularly those with narrow margins in their life options.

Remind us all of the dignity of work, and teach us to use our talents and abilities in ways that are honorable and just and are of benefit to those we serve.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania 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.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER:I hereby resign as the representative of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois, effective March 31, 2015.

Respectfully,

AARON SCHOCK,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. BRUCE V. RAUNER,
Governor, State of Illinois,
State House, Springfield, IL.

DEAR GOVERNOR RAUNER:I hereby resign as the representative of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois, effective March 31, 2015.

Respectfully,

AARON SCHOCK,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE CLEAN AIR, STRONG ECONOMIES ACT

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, EPA has proposed a new lower standard for ozone—smog—before America has finished her work on the current standard. We have made important gains in air quality, but this latest draft is so low that most of America will be out of compliance.

Under current law, EPA can't even consider whether we have the technology to achieve the new low standard. EPA says that half the work to meet this new rule will come from technology that doesn't yet exist. This rule will mean lost jobs and lost opportunities.

This week, the gentleman from Ohio, BOB LATTA, and I reintroduced H.R. 1388, the Clean Air, Strong Economies Act. Our bill requires EPA to protect health and consider whether a rule can be met.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help us balance clean air with a strong economy by supporting H.R. 1388.

Printed on recycled paper.

HAPPY 105TH BIRTHDAY TO BERTEL VAN EEK

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, 105 years ago, in a small town in Germany, Bertel Van Eek was born.

Her 105 years on this Earth have been a testament to the greatness of the United States. She has seen so much. Living in Holland during World War II, she saw the capability and bravery of our military and its members.

She personally lived our Nation's immigrant story, coming to America after the war with $20 and the clothes on her back and eventually becoming an American citizen.

As someone whose spouse died 34 years ago, she has been able to live with dignity because of two of the greatest public policies in the history of this country, Medicare and Social Security.

She has seen the power of the American education system, watching her daughter and son-in-law become teachers and seeing three grandsons, who love her very much, also pursue educational opportunities so they could follow their dreams. Mr. Speaker, she even saw her youngest grandson get the honor of serving his community in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying to Bertel Van Eek, my grandma, happy 105th birthday, Oma. We love you very much.

THE MEDICAL EVALUATION PARITY FOR SERVICEMEMBERS ACT

(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, today, along with the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman TIM RYAN, I am introducing the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act.

This legislation, which has strong bipartisan support and the support of a large number of military and mental health advocacy groups, will help the military identify behavioral health issues and improve suicide prevention by instituting a mental health assessment for all incoming military recruits.

A recent Army study confirmed the need to address mental health issues in a timely manner, finding that ''nearly one in five Army soldiers enter the service with a psychiatric disorder, and nearly half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting.''

Our military makes sure that every servicemember is physically fit for duty, and this legislation will ensure that they are also mentally fit. Furthermore, it will ensure that we have a better baseline against which to measure any potential mental harm that may have occurred during their duty.

These brave men and women put their lives on the line every day in the service of our Nation, and it is our duty to offer everything in our power to guarantee they return home safely, both physically and mentally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

TWO ISSUES OF JUSTICE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I speak on two issues of justice. One deals with my alma mater, the University of Virginia. And I would like to thank the young man, the student who experienced an unfortunate incident that caused him to have 10 stitches and to bleed on the streets of Charlottesville by the hands of those who were enforcing the law. I want to join him by saying that we all should be treated with human dignity, and I thank the Governor of the State of Virginia for a full investigation. We have to find a way to balance law and order with the dignity of the treatment of African Americans and all people.

I will also say that the hostage-taking of the Attorney General nominee by those who will not push for her confirmation on the floor of the Senate, of the other body, is not the handling of the Constitution and the advice and consent that is necessary in the process of government.

She is qualified. She is ready to serve. The Nation needs a chief law enforcement officer. We must come together and find that balance that the Constitution protects, and that is the right of all people to access and freedom of speech. But we must also respect law and order. We have to find a way to walk that pathway together.

ELECTRICITY FOR RURAL HAITI

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three of my constituents from Owenton, Kentucky: Matthew Everett Greenlee, Mark Allen Greene, and Robert Wayne VonBokern. These three outstanding power linemen from Owen Electric Cooperative recently volunteered for a project in Haiti that, when completed, will provide safe, affordable, and reliable power to 1,600 consumers.

The goal of the project is to build a distribution system that will connect three towns in Haiti and establish its first electric cooperative, the Cooperative Electrique de l'Arrondissement des Coteaux.

My constituents upgraded and installed new lines and service drops in the town of Roche-a-Bateaux. They also trained locally hired linemen in proper construction methods, pole climbing techniques, and proper handline use, and important safety practices.

Electricity is essential to the quality of life for those in Haiti's rural communities. It assists in the provision of clean water, health care, education, and general economic opportunity. Therefore, I salute my constituents for contributing their time and efforts in Haiti on this critical project.

GOP BUDGET MAKES IT HARDER FOR FAMILIES TO GET AHEAD

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

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this irresponsible and dishonest budget recently proposed by the House Budget Committee Republicans. Under this budget's grossly misguided priorities, people at the top continue to get richer while hardworking American families fall further behind.

Last fall, at election time, congressional Republicans said they understood the pressures that American families were feeling, and they promised to help hardworking Americans. But this Republican budget would squeeze hardworking Americans even harder in countless ways, making it harder to pay for college, making it harder to pay for their health care, making it harder to ensure a secure retirement.

This budget would eliminate health care coverage for tens of millions of Americans, cut nondefense government programs, from transportation to research to education, and make more than $1 trillion in unspecified cuts in Federal entitlement programs.

This House Republican budget would make life a lot harder for hardworking American families like the ones I represent in western Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that needs not to pass.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to speak about values, the values that we have as Americans, the values that we hold dear. The fact that someone can work their entire life and finally make it to retirement and be able to live out their golden years with dignity is something that this budget denies.

The idea that an American child could be born in this great country and have an opportunity to go to a college or university and become whatever they want to be—maybe an astronaut, maybe an engineer, maybe even a politician—but without an education, every single one of those dreams is tougher and harder than ever before.

The budget that has been proposed by the Republicans in this House denies

dreams, denies food, denies health care to seniors; and many more disasters are in this budget. This budget denies an opportunity for children to get an education.

If you were born with a silver spoon in your mouth, this budget is for you—extending tax loopholes into perpetuity but denying and condemning children away from education, seniors away from food and health care.

This budget doesn't deserve one vote. This budget deserves to be reworked, to carry the values that we hold dear in this country.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 114TH CONGRESS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 8, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 152

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to commit.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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, House Resolution 152 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board, and a closed rule for consideration of H. Res. 132, providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 114th Congress.

Across the Capitol, the United States Senate took positive action on March 4 when it passed a resolution, S.J. Res. 8, invoking the Congressional Review Act to overturn the National Labor Relations Board's recent ambush election rule. On that same day, my colleagues and I at the Committee on Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing on legislation I strongly supported and cosponsored, H.J. Res. 29, which is identical legislation to that which will come before the House today.

The National Labor Relations Board's ambush election rule is just the latest of its outrageous actions taken in defiance of longstanding precedent, jeopardizing employee free choice and privacy and employer free speech. This rule would give workers as few as 11 days to consider a consequential decision before voting for or against joining a union, prevent employers from having adequate time to prepare for union elections, and postpone critical questions over the election, such as voter eligibility, until after the election.

While providing little consideration of the longstanding rights of employees and employers, the rule further violates their privacy by ensuring that workers' personal information such as email addresses, work schedules, phone numbers, and home addresses are provided to union leaders.

There is a myriad of consequences to this harmful regulation, including constraining the rights of workers to make informed decisions, severely hampering employers' rights to speak to their employees during union organizing campaigns, and weakening privacy rights of workers.

These consequences will seriously impact the relationship of workers and employers and upend a carefully crafted process for organizing elections. These precedents have arisen over decades of practice within existing rules and should not be upended by hyperpartisan bureaucrats to the benefit of national unions at the expense of hardworking Americans.

H. Res. 152 also provides for consideration of H. Res. 132, the committee funding resolution for the 114th Congress. Since taking the majority, House Republicans have been careful stewards of taxpayer dollars, streamlining House operations and saving funds wherever possible. In fact, this Congress, the House remains below the amount authorized in 2008.

This bipartisan resolution will allow our committees to continue their vital work on behalf of this institution, including legislative reforms and oversight with additional investigations and field hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolutions, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 8, the resolution to overturn the National Labor Relations Board's election rule.

The other bill I support, H. Res. 132, which provides for the expenses of the committees of the House. The House Committee on Administration's bipartisan work should be commended because, as we all know, committees that we individual Members of the House are members of play a very important role in the work we do every day.

Now, I think it is unfortunate that this bipartisan bill has been packaged with a partisan bill to repeal important, commonsense reforms that were done at the National Labor Relations Board, and they have been wrapped up with a controversial bill.

The NLRB's function, as you know, is both to investigate and prosecute unfair labor practices and to provide a legal framework for employees and employers where employees may be seeking to organize in their workplaces for better wages and working conditions. Both of those functions are required of them by the National Labor Relations Act, which has been in place since 1935.

The work that the NLRB is doing is important. It is precisely what is required by the National Labor Relations Act. Holding a vote on this resolution will get in the way of the NLRB's pursuing its mandate successfully. Instead of focusing on important issues like shrinking the wage gap and growing the middle class, instead, the Republicans are spinning their wheels to score points by going after the National Labor Relations Board and commonsense reforms to make it function more effectively.

The President has already released a statement vowing to veto this resolution, so it is another example of spinning our wheels. It is obvious that neither the Senate nor the House will have enough votes to override this

veto, so I ask simply: Why are we wasting our time on this misguided legislation when there are plenty of challenges that our country faces, whether it is balancing the budget, growing the middle class, or dealing with use of force abroad? Instead, we are discussing legislation which won't become law. While we are 3 months into this Congress, I can't even count the amount of hours we have spent on the floor discussing legislation that, as everybody knows, won't become law because we have a President in the White House who said he will veto it.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation uses the Congressional Review Act, which is a rare legislative tool that allows the majority to rush through legislation with little debate. In the Senate, normal rules of debate and cloture are not even required, but it does require the President's signature.

Now, keep in mind, the Congressional Review Act is used to undo rules that have been promulgated by the executive branch through the Executive Office. So why would a President sign something that undoes his own rules? He simply wouldn't have made those rules in the first place if he didn't want them done.

So here we are, without two-thirds of this body, going through these motions on something that we know isn't going to become law. The Congressional Review Act has only been used once to overturn a rule in the entire history of the United States and is there for emergencies. This bill is far from an emergency. Instead, it is packaged with a closed rule—an extreme and unnecessary procedural action—rather than allowing for amendment and discussion of ideas from both sides of the aisle.

This resolution would overturn the new and improved election rules at the NLRB which are simply modernizing an antiquated system. The current rules were done before email existed, as an example. And we talk about how important privacy is; we are only talking about email addresses that the employer has. So if employers can use them to lobby their employees one way or the other in a vote, the organizing campaign should also be able to use those same email addresses. If neither side has access to them, that is fine; but if one side has access to them in an election, the other side needs to have access under similar terms.

We in this body have a responsibility to protect workers' rights and to provide employers with predictability and an expeditious processing of organizing requests in the workplace. Under the current archaic rules prior to this change, it was far too easy for bad actors to endlessly delay workplace elections.

In our committee that Dr. FOXX and I serve on, we got to hear the testimony of a nurse from California who had engaged in an effort in her workplace to organize the nurses that had been delayed time and time again, more than a year before a vote was finally held. Oftentimes, if a year or 2 or 3 go by, there might be different employees, people come and go, the groups of employees change, and often some of these involved in the organizing are subsequently fired. Employers are able to do this by appealing time and time again on issues that have no bearing on the election simply to delay, delay, delay.

The modest, commonsense reforms of the election rules truly go a long way in balancing the system and making it work more efficiently. They are standardized practices that are already common through many parts of the country to allow workers to make their own decisions without manipulations, threats, or intimidation from either party.

Under current rules, what happens all too often is employers continuously appeal an election with unwarranted litigation so they have time to threaten, coerce, and, far too often, fire workers. By the time the election occurs, workers have moved on, voluntarily or involuntarily, to other jobs or have been threatened so many times they feel they have been forced to vote ''no.''

There is a proven direct and causal relationship between the length of time it takes to hold an election and illegal employer conduct. In other words, bad actors stall the election process and use the system they have to do whatever it takes to win the election. There are hundreds of examples of unscrupulous actors using the current system in this way.

The nurse that I mentioned earlier decided that she and her coworkers wanted a better workplace environment and began to organize, but the employer delayed the action multiple times so they had time to threaten the workers via text and email. They even held mandatory meetings with employees to threaten and coerce them into voting against organizing. They even did this under the guise of education. In the end, the nurses were too scared to form a union.

Another unfortunate, but telling, example we talked about in committee is a Mercedes-Benz dealership that delayed and stalled an election at every opportunity. The entire process wound up lasting 428 days. With the new rule, the process would have taken 141 days. What I can't understand is how some people think that 428 days is reasonable and that somehow 141 days is an ambush election. I think 428 days for a union election is inexcusable. It is harmful to our families and the economy and harmful to the businesses, the lack of predictability that that brings.

The average resolution for an election is 38 days. And we are not dealing with the average here; we are dealing with the outliers. One in 10 election cases are still unresolved after 100 days. There is no excuse for that. It is unthinkable. It is these 10 percent of employers and organizing efforts that this election will impact. The other 90 percent work well. The current NLRB processes work well. We don't need to change their methods.

I keep hearing arguments that employees are losing the rights to privacy, but I want to address these points because they are completely false.

The companies have work schedules, email addresses, and phone numbers. They often use these to threaten and coerce employees at all hours of the day and night. Those who are organizing already have access to home addresses, but that is all they have. Without work schedules, they might show up when an employee is sleeping or when they are not home. This new rule provides the same information to employers and organizers. If you ask me, a home address—which they already have—is far more intrusive than an email or phone number, and I think that these reforms will, therefore, further the privacy of workers.

The rules simply modernize the disclosure requirements, because the last time they were updated people didn't have cell phones and emails. All they had were home addresses, which is why the union organizers currently have access to home addresses.

Employers also indicate that they might be surprised by an election. The timeline the employers are referring to of 11 days is essentially impossible in the real world. Moreover, in essentially every case, the employer is fully aware that organizing is occurring long before the petition is filed. Under the new rule, employers will have plenty of time to make their cases, and employees will have plenty of time to make an informed decision.

It is important to note that if the resolution were to actually pass and somehow be signed by the President—which it won't be—it would forever prohibit the NLRB or any agency from enacting a substantially similar rule.

□ 0930

That means the simple modernization efforts that I hope we could all agree upon, such as allowing parties to file election documents electronically, as this rule does, will be forever off the table, forcing both businesses and workers to use an antiquated and costly system.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My colleague from Colorado knows very well that the House is doing its work and focusing on the things that are important to hardworking Americans. Just this week, we are holding 81 hearings here in the House in various committees. That is definitely doing our work. We are here on the floor today looking at a very important piece of work and overriding this onerous rule. That is not a waste of time.

Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Board has been attempting for

years to tip the scales toward union organizers, and last December, it was finally able to accomplish one of its major goals with approval of this ambush election rule.

The two Board members who descended from the decision were clear about the rule's primary purpose: enabling initial union representation elections to occur as soon as possible. This rule will shorten the length of time in which such an election is held from the current median of 38 days to as little as 11 days.

The Board's decision was broad and unprecedented, overturning decades of practice in labor laws and skewing elections in favor of unions. One of its most outrageous provisions is postponing decisions about who is eligible to participate in an election to after the election.

One of the most fundamental principles of a fair election is ensuring only those eligible to vote to have the ability to vote, maintaining the value of each voter's individual vote. That basic democratic protection would be shattered by this rule. It may also lead to more union representation elections being set aside and new elections being ordered.

Glenn Taubman characterized the consequences of this ambush election rule very fittingly in testimony before our Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, saying:

> It is akin to a mayoral election in which it is unknown, either before or after the election, whether up to 20 percent of the potential voters are inside or outside the city limits.

The rule will also require a new mandatory poster be placed in the workplace within 2 business days of receiving a petition for election, the content of which will be determined by the National Labor Relations Board.

Employers are also provided only 8 days to find experienced representation before facing a hearing and must file an in-depth statement of position within only 7 days of receiving a petition for election.

Companies of any size—and, in particular, small businesses—frequently do not have in-house counsel and are not prepared at the drop of a hat to respond to complex, consequential legal situations.

A provision with a serious impact on employee privacy is the access provided to unions of additional contact information, including every employee's name, address, personal phone number, and personal email address, which must be provided within 2 days of an election order without any option to opt out.

Important review procedures would be set aside by this rule as well, including the opportunity for review of decisions made prior to the election by the Board itself. The Board's requirement for review of postelection disputes would be made discretionary for the first time as well, limiting oversight.

This flawed decision is currently facing litigation from the private sector as well, with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other trade associations filing a lawsuit to block its implementation as a violation of the National Labor Relations Act, Administrative Procedure Act, and employers' rights.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Export-Import Bank ensures that American businesses remain competitive in foreign markets, and reauthorizing it would create certainty for business across this country and is fully permissible under WTO rules.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of legislation which would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I, indeed, rise to oppose the request for a previous question in order that we might get on with the task of deliberating on reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Just to remind people, the Export-Import Bank provides loans or loan guarantees to the foreign purchasers of American-made goods and services—American-made goods and services.

This venerated institution has been around for 80-some years, it has been enthusiastically supported by every single President since; Democratic and Republican, liberal and conservative, all have supported reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

This federally chartered Bank disappears in 103 days if we do not act. If the House continues to refuse to place it before the committee of jurisdiction for a hearing, refuses to place it before the committee of jurisdiction for a markup, refuses to consider it on this floor, the Bank will disappear in 103 days.

The problem is that is not when the damage is done. The damage is already beginning because of the cloud of uncertainty that hangs over the Export-Import Bank. Air Tractor, a company in Texas, which manufactures airplanes for use in firefighting and agriculture, lost a multimillion dollar order to Africa because they were told: We don't know if the Bank will be around.

Last year, FirmGreen, a California-based firm that was founded by a wounded Vietnam veteran, lost a multimillion dollar deal overseas because they were told there is too much uncertainty, there is too big a cloud of uncertainty hanging over the Export-Import Bank.

Ladies and gentlemen in the House, I don't know what to say, I don't know what to say to Terry and Stacie Cochran, the owners of a business in eastern Washington that have grown their business from one-third based on exports to two-thirds based on exports as a consequence of their relationship with the Export-Import Bank. I don't know what I would say to Terry and Stacie if this cloud of uncertainty continues to hang and the Bank goes away.

I don't know what to say to STAC, a business located in my district in Sumner, Washington, an idea in a gentleman's head—also, by the way, a veteran—who formed a business to sell adhesives into the marketplace that now employs 8 or 10 people with a significant export business. Why? Because of the Export-Import Bank.

I don't know what to say to Manhasset, of all places in Yakima, Washington, one of the world's leading music stand manufacturers. Indeed, 90 percent of the transactions, approximately, of the Export-Import Bank are for small businesses.

The damage is being done now in the absence of action and the failure of this House to take up this issue. The real damage is long term, and it is significant, and it is material.

I talked the other day on the floor about the fact that commercial airlines is basically a manufacturing duopoly. We all know that. One is based in France. It is Airbus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Airplane manufacturing currently is a duopoly, a French-based business and an American-based business, which I want to remind people is the heart and soul of engineering manufacturing in this country, it is the heart and soul of it.

It is not going to remain the case, in any event, because, as we all know—and if we don't, we should—China is right now in the process of developing a wide-body commercial aircraft for entry into the world marketplace. I think it is tentatively named the C919.

China's export credit authority, which I remind the Chamber every other developed nation on the Earth has, is multiple in size of America's export credit authority, the Export-Import Bank. They are literally—not figuratively—they are literally sitting over there, rubbing their hands in glee, waiting for this Chamber to refuse to act because when their airplane comes online in 2 to 8 years, they are going to jump into this market like there is no tomorrow.

The damage to the heart and soul of our manufacturing sector cannot be exaggerated; indeed, to remind you, every advanced economy on the face of the planet has an export credit authority, and if we allow ours to expire, it is tantamount to unilateral disarmament.

An amazing array of groups support this. Everybody from—yes, believe it or not—the Sierra Club, to the Chamber

of Commerce, to the International Association of Machinists, to the National Association of Manufacturers. Everyone supports our bill; yet we dither.

In summary, to repeat, the Export-Import Bank is a job-creating machine, 1.2 million jobs in the last 5 years. The Export-Import Bank is a deficit-reducing machine, $6.9 billion to reduce our deficit. It doesn't cost us anything. There are no Federal taxpayer dollars involved. It is a superperforming agency. It creates jobs; it reduces our deficit—and significantly—and it goes away in 103 days if this Chamber fails to act.

I oppose the demand for the previous question so that we might get on with the business of strengthening America's economy.

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

The word ''venerated'' is usually reserved for clerics and not government agencies. Such an attitude borders on worship of government agencies, and I doubt very seriously that the majority of hardworking Americans agree with that attitude.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I hope you are feeling better soon, also.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of both the rule and Senate Joint Resolution 8, which would overturn the National Labor Relations Board's ambush elections rule. I was proud to join my friend, Chairman JOHN KLINE, in introducing the House version of this resolution.

We are here today because the Obama administration is trying to fix a problem that does not exist, claiming that expediting elections on whether to form a union is needed because of delays in the process and supposed unfair advantages to employers.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I grew up in a union household. My father worked for B.F. Goodrich Company. He was a longtime union member after World War II. I have seen many things that the unions have done that have been good. Unions are legal in America. Employees have a right to hear all the information. They can decide whether they want to be in a union or not be in a union.

There is no big hurry. Look, the National Labor Relations Board—and this is March Madness, so I will use a basketball metaphor. I played basketball, and other people do; you expect the referees to just be a fair arbiter of the game. When you go in someone else's home court, you expect to get a fair call.

□ 0945

That is all we expect the NLRB to do, and that is not what is happening now. Here are the facts.

In reality, under the current procedures, 94 percent of elections are held within 56 days. The median is 38 days from a petition's being filed. Furthermore, unions won 60 percent of those elections, so they win more than half—or two-thirds, I should say. Given the importance and consequences of the decisionmaking being made by workers, this is an entirely reasonable period of time.

Under the NLRB's radical new policy, union elections could be held, Mr. Speaker, in as little as 11 days after a petition is filed. As an employer myself of not a large business, I don't know if I could find a labor attorney in 11 days to go through this very complicated legal issue. This is not nearly enough time for employers to present their side to employees or for those employees to make an informed decision. Unfortunately, for workers, the NLRB rule doesn't stop here.

Of grave concern to me is the threat posed to workers' privacy. Currently, employers are required to turn over a list of employees and their home addresses to union organizers within 7 days after an election is ordered. So you have a week. The ambush election rule, instead, would open the door for greater harassment and intimidation by requiring employers to turn over each employee's name, address, phone number, email address—all within 2 days of an election order.

It is for this reason that I introduced the Employee Privacy Protection Act in the last Congress. This bill would have required only the names of the employees and one piece of contact information of the employee's choosing. The employee gets to decide how he is contacted and to have that be provided to union organizers. I think that is very reasonable. This will allow communications to happen but on the workers' terms.

Choosing whether to be represented by a union is a big decision with ramifications in the workplace and at home. Instead of ensuring a fair process for unions, employers, and workers, this NLRB is trying to rig the game in favor of union bosses, and that is not fair to workers or to employees.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the resolution.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question because I believe that it is imperative that we have an opportunity to present a piece of legislation that will have a tremendous impact on our economy.

I believe that H.R. 1031, Promoting U.S. Jobs through Exports Act, is an important piece of legislation, and I am in complete agreement with my colleagues who have indicated that this piece of legislation has not received a fair hearing. It has not received a markup in the Financial Services Committee, and it has not been afforded an opportunity to come to the floor.

One of the ways that we can eliminate things here in Congress is by not acting on them at all. It appears that this piece of legislation is destined not to be acted upon; thereby, the elimination of the Export-Import Bank will take place. This is unfortunate.

I believe that, when there are things that you would like to say that are being said better by others, it is better to let them say them. I would like to just quote a few things from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce with reference to the Ex-Im Bank.

The Chamber indicates: ''Failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would put at risk more than 150,000 American jobs at 3,000 companies.'' That is significant.

The Chamber goes on to talk about the spinoffs—the other jobs—that will be impacted by virtue of the 150,000 jobs that will be put at risk: ''Tens of thousands of smaller companies that supply goods and services to large exporters also benefit from Ex-Im's activities,'' meaning that these companies too will suffer, and these are additional workers who will suffer.

The Chamber indicates: ''Other countries are providing approximately 18 times more export credit assistance to their exporters than Ex-Im did to U.S. exporters last year.''

It goes on to read: ''If Congress fails to reauthorize Ex-Im, the United States would become the only major trading nation without such a bank, putting American exporters at a unique disadvantage in tough global markets.''

Now, that is the United States Chamber of Commerce. I think this is a source that many of my colleagues on the other side would rely upon.

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

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am also here to say that the State of Texas, which is the largest State that deals in exports—the top exporting State, accounting for approximately 18 percent of the national exports—would be hurt. In Texas, we have approximately 1,630 exporters that utilize the Export-Import Bank. In my district, 46 small businesses are using the Export-Import Bank, and 14 of these are minority-owned while five are owned by women. The bank is making a difference.

In Texas, we have a saying: ''If it ain't broke, don't fix it.'' It ain't broke. We are trying to fix it, and we are doing it by eliminating an entity that is making a difference for our economy.

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

The history of this regulation is as sordid as most of the NLRB's actions have been over the past few years.

The Board initially attempted to promulgate this regulation in 2011 without a legitimate quorum and saw its decision struck down by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

That court decision was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

After rescinding its initial attempt at imposing an ambush election rule, the Board, now back to its full strength after threats by Senate Democrats to exercise the nuclear option to spark filibuster reform, reintroduced the ambush election rule in February of last year. Today, we face the consequences of that effort.

Those efforts are not the only objectionable actions of the National Labor Relations Board in recent years. Last year, I sent a letter, with several of my colleagues, opposing the NLRB general counsel's efforts to deem franchisers joint employers with their franchisees. That determination could have profound consequences for the over 8 million Americans who go to work at our country's over 750,000 franchise businesses.

The NLRB also purported to be able to instruct private businesses as to where they could invest, telling The Boeing Company in 2011 that it could not operate a factory in South Carolina it had already built. Our Federal Government has far too much power, but, thankfully, it does not yet have the power to tell businesses where they can and can't expand. The Board was forced to withdraw its complaint in that instance.

The NLRB regulation that we will address today on the floor is just another in a long line of objectionable actions that the Board has taken since President Obama's appointees have taken office. There is no reason to believe that their approach to the law will change, but our step today to invoke the Congressional Review Act is merely another sign of our willingness to exercise oversight tirelessly into the Board's actions. We will continue to be vigilant on behalf of workers and their employers.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. GREEN's repeated reference to the United States Chamber of Commerce's point of view prompted me to believe that entering their actual words, that of the Chamber's, into the RECORD would be a constructive addition to this debate. So I read from their letter:

''Failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would put at risk more than 150,000 American jobs at 3,000 companies that depend on the Bank to be able to compete in global markets. Ex-Im is especially important to small- and medium-size businesses, which account for more than 85 percent of Ex-Im's transactions. Tens of thousands of smaller companies that supply goods and services to large exporters also benefit from Ex-Im's activities.

''Other countries are providing approximately 18 times more export credit assistance to their exporters than Ex-Im did to U.S. exporters last year.''

Further, the ''reauthorization of Ex-Im would benefit taxpayers by reducing the deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars. Far from being a subsidy, Ex-Im has generated $2.7 billion for taxpayers in the last six years, mostly through fees collected from foreign customers. Eliminating Ex-Im would increase the U.S. budget deficit.''

I am going to repeat that. ''Eliminating Ex-Im would increase the U.S. budget deficit.''

''Ex-Im's overall active default rate hovers below one-quarter of one percent, a default rate lower than commercial banks.

''The U.S. Chamber, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, urges the House to pass long-term Ex-Im reauthorization as expeditiously as possible.''

Those are verbatim words from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's position on the long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Why? Because they know that the failure to do so 103 days from now will materially damage the U.S. economy and will reduce the numbers of jobs. I urge you to support the long-term reauthorization of the Ex-Im.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close if my colleague from Colorado is also prepared.

Mr. POLIS. If somebody else shows up, I might yield to him; but with that understanding, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about the Export-Import Bank and what they do and why it is so important.

First of all, there are a lot of forms of subsidization that are not permitted under trade rules or the WTO. However, there are certain safe harbors for things that are allowed, and all of our major trading partners have something like an Export-Import Bank.

What it does is it helps to effectively finance our exports. When we have somebody who wants to buy products from an American company in another country, rather than have that company, itself, have to collect that overseas debt, effectively, that debt is transferred to this pseudopublic entity, the Export-Import Bank, and that, effectively, becomes the collection agent overseas for that debt. It, effectively, allows our exporters to get their payments up front to outsource any risk of no payment occurring. In fact, the U.S. Export Agency is in a better position to collect those debts because people will see them abroad as an entity of the U.S. Government. It works out well, as it is profitable; it is supported by the business community; and it is fully permissible under trade rules.

If we fail to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, we are, effectively, stabbing ourselves in the foot. We are hurting our own export economy. Do we think for 1 minute that other countries are going to stop engaging in similar allowable trade practices that benefit their own manufacturing industries? No, of course not. People across the world are going to scratch their heads just as they do when our own Congress shuts down our government, just as they do when Members of our own Congress undermine our own President diplomatically. They ask: What are the Americans doing? They are doing this to themselves. They are hurting their own exports, and they are hurting their own manufacturing.

That is exactly why I hope that we do defeat the previous question and come forward with a clean Export-Import Bank reauthorization, which I am confident would overwhelmingly pass here on the floor of the House.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, what this discussion really comes down to with regard to the NLRB is whether or not bad actors should continue to get away with abusing an antiquated system for their own advantage.

I truly believe—and I hope my colleagues do, too—that employers and employees should have a level playing field with an updated and expeditious processing mechanism. Employers should not be able to endlessly delay and appeal elections and abuse a process that was put in place just as much for them as it was for employees.

Organizing has a long and important history in America. Unions and collective bargaining have made sure we have a weekend to spend with our families, a 40-hour workweek, and made sure women are paid fair wages.

□ 1000

Organizing has made sure workers are safe from all types and forms of workplace dangers. Countless studies show that the proportion of workers in labor organizations tracks very closely with income for middle class Americans.

Critics of this rule don't want a level playing field for labor organizations to fight for the middle class. They want a process that is open to delay and manipulation. Rather than letting workers choose for themselves whether or not they want to join a union, bad actors would prefer to delay or prevent the choice from ever being made at all. This new rule reduces the opportunity for bad actors to play games with the process and applies new technological updates to the process as well.

The Republicans, time and time again, seem to want to waste time on

grandstanding instead of legislating. This is a perfect example of another bill that won't become law. The Republicans want to tilt the economy toward the wealthy, toward big business, toward CEOs.

We were sent here to do the people's work. The new rule for the NLRB is entirely consistent with the legislative intent of the creation of that agency, and it is for the advantage of people who live in our towns and cities. It improves the economy, raises up the middle class, helps give everybody a fair shot at the American Dream.

When we talk about the pathway to the American Dream, the pathway to success in our country, the organized labor movement has and continues to make enormous contributions toward making sure that Americans are earning livable wages, that they can support their families and live the American Dream. It is not only the weekends and 40-hour workweeks that they have given us. The organized labor movement continues to fight for the middle class and to fight to grow the middle class and to address some of the increasing trend of income disparities that are threatening our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, and then we will bring forward the Export-Import Bank clean reauthorization that does create jobs for middle class Americans and in manufacturing. Some of those plants will be union and some won't be. That is the choice of the workers. The NLRB bill facilitates that choice. It doesn't presuppose that every workplace will want to organize nor that no workplaces will want to organize. It simply has a fair set of rules in place—fair to businesses, fair to employees, fair to labor, fair to everybody—that allows a decision to be made regarding organizing in the workplace.

What is even more important about the effort Mr. HECK talked about is it will allow workers and business owners to participate in a bigger pie. That is what we all want. By reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, we are creating jobs in our country and the export sector; and that means that the owners of the companies will do well; it means the employees of the companies will do well; it means the management will do well; it means the line workers will do well.

So let's participate in a growing pie by passing a clean reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank rather than trying to divide the pie to take more away from working families and the middle class and give more to big businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The proud traditions of this House and its committees are continued by the committee funding resolution this rule will provide for consideration of. Our record of careful stewardship of taxpayer dollars continues with the House authorized funds for the 114th Congress below those in 2008. The funding resolution was favorably reported out of committee by unanimous voice vote. The chair and ranking member of each committee worked together to develop their individual budget priorities, and each committee also reaffirmed its commitment to uphold the equitable two-thirds/one-third allocation between the majority and minority sides.

Our record of careful stewardship of taxpayer dollars continues, with the House authorized funds for the 114th Congress below those in 2008.

Returning to the ambush elections rule, which was, sadly, not crafted in the same bipartisan fashion as our committee funding resolution, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that providing for free and fair elections is one of the most fundamental principles of our democracy.

The National Labor Relations Board's ambush elections rule is an affront to that principle. Without a chance to opt out, it provides the personal contact information of every employee to organizers who may have had no previous interactions with those employees. The rule could lead to union representation elections being held within only 11 days without any certainty over who should be participating in the election or adequate time to consult with legal counsel.

It is not as if existing rules favor one party over another. If anything, they favor unions. Currently, 95 percent of elections occur within 2 months, and unions win more than 60 percent of them. The National Labor Relations Board should be focused on maintaining fair union representation elections backed by longstanding precedent, not upending a longstanding, carefully tailored process for elections that provided fundamental protections to all stakeholders: workers, unions, and employers.

This Congressional Review Act joint resolution is an important step in Congress exercising its oversight role to ensure that independent agencies and the executive branch do not step on vital protections for hardworking Americans.

I strongly commend this rule and the underlying resolutions to my colleagues for their support.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 152 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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 bill (H.R. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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. POLIS. 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 of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 181, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—233

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)
Carter (TX)
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 (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
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
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
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, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
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
Pelosi
Perlmutter
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
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—18

Ellison
Garamendi
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Jordan
Labrador
Payne
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Schock
Scott, Austin
Smith (WA)
Williams
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

□ 1033

Mr. CARNEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. RUSH and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. MICA, BURGESS, and Mrs. HARTZLER 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. POLIS. 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 233, noes 181, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

AYES—233

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
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
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 (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin

Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
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
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
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, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
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, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
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
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—18

Bucshon
Garamendi
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Hinojosa
Jordan
Labrador
Payne
Perlmutter
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Schock
Scott, Austin
Smith (WA)
Williams
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

□ 1040

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.

Stated for:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 127 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 127 I was unavoidably detained and missed voting of rollcall No. 127. Had I been present, when the vote was called, I would have voted "no."

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 2015, the House voted on H. Res. 152, to provide consideration of H. Res. 132. I accidentally voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 127; I do not support H. Res. 152 or H. Res. 132; I intended to vote "no" on rollcall vote No. 127. I would like the record to accurately reflect my stance on this issue.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 152, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures (published at 79 Fed. Reg. 74308 (December 15, 2014)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 1045

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. 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 S.J. Res. 8.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 8.

In just a few short weeks, a regulatory scheme that many Americans never heard of will become a reality in almost every private workplace across the country.

Today, workers and employers rely on a fair process for union elections. Under the current process, employers have time to raise concerns and, more importantly, time to speak with their employees about union representation.

Under the current system, workers have an opportunity to gather the information they need to make the best decision for their families. But unless Congress acts, Mr. Speaker, that will all change.

Under the guise of streamlining union elections, the National Labor Relations Board is imposing draconian changes that will undermine the rights workers, employers, and unions have long enjoyed.

The Board's rule arbitrarily limits the amount of time employers have to legally prepare for the election, and it denies workers a reasonable opportunity to make informed decisions about joining a union.

The rule also delays answers to important questions—including voter eligibility—until after the election, which means the integrity of the election results will be compromised before a single ballot is cast.

To add insult to injury, the Board's rule will also force employers to provide union organizers with their employees' personal information, including email addresses, phone numbers, work schedules, and home addresses. Instead of advancing a plan to help stop union intimidation and coercion, the Board is actually making it easier for labor bosses to harass employees and their families.

Are there times when delays occur under the current system? Of course. But delay is the exception, not the rule. In fact, right now, the median time between the filing of an election petition and the election is 38 days. Yet under the Board's new rule, a union election could take place in as little as 11 days. Eleven days.

This is a radical rewrite of labor policies that have served our Nation's best interests for decades. Unfortunately, this is what we have come to expect from the National Labor Relations Board.

Let's not forget, this is the same Federal agency that tried dictating where a private employer had to run its business. This is the same agency restricting workers' rights to secret ballot elections. This is the same agency ignoring the law by asserting its jurisdiction over religious institutions. This is the same agency tying employers in union red tape and empowering labor leaders to gerrymander our Nation's workplaces. This is a Federal agency that is simply out of control, and it is our responsibility to do something about it.

This resolution, which I am proud to sponsor along with Senator LAMAR

ALEXANDER of Tennessee, invokes Congress' authority under the Congressional Review Act to block the NLRB's ambush election rule and anything substantially like it.

If the Board or my Democrat colleagues want to pursue responsible reforms to improve the union election process, then I stand ready to work together on that effort.

But if you believe employers should be free to speak to their employees during a union organizing campaign, then support this resolution. If you believe workers should be free to make an informed decision about whether to join a union, then support this resolution. If you believe we should protect—rather than threaten—employee privacy, then support this resolution. Finally, if you believe workers, employers, and union leaders deserve a fair election process, then reject the Board's ambush election rule by supporting this resolution.

I encourage my colleagues to stand with America's workers and job creators by voting ''yes'' on S.J. Res. 8.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 8.

The Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval that we are considering today would undo the NLRB's election rule. The National Labor Relations Board election rule was promulgated to make the election process more efficient and fair.

The current process to hold an election on whether to form a union is badly broken. After workers have filed a petition to hold an election, bad actors can use frivolous litigation to stall an election for months, even years. Election delays can provide opportunities for unscrupulous employers to engage in threats, coercion, and intimidation of workers. These delays can be exploited to violate workers' rights, including firing pro-union workers or threatening to close the plant if the workers choose to vote a certain way.

We all know that the sanctions against violations are insufficient to deter the unscrupulous activities, including firing pro-union employees.

Researchers from the Center for Labor Research and Education at Berkeley found that the longer the delay before the union election, the more likely the employer was to engage in illegal conduct that violates its employees' rights. The NLRB election rule would help prevent the illegal intimidation and coercion of workers.

Mr. Speaker, this regulation provides targeted solutions to discrete, specifically identifiable problems. The rule brings into the 21st century the updating of rules involving the transmission of documents and communications, allowing you to use email and electronic communication rather than paper. It will enable the Board to better fulfill its responsibility to protect employees' rights by fairly, accurately, and quickly resolving issues of representation.

In many cases, the rule just simplifies and standardizes practices that have been common in regions all over the country already, or reflects existing practices used in civil actions. The rule does not change substantive law involving elections. It just makes sure that you can have a timely election.

These modest updates provide workers and employees with reasonable time to consider unionization while preventing unreasonable delay by bad actors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution isn't going to go very far. The administration has already issued a Statement of Administration Policy that I would like to quote from. It says that:

''The Board's modest reforms will help simplify and streamline private sector union elections, thereby reducing delays before workers can have a free and fair vote on whether or not to form or join a union.''

It goes on to say that:

''Giving workers greater voice can help ensure that the link is restored between hard work and opportunity and that the benefits of the current economic recovery are more broadly shared.

''The National Labor Relations Board's representation case procedures rule helps to level the playing field for workers so they can more freely choose to make their voice heard. In doing so, it will help us build an economy that gives greater economic opportunities and security for middle-class families and those working to join the middle class.''

It concludes, Mr. Speaker, that:

''If the President were presented with S.J. Res. 8, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the Resolution.''

Mr. Speaker, instead of wasting time on this resolution, we should be addressing job creation, stagnating wages, economic inequality, and working to improve opportunities for Americans, rather than considering this resolution.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, somehow I am not surprised that the Obama administration supports the administration's National Labor Relations Board's actions.

At this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to say it this way, but the fact of the matter is that the NLRB is creating a solution to a problem that does not exist by wholly changing the union election process through their new ambush election rule. This rule, if left unchecked, restricts the right of employers to speak to their employees during their organizing campaign. It cripples—it cripples—the rights of workers to make an informed decision. It denies all stakeholders access to a fair process. And isn't that what we are about?

This change is meant to weaken employers and employees who simply want a fair and just process that gives ample time for a deliberative review, discussion, and decisionmaking. Furthermore, the ambush election rule completely disregards the promise of neutrality that NLRB is mandated to uphold.

The NLRB should serve as an impartial arbiter of labor disputes, and I urge my colleagues to join the Senate in passing S.J. Res. 8, which will stop these harmful and unjust actions committed by the NLRB and preserve fair election policies which have been in place for decades.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in very strong opposition to this resolution, and I urge every one of my Members to oppose this resolution.

We considered a Paycheck Fairness Act, a card check bill which said that if the unions got the signatures of a certain percentage, that they could move ahead and be organized, subject to an election.

There was a hue and cry about, that was undemocratic, that there ought to be a requirement for an election. A number of people came into my office, and I said, Well, I think we can accommodate that. We will make sure there is a requirement that—as every one of us can do—you can get the names of the voters, you can get their addresses, you can even get their history of voting, and you can perhaps call them on the phone. We can all do that in elections.

But the fact of the matter is—and everybody on this House floor knows it—procedurally, so many employers who do not believe that they are going to prevail take the steps of delaying and delaying and delaying. They want elections tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, what the NLRB is trying to do with this rule is to make sure that there is an election, that it is fair, and that it will be held in a timely fashion.

I hope this House defeats this resolution.

This resolution would prevent the National Labor Relations Board from implementing the rule it promulgated in December to modernize worker representation elections.

But there is a fear of elections, and the fear of elections is that the majority of employees will say, yes, I want to have a better voice.

This is a case, once again, of the Republican majority seeking to roll back

the hard-earned rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively for better wages and benefits. And that is not an assertion. That is demonstrably proved in State after State after State over the last few years in which Republicans have taken control, and their first item of the agenda has been to undermine workers' rights.

When workers organize for higher wages and benefits—like health insurance, retirement savings, and affordable child care—it opens the doors of opportunity for workers and their families to secure a place in our middle class. We know our middle class is shrinking. We know the middle class is having a very tough time.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

According to a 2013 report by the Center for American Progress, the decline of union membership between the 1960s and today correlates to a decline of the middle class.

When we have strong unions and workers' rights protections, the middle class does better. And workers who are not unionized benefit from the ripple effect of rising wages.

Let's defeat this bill.

I think the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of this committee, has said that he would sit down with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) to come up with a bipartisan bill—which this is not—which will do what all of us say we think is fair, to have elections, to have elections where both sides—and of course the employer always has access to the voter in this case—and do something for the American worker and for business which will put us on a steady path to growing the middle class and making sure that workers are treated as they ought to be, with the dignity and respect and the ability to support their families that they need.

□ 1100

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I always find it to be of interest listening to this debate. Do you know what is most ironic about this bill? It is about elections. Everybody in this body has an election. But do you know what is different? Everyone in this body knows when their next election is going to be held and knows how much time they have to campaign, so much so that we have rules on this floor when we cut off communication months in advance so you can campaign.

I listened with interest to the minority whip speak on this floor his support for something different from what this bill does. I wonder, if he cared so much about what the NLRB is doing, would he apply those exact same rules to his own election? Would he care to not know when it is going to be and then when it gets called he has 11 days to campaign? I think his speech would be different. So why are we asking the rules for us to be different from every other worker across this country?

The root of representation is to work for the interests of those you represent. Everyone in the House knows that. And unions, as representative bodies, should exist for the benefit of the workers. But I don't think anyone disagrees that it is the workers, not the unions, who know what is best for themselves. Workers are the best judges of whether they want to support union political activity or even if they want to join a union at all. Joining a union is a big choice. To make an informed decision, workers need time to decide what is best for them and their families, and they shouldn't be pressured or rushed.

So if unions really care about workers, and if they are confident that the benefits of their union outweigh the costs, they will give the workers as much time as they need. That is the irony of the recent decision by the National Labor Relations Board, to allow unions to call rush elections, to ambush employees and employers. Ambush elections don't help workers; instead, they bully workers to accept unionization as fast as possible. That is not pro-worker; that is pro-union—and there is a big difference.

What makes the situation worse is that ambush elections will soon be forced on workers not by an act of Congress, but by unelected bureaucrats in the NLRB. That is an affront to the separation of powers that this country was based upon.

So here in Congress, Mr. Speaker, we are taking action. As our Senate colleagues have already voted to do, we are going to use the Congressional Review Act to send a resolution straight to the President's desk that blocks this antiworker and antibusiness rule.

Now, I know the President has already threatened to veto this resolution, but I actually hope he will change his mind, because what does the President want to fight for? Does he want to fight for the workers? Does he want to fight for small businesses and jobs?

Ambush elections don't help workers. They don't help employers. They only help unions. And no public official, not any Member of this House, and especially not the President, should ever support rules that allow special interests to strong-arm the hardworking American people.

Mr. Speaker, nobody in this House should support a rule about an election they wouldn't put upon themselves, and I don't know one Member of this House that would sit back and say somebody can call an election and you only have 11 days to campaign. I would like to hear somebody vote for that on this floor and ask to be held to the same standards they are trying to hold every other worker to in this Nation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, where to begin? In hearing the majority leader's remarks and in talking about fair elections, how is it fair if only one side has access to the phone numbers and email addresses and not the other side? Can any of us imagine running in our campaigns where only we or only our opponent can call or write emails to the voters? That doesn't make any sense.

Talking about 11 days, again, that is fictitious. This rule is about the 1 in 10 cases that take over 100 days. Mr. Speaker, we heard testimony in committee about organizing that lingered on hundreds and hundreds of days. And as our ranking member pointed out, the longer it takes, there is a direct and causal relationship to illegal behavior.

The election rules that the NLRB has implemented will help expedite this process to be sure it is done in accordance with the law. It modernizes our antiquated system to level the playing field for workers. These rules set up a fair system so that bad actors that needlessly delay and abuse the electoral system for the sole purpose of having time to coerce employees through mandatory meetings, threats, and even firings won't be rewarded for their bad behavior. This coercion is not just some far-fetched idea. One in 10 cases take over 100 days.

Now, why would delaying a union election be a bad thing for union workers? Because during that delay, these workers are forced into rooms, receive threats, are bombarded with texts and emails from the employer—again, from one side in the election—but the other side in the election, absent these rules, doesn't even have access to text or phone.

Mr. Speaker, we should be focused on creating new jobs, not destroying them, and growing the middle class, not shrinking it. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Chairman KLINE, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's leadership on this important issue, and I am grateful to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

As a member of the House Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, I am concerned with the National Labor Relations Board's latest rule, which is referred to as the ambush election rule, and I stand in strong support of S.J. Res. 8.

The ambush election rule is a tool to force union elections, not to protect

workers. Revisions of the list requirements under the rule will compel employers to provide very personal information about their employees, such as names, address, telephone numbers, and email addresses. This will violate the privacy of workers while reducing the informed decision period. To add insult to injury, the rule does not limit or dictate what unions can do with this sensitive information.

I am pleased that South Carolina is a right-to-work State. Union membership is not a requirement of employment in our State. It is based on freedom of choice. I am grateful we have fought as a State to give our employees and job creators the flexibility to choose what is best for them.

South Carolina has successfully opposed the rogue NLRB when the NLRB tried to block 1,000 jobs at the Boeing facility in Charleston. With the leadership of Governor Nikki Haley, Attorney General Alan Wilson, and Senators LINDSEY GRAHAM and TIM SCOTT, we stopped the NLRB, and now over 7,000 jobs have been created.

S.J. Res. 8 will express our strong disapproval of the National Labor Relations Board rule and ensure a fair elections process.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Thank you, Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Review Act is yet another attack on employees' rights to organize and to limit the National Labor Relations Board. The NLRB should have the ability to safeguard those rights and protect our Nation's workers from unfair labor practices.

It is outrageous that the rights of employees are attacked, particularly at a time when we have a jobs deficit, a shrinking middle class, and are still struggling to recover from the Great Recession.

The NLRB has made modest attempts to modernize its election procedures and reduce unnecessary litigation and delay in the election process. These are commonsense fixes that should not be controversial.

The CRA would freeze in place the Board's current flawed election procedure. The Board would be prohibited from adopting rules to utilize new technology or modernize its procedures. The NLRB is an expert agency and should be trusted to determine the appropriate use of electronic voting or rules to safeguard ballot secrecy.

Furthermore, I am not aware of any other government agency that has to seek Congress' permission before modernizing its rules for voting that takes place under its jurisdiction.

Dismantling the NLRB would only serve to weaken, undermine, and jeopardize the economic security of the middle class. It is bad for business, bad for families, and bad for our economy. In fact, the National Labor Relations Board is the last line of defense for workers.

We shouldn't be attacking our Nation's employees; we should be supporting them, investing in them, and protecting them. Let's come together to create jobs, protect the middle class, and make the investments we need to grow our economy.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL), a new member of the committee and someone who has been actively engaged in the major debates since he has walked into this body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, labor relations are vital to the smooth operation of business and commerce. In the culture of our Republic, Americans are raised to expect to have their say in everything from schoolroom elections to choosing the President of the United States. It is in our DNA to have a choice. To inform that choice, we expect free speech so we can ask questions, gain information, and make wise decisions. This is why the recently finalized rule by the National Labor Relations Board is so egregious. It is against that American spirit.

Under this rule, longstanding policies that allow employers and employees to guide how they relate through unions has been deeply damaged. Companies could have as little as 11 days, or employees in relating to the companies, as little as 11 days to make a choice that could drastically affect their career and the health of the business that they rely on to put bread on the table.

Employers would only have a 7-day period to obtain counsel, set parameters, and are even restricted in contacting and discussing issues with their employees. They are prohibited from making any changes after that 7-day period based on new information that they may acquire.

Further, the privacy and safety of workers is placed in jeopardy by a swift ambush election process imposed by these rules that could put their employment in jeopardy.

This resolution stops this. It restores policies that have guided labor relations for decades. It upholds the right for American workers to gain information to make choices without draconian, strong-arm pressure tactics that harm the worker and stifle American free enterprise.

This body was founded, Mr. Speaker, on the spirit of promoting the general welfare and ensuring domestic tranquility for our Nation. Passage of S.J. Res. 8 aids this by stopping and blocking the strong-arm tactics of the National Labor Relations Board, and the American people are counting on us to do that job.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 8, an unnecessary partisan attack on hardworking Americans that will interfere with the rights of workers to an expeditious election on union representation.

America's middle class workers should be free to decide if they want an election. Unfortunately, the current process can be mired in litigation, and in some cases, workers waiting for an election have faced interference or intimidation from outside groups. The NLRB's rule safeguards the ability of workers to choose whether to be represented by a union without confronting unnecessary delays.

It makes little sense why Congress would want to get in the way of middle class Americans—factory line workers, health care workers, and utility workers—who ask for an election on union representation. It is also unreasonable to assume that employers, many of which have sophisticated legal teams, are going to be caught flat-footed. There is no ambush here.

Mr. Speaker, the NLRB had a lengthy rulemaking proceeding with thousands of comments. It is unfair and, in fact, draconian to now use the Congressional Review Act to try to undermine the rights of workers by getting rid of this rule. The resolution is an ill-advised attempt to silence the voice of American workers, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

□ 1115

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), another new member of the committee and someone who has also been engaged since the day he walked in.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am always interested when we are talking about workers and I hear that people want to talk about what is best for workers.

I will tell you that I am a new Member of Congress, and I have had the privilege the past 30 years of my life to give people the privilege to have a good job. That is one of the greatest privileges of my life.

We all want to do what is best for those folks who are sacrificing for us. We appreciate them; we appreciate their efforts. That is why I rise to support Senate Joint Resolution 8, to demonstrate the disapproval of Congress of the National Labor Relations Board's ''ambush election'' rule to protect our workers.

A few weeks ago, the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, of which I am a member, held a hearing on this very issue. We learned that this NLRB is not only unprecedented, it undermines the rights of both workers and employees and creates for challenges for businesses when our economy can least afford it.

The expert testimony was from those who have been engaged in labor relations for quite a long time with tremendous experience. Their testimony

provided comments about just how troubling such a threat to the privacy of workers and their families as employers would be required to disclose the names, addresses, phone numbers, and emails of employees to the NLRB, then to the union.

This rule is misguided, and NLRB has no business in rushing to advance its own agenda. We need to protect fairness in the work place. That is why I call on my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 8.

I am proud to say that I am from the State of Georgia, a right-to-work State.

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

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ALLEN. In the State of Georgia, we have created almost 300,000 jobs since 2006. I am proud to say we have got the finest workers in America, and I want those workers to have the freedom to make their decisions and not the NLRB.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, BOBBY SCOTT, for yielding me time.

I am a small business owner, and I am a union member, and I have a union business. The disapproval of the NLRB rule under the Congressional Review Act is an extreme move that would roll back hardworking Americans' rights to a fair and timely election on union representation.

Let us look at what this rule does, two things: One, it modernizes communications; and, two, it protects workers from dishonest employers.

When this law was written, emails and iPhones didn't exist, so it simply adds them to the list of what is available to contact people about joining a union.

Second, it creates a fair, modern workplace election process that elections can be done in a timely manner. The current process has long been vulnerable to manipulation, delay, and drawn out legal maneuvering by some unscrupulous employers.

The reality of today's workplace is employers still hold all the cards. The few bad actor employers can delay a union vote by intimidating or threatening employees. They already have the phone numbers, the emails, and the home addresses. Let's face it: What is more intimidating, getting an email or saying you know where someone lives?

The bottom line is this isn't about the NLRB rule; this is about a process that we see across the country attacking hardworking Americans. Whether it is through so-called right-to-work laws or preventing the NLRB from updating the union election process, this is more evidence that the majority party is out to hurt the very hardworking Americans who want the ability to form a union.

This has a substantial impact on their lives. Workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement are paid more on average than those not covered and are more likely to have health care, retirement, and paid leave benefits than nonunion workers.

I would strongly urge us to vote against this political maneuvering message.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from my neighboring State of Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), another new member of the committee. We have got an almost embarrassment of riches of hardworking new Members.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be here to speak one more time on Senate Joint Resolution 8.

I will make two points again. One of the things we see here is we have new rules which continue a trend, and that is you are fundamentally changing the way things have been for 70 years. In the past, unions have done a good job of organizing.

We have added union representation to things, but one of the things that businesses want and that America wants is consistency. One more time, after having no big problems for 70 years, we are turning things fundamentally around. Now, why is that bad?

The gentlewoman from Oregon just said this is no big deal because businesses all have lawyers on staff or whatever.

Two comments on that: First of all, businesses don't all have lawyers on staff; and, secondly, I think it shows a fundamental misunderstanding of how business works and why it is so difficult to go into business today and why it particularly targets small businesses when you come up with new regulations.

This would be a problem even for a big company that did have a lawyer on staff and say it is no big deal; but, of course, who is less likely to have a lawyer on staff? A small business who doesn't have full-time HR representatives and that sort of thing. This is targeting those small businesses.

Again and again and again in this country, one thing that bothers me is the degree to which people don't have sympathy for small businesses. When you change things, they are the ones who have to go out, hire an outside lawyer, get up to speed on things, pay the big legal bills, and pay the price.

That is one reason why, in certain industries, you do see, over time, big businesses continuing to grow because little businesses can't keep up with all the little rules.

I will remind people one more time that this invades employee privacy. It is something they are not asking for. There is no reason for outside groups to be able to get somebody's home address or that sort of thing.

In any event, I will ask the other people present in the room to go back home and ask, particularly their small employers, when they have to run to a lawyer—first of all, to ask their small employers whether or not they have a lawyer on staff because I think the vast majority of businesses in this country don't have a lawyer on staff; and, secondly, whether they do or don't have a lawyer on staff, if they have to go run to a lawyer, whether they think its no big deal, because I think it is an awfully big deal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I would like to point out that I think the people who promote this piece of legislation and the people who oppose it basically take their positions for the same reason, and that is that labor unions improve wages, make better working conditions, promote job security, and give strength in numbers.

We oppose and support this bill for the same reason. Some people want to see workers get more pay—we have seen stagnant wages—and some people think that when workers make more money, it just hurts corporate profitability—which, by the way, is up and has been increasing.

The point is simply this: The NLRB does its job and modernizes union elections and proposes a rule. The Republican majority comes in and says, We don't like that because that might lead to more union elections, and it may lead to more unionized workers, and we like it how it is, we like flat and declining wages, we want the employers to have all of the power, we want the workers to be alone and on their own and without the strength that the numbers that a union provides. It is just as simple as that.

Americans watching this debate today have yet another opportunity to see who is on their side and who is not. American workers get more money and get paid better when they are in unions.

Collective bargaining strengthens family budgets because it means that workers can say, Do you know what, that is unsafe; do you know what, you are making plenty of money, so should we; do you know what, we need to get some job security in a union contract around here—and that is exactly why we see the opposition to this NLRB rule.

So it is disappointing. I think President Obama was right when he said the number one problem facing the United States today is income inequality. That is the concentration of riches at the top and the stagnation for wages for everybody else.

If that is the problem, then we need to do something about it. That means modernizing the right to collectively bargain.

I will say modernizing union elections is the thing that will help us achieve that equality.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

It is incredible. We are in this great Hall of democracy. The world looks to this very building, for what it seeks is to give people a voice, what our country was founded on. What we are having a vote on today is to clamp down and shut the mouths of those who are seeking to have a voice.

Very recently, there was a poll conducted that said, if given the opportunity, 73 percent of American workers want to have a voice and would vote for a union, but what we are hearing today is shutting down the voice and creating predictability. This is about democracy; this is about what we in America believe in: giving everybody an equal opportunity for a voice.

What the NLRB—and I have dealt with them for over 30 years. We have won some; we have lost some. They have been independent. Sometimes, I haven't been happy with their decisions, but I have always felt they have been fair.

What we are talking about is bringing them into the 21st century, making a voting date that is agreeable to what real people think. You shouldn't have to wait 6 months, 9 months, go through the appeal process.

Let's have a vote because, remember, the employer has had access—unfettered access—to all these employees, and all we are saying is let's make sure that workers have a voice. If they say ''no,'' no harm, no foul, and go home. This is about creating an equal playing field, which certainly isn't there.

That is why I am urging my colleagues to vote against this anti-American, antidemocracy, antiworker resolution.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT.

One of the things that made the 20th century known as the American century was that the United States had the largest middle class in the history of the world—the idea that if you worked hard and played by the rules, you would get a fair wage and good benefits and that your children would be even able to do a little bit better than you have been able to do.

It wasn't always that way, though, in the United States. We can thank to a great extent some of the great advances that we had in the 20th century, as far as workers' rights, to that of organized labor. Without labor unions, we would not have the strength of the middle class today.

It is no accident that in the post-World War II period, when you saw average incomes rise in the fifties, in the sixties, in the seventies, you saw average incomes rise for workers, sure enough, you saw the percentage of the American workforce unionized also increase.

□ 1130

It is also no accident that, as the percentage of the American unionized workforce declined, so, too, did the average wages to the point at which we are today, where we have had a 20-year period in which middle class wages are stagnant, in which the working class has actually fallen behind, and in which—no surprise—we actually have the lowest percentage of the workforce unionized today in over 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, let's stand up for the middle class. Let's stand up for our workers. Let us reject this antilabor, anti-union, antiworker measure, and let's start fighting and working for those who are working for America.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Is the chairman prepared to close?

Mr. KLINE. I am.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The rule that is subject to this resolution creates no substantive change in the law. It just requires that an election be timely. We have heard this 11-day myth. Let me just go through a little about that myth and how you get to the 11 days.

First of all, the regional office would have to issue a notice of a hearing on the same day that the union would have filed the election petition. The hearing would have to be held as soon as possible and last only one day, and the regional director would have to issue an opinion on the same day.

Right now, it currently takes a median of 20 days for the regional director to issue a decision on the hearing, and there is no reason to believe that it would be any shorter under this rule.

The union would have to waive all of its rights to get information in terms of contact lists and things like that, and the region would have to schedule the election on the very first day possible. The chance that all of that is going to happen to get you down to 11 days is just very improbable.

The administration has already indicated that its senior advisers would recommend a veto of this legislation, so it is not going anywhere.

I look forward to working with the chair of the committee to do what we can to create jobs and to increase wages and to create safe workplaces. I would hope that the chair and I will get together on that rather than waste time on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

S.J. RES. 8—CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD REPRESENTATION CASE PROCEDURES RULE

(Sen. Alexander, R–TN and 51 cosponsors, Mar. 3, 2015)

The Administration strongly opposes Senate passage of S.J. Res. 8, which would overturn the National Labor Relations Board's recently issued ''representation case procedures'' rule. The Board's modest reforms will help simplify and streamline private sector union elections, thereby reducing delays before workers can have a free and fair vote on whether or not to form or join a union. The rule allows for electronic filing and transmission of documents, ensures that all parties receive timely information necessary to participate in the election process, reduces delays caused by frivolous litigation, unifies procedures across the country, requires additional contact information be included in voter lists, and consolidates appeals to the Board into a single process.

Instead of seeking to undermine a streamlined democratic process for American workers to vote on whether or not they want to be represented, the Congress should join the President in strengthening protections for American workers and giving them more of a voice in the workplace and the economy. Growing and sustaining the middle class requires strong and vital labor unions, which helped to build this Nation's middle class and have been critical to raising workers' wages and putting in place worker protections that we enjoy today. Giving workers greater voice can help ensure that the link is restored between hard work and opportunity and that the benefits of the current economic recovery are more broadly shared.

The National Labor Relations Board's representation case procedures rule helps to level the playing field for workers so they can more freely choose to make their voice heard. In doing so, it will help us build an economy that gives greater economic opportunities and security for middle-class families and those working to join the middle class.

If the President were presented with S.J. Res. 8, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the Resolution.

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

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

It is always interesting—isn't it, Mr. Speaker?—to listen to the debate and to the claims that are made and to the claims that are refuted. I found it a little bit interesting in listening to some of the comments on the other side of the aisle that, apparently, this Congressional Review Act S.J. Res. 8 action and all of those who support it are anti-union, antilabor, antiworker, and—I was a little shocked to hear—even anti-American.

I am not called ''anti-American'' very often, Mr. Speaker, and I do resent it a little bit, but that is the way this debate kind of goes. Let's get a couple of things, I think, straight. I know that everybody can have his opinion and not the facts, but there are some things that, I think, are pretty clear.

According to the National Labor Relations Board, itself, more than 94 percent of elections occur in less than 56 days, which is less than 2 months, Mr. Speaker, and the median time is only 38 days. Unions, Mr. Speaker, win over 60 percent of those elections, so there is a voice for union organizers, for workers, and for employers, because there is time. There is not a rush.

Now, we just heard some discussion about whether 11 days is probable—we all agree, I think, it is possible—or

maybe it would be 12 or 13 or something like that, but it is not in question that you only have 7 days under this rule. This is the rule, by the way. This is the rule that we are talking about. The law that is affected is many times thicker than this.

My colleague from Wisconsin talked about whether or not you have a labor lawyer on staff. Certainly, if you are a small- or middle-sized company, you don't. You can't afford that. So you have 7 days to go out and find a lawyer who can help you comply with this rule and with the law, the much thicker law. You have 7 days to get your position down in writing, and then you are stuck with it. Then you could have the election 4 days later. That is not an opportunity for informed discussion, debate for either the workers or for the employers.

This is called an ''ambush'' election because it is, indeed, an ambush. We heard one of the speakers talk about: Would you rather have somebody have your email address or your home address? Under this rule, you get it all. Mr. Speaker, clearly, there are many instances of intimidation during these exercises, and often that intimidation comes from union organizers, not from your fellow workers usually but from outside union organizers, who are trying to push this onto the workforce.

So I am very pleased to be supporting S.J. Res. 8, which is to provide congressional disapproval. I am not surprised, as I mentioned earlier, that the Obama administration supports the Obama National Labor Relations Board's position here, but it doesn't mean it is right, and it doesn't mean we shouldn't be standing up for the voices that we have heard about—for employers and employees—so that they can make informed decisions.

The NLRB's rule, Mr. Speaker, stifles the right of employers to speak to their employees during an organizing campaign. It also cripples the right of workers to have the information they need to make a very important decision about whether or not to join a union or even that union. That is a big decision, and it shouldn't be jammed into 11 days or 2 weeks. You need the time to be informed in order to make such a decision.

A ''yes'' vote on the resolution will help rein in this activist National Labor Relations Board, and it will ensure workers, employers, and unions can participate in a fair union election process. I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 8.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 186, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—232

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)
Carter (TX)
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 (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
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)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
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, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
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
Pelosi
Perlmutter
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 (NJ)
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

Garamendi
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Hinojosa
Jordan
Labrador
Payne
Roskam
Schock
Scott, Austin
Smith (WA)
Young (IN)

□ 1208

Mr. CLYBURN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. STUTZMAN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOUSTANY. 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 233, noes 159, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

AYES—233

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hill
Himes
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Pelosi
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—159

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Benishek
Bera
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cummings
DeFazio
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Fudge
Garrett
Gibson
Gowdy
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Love
Lowey
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McSally
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—39

Barton
Capuano
Cárdenas
Crawford
Davis, Rodney
Doggett
Fincher
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Grijalva
Hanna
Harris
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Lummis
Marchant
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Quigley
Roskam
Schock
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sires
Smith (WA)
Walberg
Wilson (FL)
Young (IN)

□ 1215

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 976

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 976.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY MOHAMMAD ASHRAF GHANI, PRESIDENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, March 25, 2015, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, the President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, March 24, 2015, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 25, 2015.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 152, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the amendment printed in House Report 114–45 is adopted, and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 132

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture,

$10,173,096; Committee on Armed Services, $14,208,340; Committee on the Budget, $10,380,424; Committee on Education and the Workforce, $14,044,580; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $19,531,442; Committee on Ethics, $6,201,326; Committee on Financial Services, $15,086,852; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $14,923,986; Committee on Homeland Security, $14,407,846; Committee on House Administration, $9,293,130; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $9,197,310; Committee on the Judiciary, $14,395,572; Committee on Natural Resources, $13,422,774; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $18,059,682; Committee on Rules, $5,846,964; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $10,671,164; Committee on Small Business, $6,045,228; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $16,728,260; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $6,958,062; and Committee on Ways and Means, $17,515,290.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2015, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2016.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $5,086,548; Committee on Armed Services, $7,104,170; Committee on the Budget, $5,190,212; Committee on Education and the Workforce, $7,022,290; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $9,765,721; Committee on Ethics, $3,100,663; Committee on Financial Services, $7,543,426; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $7,461,993; Committee on Homeland Security, $7,203,923; Committee on House Administration, $4,646,565; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $4,598,655; Committee on the Judiciary, $7,197,786; Committee on Natural Resources, $6,711,387; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $9,029,841; Committee on Rules, $2,960,982; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $5,335,582; Committee on Small Business, $3,022,614; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $8,364,130; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $3,479,031; and Committee on Ways and Means, $8,757,645.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2016, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2017.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $5,086,548; Committee on Armed Services, $7,104,170; Committee on the Budget, $5,190,212; Committee on Education and the Workforce, $7,022,290; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $9,765,721; Committee on Ethics, $3,100,663; Committee on Financial Services, $7,543,426; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $7,461,993; Committee on Homeland Security, $7,203,923; Committee on House Administration, $4,646,565; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $4,598,655; Committee on the Judiciary, $7,197,786; Committee on Natural Resources, $6,711,387; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $9,029,841; Committee on Rules, $2,885,982; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $5,335,582; Committee on Small Business, $3,022,614; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $8,364,130; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $3,479,031; and Committee on Ways and Means, $8,757,645.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—

(1) REVIEW.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2016, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee's use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

(2) WAIVER.—The Committee on House Administration may waive the application of paragraph (1) to any or all of the committees named in subsection (b).

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

(b) AMOUNT.—The reserve fund under this section shall have a balance of $1,000,000, of which—

(1) $500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2015, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2016; and

(2) $500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2016, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2017.

(c) ALLOCATION TO COMMITTEES.—Amounts in the reserve fund under this section shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 251A or 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any change in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 132.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 132, which is a resolution setting the funding levels for each House committee.

Every Congress, it is the responsibility of the Committee on House Administration to establish funding levels for committees in the House so that they may budget appropriately and prepare their oversight and operational responsibilities for the rest of Congress with a full knowledge of the resources available.

The Committee on House Administration started the consideration process out of this committee funding resolution by holding hearings to receive input from the chair and ranking members of each of our House committees. These were very productive, very informative hearings, and I am certain that my partner in this effort, the ranking member of our committee, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, certainly will share that belief. Each chair and ranking member worked together in the development of their committee's budget requests and in their advocacy for those requests before our committee. It was a true example of bipartisanship.

This funding resolution that is a product of the information developed by our hearings is also a bipartisan product, which was favorably reported out of our committee by unanimous voice vote. I am very pleased that each committee reaffirmed their commitment to uphold the equitable two-thirds/one-third allocation between the majority and the minority sides.

The Committee on House Administration has taken really great care, Mr. Speaker, in examining the funding levels authorized for each committee in this resolution so that the priorities of the House and the priorities of the American people are put front and center.

I think it is important to note that, over the past few Congresses, the House has not only asked for fiscal responsibility across the Federal Government, but has led by example in showing fiscal responsibility by making reductions in our own budgets, both in individual Member office budgets as well as the committee budgets.

Since the 110th Congress, for example, Mr. Speaker, the House has had actually a 15 percent reduction in our committee budgets. At the same time, our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol did not actually reduce the funding for their committees other than what was mandated by ''sequestration.'' In fact, the other body actually increased their committee spending while the House was reducing spending, until making some modest reductions in the committee budgets recently at the start of the 114th. I just point that out. We were leading by example here.

Additionally, the Executive Office actually had a 30 percent increase in

their spending since 2008, and, given that it is the role of the Congress to conduct effective and needed oversight over the entire executive and judicial branches, I think it is very vital that we make certain that our committees have the resources they need to meet this important duty.

So that brings us here today, Mr. Speaker, to the consideration of House Resolution 152.

After hearing from each chair and each ranking member, the committee was able, really, to better ascertain the needs of each committee and to ensure that they did have adequate and proper funding. Many committees, including the Committee on House Administration, received no increase in funding in this resolution from what we were allocated in the 113th Congress. Many committees received flat funding. Because of the increased oversight or legislative priorities, other committees required a very modest or targeted increase in their resources.

The overall proposed increase in authorized funding for the committees is 1.63 percent for 2015 and 1.57 percent for 2016. Again, though, there are about half of the committees that received no increase in funding, got level funding.

The committee funding resolution also takes into account that there might be unforeseen circumstances that will pop up during the course of this Congress that might require some additional resources. For instance, in the case of the Judiciary Committee, it was testified by the chair and the ranking member that there is a possibility of a judicial impeachment proceeding. They may have to conduct that; they may not. So to prepare for that kind of unanticipated need, the Committee on House Administration has actually allocated $500,000 for each session in the 114th into a reserve fund which could be allocated for something like that or, if there is another committee that demonstrates a real need for it, an emerging priority that perhaps they couldn't see at this point in time.

I just think that that is a very fiscally prudent way to budget, not just giving money on the ''if come,'' but if we really do see that we need it, of course then we can protect that money; if we don't need to spend it, it won't be spent.

Before authorizing any increase in funding, the Committee on House Administration really dove into why the increase was needed, such as a specific new priority, emerging challenges that some of our committees will face this Congress. Some of the committees requested additional funds for urgent equipment needs.

Part of our responsibilities, of course, are to ensure smooth operations of this institution, because a breakdown of equipment that we rely on every day to assist with the daily function of the House may lead to proceedings being severely delayed or halted, and we thought that was an unacceptable possibility. So, as an example, some of the equipment that, as I say, that some of the committees are looking for, we wanted to make sure we had resources there.

Another example is the need for additional specialized staff members to assist in the oversight functions that the committee is charged with. For instance, the Armed Services Committee, a good example, had great needs for additional staff to help with conducting vigorous oversight in the pursuit of major overdue reforms at the Pentagon which could save the Nation, literally, tens of billions of dollars. We thought that was a fiscally prudent use of additional resources.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee has immense new challenges in conducting their oversight needed to get to the bottom of the scandalous treatment of our veterans at the VA hospitals across the Nation. Again, we thought that that was an appropriate expenditure as we ensure that those who have served the cause of freedom get the care and the benefits that they have earned. Again, not only do we believe that it is a prudent use of additional resources, but an imperative duty.

Other committees have expressed a desire for more field hearings across the country, and our committee was very supportive of this because we really believe that getting out of Washington, if you will, and conducting these field hearings, talking to the American people, really allowing Members and committees to gather firsthand knowledge of how the Federal programs are functioning and their impact on our Nation, was a very important thing.

So I would say this. I think it is important to note that, while there is a very small overall increase in authorized committee spending, this funding resolution does not require any new spending, does not require any new spending within the House's overall budget. This funding resolution only redirects already appropriated resources to new priorities.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we are proposing modest, targeted increases to meet the House committees' oversight and operational needs, and I would hope that each Member of the House will concur with the priorities that we have set forth in this funding resolution to allow each of our committees to continue with their important work.

Producing this resolution, I think, was important work for our committee, and I certainly want to thank all of our members, both Republican and Democrat, particularly the distinguished ranking member, Mr. BRADY from Pennsylvania, for his cooperation, their participation in the process, and the ideas that everybody brought to the table that helped produce this resolution that we bring to the full House today, which I will note as well, Mr. Speaker, was passed out of our committee unanimously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 132.

After several days of testimony by committee chairs and ranking members and careful review by the Committee on House Administration, we determined what we believe to be appropriate committee funding levels for the 114th Congress.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER and her staff for their diligence throughout this process. We have worked closely and cooperatively. While we would have liked to have done more, I believe that these levels will allow committees to perform their oversight responsibilities. It is my hope that we continue to explore ways to ensure congressional committees are equipped with the proper amount of resources needed to operate fully, while still maximizing the value of their committee funding.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would add that, for the 114th Congress—and I think this is a very important point, actually—the House remained below the amount authorized back in 2008. We are below the amount authorized in 2008. So the House has been making significant strides to take a very hard look at the way that we utilize our individual budgets, both in our Member offices as well as in our committees, and we are absolutely committed to being fiscally responsible stewards of the taxpayer dollar.

This funding resolution highlights those priorities to remain guardians of the taxpayer dollar, and as such, each committee must operate responsibly, using their budget to set priorities to carry out their important work.

Even after the adoption of the resolution, the Committee on House Administration will continue to work with each committee to assist them in finding solutions which deliver savings and allow every committee to stretch the valuable resources allocated so that they can continue to carry out their important duties.

At the Committee on House administration, we understand, Mr. Speaker, that it is our responsibility to ensure that the House operates in a fiscally responsible manner, an effective and efficient manner, and that is a responsibility that we take very, very seriously. I believe strongly that we have found the appropriate balance in funding this resolution that will keep in place fiscal responsibility and, at the same time, ensure that the important work of the House is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I would mention to the ranking member that I don't think I have any other speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER). It is no secret that she won't be returning in the next Congress, but this will be the last time that I will be with her managing the committees' funding.

I know she is here 21 months more, but I want her to know that every chance I get, with this microphone, I will thank her.

She is, without question, one of the classiest ladies I know in this House. She is fair. I enjoy going to the committee meetings. We smile and we shake hands before the meeting, and we smile and we shake hands after the meeting. She is a pleasure to work with. I wish her well. And again, for the next 21 months, any chance I get, I just hope that I do have the opportunity to keep on thanking her.

I only hope that this House will take note of the way our committee works. We work together. We compromise together. And because of that, things get done.

So, again, I wish her well, and I will have more opportunity to wish her well.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let me just sincerely, sincerely thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY), my ranking member.

If I am going to miss anything in this House, it is the great friendships that I have made with many people, both Republicans and Democrats. Certainly he has been right at the top of the list. He has been nothing but professional in our committee deliberations, in the way that we handle all of these different challenges that come before our committee.

I do think it is a very good thing that he points out that our committee does operate in a very bipartisan way. We are all about making sure that this institution is able to do what the American people expect from us, and we both share that passion. So I look forward to working with him for another year and a half here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to support the passage of this resolution so that each committee can plan appropriately with the full knowledge of their available resources.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A TRIBUTE TO RUTH ELLEN DAILEY HELM

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Ruth Ellen Dailey Helm, who passed away at the age of 98 recently in Tucson.

Ruth was a pilot during World War II, one of the first female pilots to serve in our military and a trailblazer.

Unlike many of the male pilots who served at the time, Ruth was qualified to fly multiple aircraft as a member of the Women Airforce Service Pilots, or WASPs; and she ferried bomber, transport, and pursuit aircraft all over the country during World War II.

She was inducted into the Arizona Aviation Hall of Fame in 1999 and awarded the Congressional Gold Medal with her WASP colleagues in 2010.

In addition to serving our country, Ruth and the WASPs were pioneers who inspired an entire generation of women to pursue their dreams of serving as pilots in our military, and that includes me.

When I was going through the challenges of becoming a fighter pilot in the first wave, there were no mentors in front of us to see us through. But when I needed encouragement or when I wanted to quit, Ruth and her fellow WASPs, starting 20 years ago, would be there for me, to inspire me and to encourage me and to give me what I needed to fight for another day.

They were more than role models who broke down gender barriers to serve in our military. They were my personal wingmen—or wingwomen, and I will be forever grateful to Ruth and all the WASP women for paving the way for me, for serving as my friends and my mentors, and for proving that women could be exceptional pilots too.

SAN DIEGO REGIONAL CLIMATE COLLABORATIVE

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative, which recently won the United States Environmental Protection Agency's Climate Leadership Award for Innovative Partnerships. This award recognizes organizations across the country working on cutting-edge climate initiatives that address greenhouse gas reduction goals, adaptation, and resilience.

As a member-based network that supports public agencies in the San Diego region, the Climate Collaborative works to advance comprehensive solutions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prepare our region for climate impacts.

In San Diego, climate change is not a partisan issue. While there is debate in Congress about the science of climate change, there is not debate amongst scientists.

As I see every day, San Diegans aren't waiting for Washington to act to address climate change. The collaborative has built partnerships with business, academia, nonprofits, and philanthropic entities to share expertise, leverage resources, and advance actions that benefit San Diego's communities, economy, and natural resources.

The San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative serves as a model for other regions as we seek to address the harmful effects of climate change as a nation and as a planet. I congratulate them.

GENDER EQUALITY AT ABBOTT LABORATORIES

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 10th District's very own Abbott Laboratories in North Chicago and their commitment to gender equality.

The National Association for Female Executives recently released their list of the top 50 companies for executive women. For the sixth consecutive year, Abbott Laboratories placed in the top 10. The association recognized Abbott for their commitment to promoting and empowering women.

I am extremely proud of Abbott's commitment and accomplishments. But it is also a sign, Mr. Speaker, of how much progress we still have to make as a country. We must continue to ensure that our young women have all the same opportunities available to them as young men. We must be sure that women are not at a disadvantage simply due to their gender. It is our duty not just as Members of this House but also as human beings to ensure that women and men are equals in the workplace, and increasing the number of female executives is crucial to that goal.

Mr. Speaker, companies like Abbott have made tremendous strides, but there is still work to be done. I applaud their example and urge others to follow.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise during National Agriculture Week, with yesterday being National Agriculture Day, to recognize the contributions of farmers, ranchers, and producers to our economy and well-being.

Agriculture supports one in four Nebraska jobs and contributes more than $23 billion to our State's economy. I am very proud to represent Nebraska's Third District, now the number one agriculture district in the Nation.

Our global economy presents great opportunity. Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers live outside the United States, and they all need to eat. As a result, we are seeing growing demand for Nebraska's agriculture products. Our State's beef exports reached a record high, $1 billion in sales, in 2014.

The efficiency and forward thinking of our ag producers is making it possible to meet demand with fewer inputs and less waste.

As founder and cochairman of the Modern Agriculture Caucus, I am committed to promoting scientifically based innovation and policies.

On this National Agriculture Day and Agriculture Week, please join me in thanking the many producers working tirelessly to support our economy and help feed the world.

BOSMA ENTERPRISES AND ABILITYONE

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exemplary partnership between the AbilityOne Program, an extraordinary initiative that helps people with disabilities, and Indiana's own Bosma Enterprises.

For the past 25 years of Bosma's 100 years in business, their partnership with AbilityOne has helped disabled Hoosiers achieve a greater level of independence and enabled many to gain employment in good-paying jobs.

Nearly 60 percent of all employees there are blind or suffer some degree of visual impairment. One such man is Don Green. Don is totally blind and found it very difficult to reenter the job market. About to give up after almost 200 job rejections, Don applied to Bosma, which, because of its contracts through AbilityOne, was able to hire him as a material handler. Just 6 years later, Mr. Speaker, Don is a production supervisor, managing 40 people.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the work that Bosma Enterprises is doing in partnership with the AbilityOne Program. They open doors of opportunity and help make the State of Indiana, my beloved State, a better place to live each and every day.

THE AMERICAN PATENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from New York (Mr. KATKO).

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ABUSE

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about important issues that face our society, domestic violence and sexual abuse.

As a former Federal prosecutor for the last two decades, I witnessed how violence affects people of all ages, races, religions, and socioeconomic conditions. Domestic violence does not discriminate.

Our country has a moral obligation to stand up against those who exploit their power to commit violence against men, women, and children.

In an effort to raise awareness and to put an end to domestic violence and sexual abuse, my district will be kicking off the White Ribbon Campaign. The White Ribbon Campaign is one of the largest efforts in the world of people working together to prevent and end domestic violence and sexual assault against women, men, and children. The White Ribbon Campaign will begin this Friday, March 20, and run through March 29.

Vera House of Syracuse, New York, is spearheading the local effort in my district. Vera House is a comprehensive domestic and sexual violence service agency that provides shelter, advocacy, and counseling services for women, children, and men. They also provide education and prevention programs and community coordination.

Vera House will be providing white ribbons, such as the one on my lapel here, and white wrist bands, such as the white one on my wrist here today, in an effort to build awareness and put a stop to domestic violence and sexual abuse.

From March 20 to March 29, thousands of my constituents in central New York will be wearing a white ribbon or a white wristband to raise awareness about domestic violence and sexual abuse.

I encourage my House colleagues to join me and New York's 24th Congressional District in wearing a white ribbon to put a spotlight on this very important issue. Wearing the white ribbon demonstrates a personal pledge to never commit, condone, or remain silent about violence against men, women, or children.

I hope my country can join me today to support survivors of abuse while providing alternatives to this destructive cycle.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone paid attention to that wonderful idea that has just been given to us.

These Special Orders play a role here in that we permit ourselves the opportunity to hear from people for a little bit more than 1 minute to talk about issues that are significant and who would like to bring them to the attention of the American people and, of course, to their colleagues here in Congress.

Today I intend to bring the attention of the American people and my colleagues to a threat to the well-being of the American people, a major threat that has gone unrecognized and could well change our way of life and change the way of life for our children and destroy one of the basic rights that were written into our Constitution in order to protect the prosperity and security of our country.

I am talking about the changes that are being proposed in our fundamental technology law, in our patent system. And I know that sounds very boring to most people. But the fact is, without a strong patent system, the American people would be at the mercy of both competitors, in terms of their labor overseas, but also in terms of the vicious and totalitarian elements in other countries that might want to do us harm.

□ 1245

It is our ability to produce the technology that America needs in order to make our people competitive and to produce the wealth that is necessary for a decent standard of living that has made America the great country that it is. We are a great country not because we have very powerful and wealthy interests here in the United States, which we do. We are a great country because ordinary people are permitted to live decent lives and because our country has not been challenged throughout its history over and over again and had to waste all of our resources and all of our wealth on vast amounts of armaments and drafting all of our people into the military and having a militarized society in order to have us safe from a foreign threat. No. What we have done is we have been able to produce wealth dramatically in our country and had our workers' being competitive with labor from around the world because we have been technologically superior.

Mr. Speaker, there is a threat to that technology superiority, an incredible threat that is being foisted off on the Congress and the American people. I am here to alert my fellow Members of Congress to this threat.

One needs only to see how important the technology element of our society has been right here in the United States Congress. There is a statue here in the Capitol to Philo Farnsworth. Now, who the heck knows who Philo Farnsworth was? Well, not many. But there is a statue to him here because he represents a very significant part of the American story.

Philo Farnsworth was a farmer in Utah, a man who was educated in engineering, but a man who had very little resources. He set out in between farming to try to find and discover a technological secret that had perplexed some of the most powerful and financial interests in our country.

RCA, at that time under a man named David Sarnoff, was America's premier technology company, a company that had vast resources and was deeply involved in trying to find out how to invent a picture tube, how we would have a tube that showed images rather than just radio waves that had voice on them. This was a huge challenge and a historic challenge. RCA pumped millions of dollars of research into this.

The one who discovered this secret was Philo Farnsworth, an independent inventor, a man who was a farmer in Utah. He discovered the secret and then wrote to RCA very naively believing that this big corporation would honor his discovery and permit him to have the benefit—or at least a benefit—from this discovery.

Yes, then RCA sent Philo Farnsworth a representative from their laboratories. When he described what he had found, the scientist from RCA went away saying, ''We will be in touch,'' and never got in touch. The next thing that Philo knew was that there was an announcement that RCA had made a major breakthrough in discovery—only it was exactly the discovery that Philo Farnsworth had made and had transmitted the information to RCA.

This became one of the great jury and great legal battles of the early 20th century. Philo Farnsworth, an individual person, was up against the most powerful American corporation of the day, RCA, and had one of the strongest and toughest leaders of that corporation, David Sarnoff, who vowed not to give him a penny and not to recognize him because it was RCA that actually came up with this.

Philo Farnsworth was able to mobilize support behind his claim. He was able to have people invest in his lawsuits, and slowly but surely they made their way through our court system all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States. God bless the United States of America. A single man, a poor, individual farmer who had come up with an important technology secret had his rights respected by our Supreme Court over the power and influence of America's most powerful corporation of the day, RCA.

Philo Farnsworth was recognized as the inventor, the inventor of the picture tube which has transformed our country and transformed the world. All the picture tubes you see, and now the screens that we see on our computers, can be traced back to the discovery of this one individual, Philo Farnsworth, and the tragedy that his life was because, over the years, he lived a very poor life. He was constantly in struggle. He had very little resources. By the time he won the Supreme Court case, it was late in his life, and he did not benefit, as he should have greatly, from that.

We have a statue to this wonderful American, a man who stands for what America stands for, using technology to benefit the people, not just to enrich huge corporate interests. Indeed, Philo Farnsworth has a statue here in the Capitol. But you will never see a statue to David Sarnoff of RCA. That shows you where the heart and soul of America is.

The fact that we had a Supreme Court that decided for the little guy rather than the huge, powerful corporation showed what kind of country we have. That is what makes America great. That is what has created the new technologies that have uplifted our people and made sure that our people were competitive and, thus, had high standards of living and that we were secure from foreign threats because we were technologically superior to those foreign threats.

This is what has made America great, and today it is in jeopardy. The technological edge of our country will be robbed from us by multinational corporations who are powerful and are shifting issues through the Congress that will greatly diminish the patent protection of the American people. Had these same changes in the law that these multinational corporations would now foist upon us been the law in the days of Philo Farnsworth, we would have no picture tube. We would never have had a Philo Farnsworth. We would never have had the recognition of the creative genius of the American people. Instead, we would have had the powerful, rich, multinational corporations running roughshod over America's creative genius.

No. We have that threat today, and I would ask people to pay close attention to what is happening here on the floor of House in the next few months. What has happened is we have to understand that patent protection of the American people is something that was written into our Constitution. It is part of the heart and soul of our country.

Benjamin Franklin is well-known as the man who discovered electricity, but he was also one of the great Founders of our Declaration of Independence and, yes, one of the people who authored our Constitution—Benjamin Franklin, the great technology hero, the hero of liberty and just for all.

If you go to Monticello and visit Thomas Jefferson's home, it is filled with inventions, small inventions. Thomas Jefferson knew that we were not going to rely on Big Government, we couldn't rely on big corporate interests and rich people, but we would rely on the genius of the American people through technology. Freedom and technology are the two things that would uplift ordinary Americans. Those things are now at stake. They are now in danger.

We, in fact, are now facing basic changes to the concept of intellectual property rights, and especially the rights of our inventors, and it is being foisted upon this body in what I would say is a very deceitful manner by powerful interest groups from the outside. But remember, with the protection that we have had, America has had the inventions. We have uplifted the standard of living of the ordinary American.

We built the reaper, which permitted us to harvest huge crops of food so that Americans were well-fed, and we became the breadbasket of the world; the cotton gin which made sure that people had clothing. There was a Black American who invented the machine that permitted the mass production of shoes. The mass production of shoes was permitted because a Black American whose other rights were not protected, his rights to own the intellectual property, the inventions, the patent rights to his invention, were respected. Because of that, all Americans ended up with being able to have more than just one pair of shoes. Before this man invented his invention of how to mass produce shoes, ordinary people had one pair of shoes and that was it. That was it. When they wore out, your feet wore out.

We had things like the electric light that we know that Thomas Edison was so involved with; telephones, Alexander Graham Bell. All the major inventions that we have were invented by American genius, not of very powerful corporations, but of the American genius of the American people.

What we have always had, however, is a situation where big guys did try to steal the creativity of the little guy, but in our country, they couldn't get away with it. In our country, the Philo Farnsworths knew that they would be protected if they created something that uplifted their fellow man. So Americans and American genius was put to work as never before in any country's history to make sure ordinary people, and especially our working people in our factories and our companies, could be competitive with those factories and companies and the workers overseas.

Our people don't work harder than the people overseas. That is not what made us a great country. The fact is people work really hard all over the world, especially in Third World countries where people live in utter poverty. They work really hard. But it is the technology that is put into play, the technology put into play with that hard work and the profit motive for investing in that technology and creating that technology, that is what has made the difference in an American people that are well-fed, American people with great opportunities, American people who can be proud that they have a decent standard of living and are able to make decisions for themselves and their families, not just live in the abject poverty that existed for so long in so much of the world.

No, it wasn't just our hard work. It wasn't just our natural resources. It was a Constitution that wrote into it the rights of every individual citizen. And paramount to those rights, even before the Bill of Rights in our Constitution, is a provision that guarantees that our inventors and our writers will be given the right to own, to control their invention or their book for a given period of time and profit from it.

Traditionally, our inventors have had ownership rights to what they have invented for 17 years of protection. During that 17 years, they would own it, and when they applied for a patent, once that patent was issued, they would have 17 years to control what they had invented. Also, until that patent was issued, it has always been, in the United States, kept totally secret

what that invention is until the inventor has been actually granted the rights to own that invention.

Well, these things have led directly to a genius, a surge of genius in our borders that reflected the fact that our people had freedom and technology available to them. So these are things that we have taken for granted because this is what America is all about.

But today, powerful multinational corporations, especially in the electronics industry, are trying to destroy America's patent system. My colleagues should now understand this, and the American people should understand this and be talking to their Member of Congress and their Senators, because if they succeed in undermining our patent system and destroying the rights of the little guy to own what he has created and give the big guys the power to steal from the little guys, we will see a difference in our country. Within a generation, we will no longer have these advantages that I just spoke about. What we have today is an effort by the big guys to change the rules so they can get away with stealing from the little guys.

Now, obviously, people aren't going to come out and just say: ''Please let's vote for a bill that is going to break down the patent system so that big, multinational corporations can steal from American inventors.'' Of course they are not going to say that. So what do they say? Well, let me put it this way. 25 years ago when I first noticed—this fight has been going on the entire time that I have been in Congress.

I noticed that what had happened was that some big corporations were trying to put into the GATT implementation—GATT is a trade treaty. They were trying to put into that trade treaty's implementation language a bill that had to go through Congress, changes in our patent system that weren't even required by the treaty. I will get into what they were doing if you really want to see how heinous and sinister this is.

What were those changes 25 years ago that these big corporations wanted to make? Number one was saying that, yes, when you apply for your patent, 20 years after you apply for it, you really have no patent rights after that at all, even if it takes 15 years to get your patent.

□ 1300

The American system was the clock starts ticking when you get your patent, 17 years of protection. These big guys were trying to give our American inventors maybe no protection. After 20 years, they had nothing.

But everybody would know about it because the second provision they were trying to foist off on us was that after 18 months, if a patent had been applied for, after 18 months, even if the patent had not been granted, they were going to publish the patent application, so that every thief in the world would have heard all of the secrets of every American inventor.

They called it the Patent Application Publication Act, they were so blatant about it. After we fingered it and drew America's attention to it, they changed the name, of course.

Then it became an issue of not trying to disclose patents or patent applications, not trying to limit the amount of ownership that our patent people had; it became, instead, a battle against the ''submarine patentors.'' That is what they called it.

That was the bogeyman that was created that day in order to get people here to vote in a way that would destroy the patent rights of the American people, the patent rights that I just outlined.

Both of those were going to be eliminated. You are going to have, instead of no disclosure, you will have full disclosure of your patent application, even before you are granted the patent, and you are not guaranteed any specific time, but your patent was going to run out after 20 years, even if you had never had any time to protect it. That is what they were trying to do, and we managed to stop them.

We put a coalition together, a bipartisan coalition. MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio and myself have been active on this issue for the last 25 years, trying to thwart these huge corporate interests who are trying to neuter the rights of the little guy, of the small inventor, of the independent operator.

How did we stop them that very first time? Well, we added an amendment on that said these changes that are being foisted on us today—or being voted on today—only apply to companies that have over 100 employees.

All of a sudden, those people who were advocating this saying, Oh, this will be good for everybody, especially the small inventor, all of a sudden, they had to withdraw the bill.

Well, if it was so good for the little guy, why would they withdraw the bill? Well, they withdrew the bill because the bill was aimed at helping huge corporate interests to step on the little guy in the United States.

We defeated that, but we have been fighting, fighting, fighting for 20 years; and this year, it looks like we have lost the leverage that we had to defeat these powerful special interests.

That is why it is important for the American people and people involved in technology development to pay attention to proposals that are being made here in the House and in the Senate concerning intellectual property rights, especially concerning the patent rights that our people have enjoyed, as I say, since the founding of our country.

Today, we have a bill that is being presented. Again, it can't be presented on how do we destroy the patent rights of the average American. They have to find something that sounds so sinister that they can set up a straw man. They will say, Look at him, we are going to beat him up. That is what this bill is about.

Just like I said, submarine patents were the reason why they had to eliminate the right of the small inventor to a guaranteed term or to have confidentiality in its patent application like before. That was a submarine patent.

Well, now, they are not saying that. They have had to come up with a better term that is even more frightening and sickening than submarine patent. The cynical nature of this type of debate on an issue was demonstrated by the fact that a corporate leader, who was on the other side of this issue than I am, has now changed his position and come to me with a description of how the words ''patent troll'' came about because, now, we hear that we have got to change the law, not for submarine patents, but now because patent trolls are preying on the American people, they are draining us of funds and enriching themselves, these patent trolls.

Well, where did that word come from? This gentleman that I am talking about was in a meeting with the heads of some very powerful corporations. They sat around in a circle to decide what term they should use.

He said to me: Well, I recommended ''patent pirate.'' Well, that wasn't sinister enough, so they came up with patent troll.

By the time everyone heard that: Yes, that is the one.

Well, why is it the one? Because it sounds so sinister that it is going to be able to blind people as to who the real victim is. Now, we are out to get the patent troll, but it is the little guy, it is the small inventor, it is the independent inventors that are going to be damaged severely by an attack on a patent troll.

Now, what is a patent troll, by what they are trying to tell us? Patent troll—we keep hearing the argument that there are people in our society that are using, basically, patents that are not really good patents.

They are patents that really are not legitimate patents, and they are using these to create litigation that will enrich the lawyers—the patent trolls—because the patent trolls just reach out with some illegitimate patent claim, and then they have to get paid off or they have to go to jail.

Well, how much of this is there? There is some of that, but let us note this: There are frivolous lawsuits throughout our entire system; there are frivolous lawsuits in almost every endeavor in the American economy, but there are also legitimate lawsuits. There are people who are really damaged and deserve to have the right to sue somebody.

The law that we are facing now, that is being proposed here in Congress for a patent law, is the equivalent of eliminating the right of people to sue someone who has done damage to them in order to prevent a frivolous lawsuit from happening.

Do we really want to neuter the rights of people? Because some people abuse the system, you are going to

take the 90 percent of the cases where it is not being abused or 95 percent of the cases where it is a legitimate suit and eliminate that right in order to handle the frivolous suits? That is what is happening.

Although we are being told that all of the suits are frivolous and that the inventors are being portrayed as money-grubbers, these guys trying to take advantage of these big corporations—yeah, right. The little guy is trying to take advantage of the big guy, and that is why we have got to pass a law that dramatically restricts the rights of the little guy to deal with an infringement by a big corporation.

What this bill is, H.R. 9, and it is waiting to be brought to the floor. It could be brought to the floor in the next week, month, 2 months; we don't know yet. This bill dramatically undercuts the rights of legitimate patentholders to enforce their patents.

The patent troll element comes in with this. Today, if you are a small inventor and a large corporate interest has been infringing on your invention, if you own it for 17 years—after that, by the way, everybody can use it for free—but during that 17 years, you have a right to be compensated for the fact that you are the one who discovered this.

You invested your time and your effort and your scarce resources in order to come up with this new discovery, yes; and they have a right then to try to bring, if a large corporation is using it without paying them royalties, they have a right to bring suit.

But many of them don't have those resources. They don't have any money. They are, indeed, independent small inventors up against corporations that are worth billions of dollars and, I might say, multinational corporations.

These aren't just an American David Sarnoff. A lot of these corporations we are talking about are multinational corporations, and they have nothing to do with the American interests. They have everything to do with the interest of making money for their stockholders and their company, which is multinational, which is global in scope and not an American company necessarily.

We are going to undercut American inventors' rights to try to enforce their patent from being stolen by multinational corporations. That is what this bill does.

This is, to me, in my 25 or 26 years here in Congress, the best example of crony capitalism that I have ever seen. What is crony capitalism? That is when we pass laws and we set up regulations that are aimed at—what—helping the big guy in relationship to the little guy.

Crony capitalism is when the little guys pay and end up having their rights trampled upon, but the big guys are protected by different laws and clauses that we put into law here in Washington in the House and in the Senate.

Well, the bogeyman this time, as I say, is the patent troll. The patent troll is what? The patent troll is someone—although I wouldn't call him a patent troll. I would say there is a person who is willing to join with a small inventor—or independent inventor—to see that his patent is enforced.

We are not talking about phony patents; we are talking about legitimate patents. We are not talking about frivolous claims; we are talking about legitimate claims to patent claims of an inventor, but the inventor does not have the strength to enforce that against a big corporation that has an unlimited budget.

This bill would make it dramatically more difficult for anyone to enlist someone who is not the inventor to help them press their case against the infringement, the stuff that they had.

By the way, if this law, H.R. 9, was passed and would have been law at the time of Philo Farnsworth, Philo Farnsworth would have been beaten up, kicked around, stepped upon, and he would not have had any benefit from his invention of the picture tube.

Do we want a country in which the big guys are able to do that to the small inventors? How long are we going to be on top of things? How long will the standard of living of our people stay high and our businesses competitive and our country safe and secure because of technological advances? How long will that last if we are stepping on the little guy and we fundamentally change the nature of technology law in our country? That is what is happening.

This bill passed last year in the House, and it was stopped in the Senate. Let me note that one of the amendments that I personally had to propose that demonstrate how bad this bill is—although I managed to win the one amendment that we were able to win—was they wanted to take away the rights of an inventor to sue the Patent Office if, indeed, the Patent Office was not legally acting in terms of his patent application.

In other words, if a government agency was doing something illegally, using illegal criteria—maybe because someone else was influencing the decision from the outside, maybe there was just some sort of personality problem, maybe it was corruption from within—but if an independent inventor sees that he is being treated and is being dealt with in a way that is not consistent with the law, the small inventor has always had a right, just like any other American, to sue and take his case to court.

This is how blatant H.R. 9 is. That bill contained a provision that said the small inventor can't take his case to court. They are going to neuter the small inventor of his right to take it to court; and he has to, instead, go to an ombudsman at the Patent Office—oh, my, an ombudsman, how nice.

Eliminating the right of an American citizen and inventor in order to—what—in order to send him to a government bureaucrat and the agency that he thinks has done him wrong, rather than having a day in court.

□ 1315

That exemplifies everything that is in H.R. 9, and it is so cynical because what we have got is, again, the American people saying, ''Look at this straw man.'' It is called ''straw man argumentation.'' Let's build up a straw man—the trolls—and everybody will think that we are aiming at the trolls when, in fact, the real targets are the little guys—the American independent inventors—the little guys who can't afford without some help from the outside to enforce their patents.

There is nothing wrong with someone investing in an inventor who says, ''Look, I have got my whole life's savings in this. I have invented this, but this big corporation refuses to give me any royalties from my patent.'' There is nothing wrong with trying to help that inventor enforce his rights—there is nothing wrong at all—but the straw man is that person who is actually investing in this. Now, he didn't invent it, and he is going to profit by it. Thus, he is a troll. No. That person is fulfilling an important role in not permitting outside people to invest in inventions and with inventors.

By doing that, what we have done is diminish the value of every American patent. That understanding defeated this bill in the Senate last year because our American universities understood that, if that went in, the value of all of these patents that the American universities have been developing would dramatically go down. It diminishes the value of all patents when you eliminate that right of the people to invest in patent enforcement. That makes sense.

So there was an upheaval at almost every American major university and in many other industries that deal directly with long-term research and development, like the pharmaceutical industry, for example. They knew that we could not allow this to happen. That was stopped in the Senate the last time around. People realized that this type of crony capitalist attempt was to the detriment of the American people.

We have some of the most powerful multinational corporations still at play, trying to push this through this session of Congress. People have to know that H.R. 9 is crony capitalism personified. They need to talk to their Congressmen, and my colleagues need to talk to each other about this bill and not just accept what is being handed to them as something that has made its way through the committee process.

This bill destroys the rights of discovery for the little guy. This suit basically doesn't do anything to go up against frivolous lawsuits, but it deems all of the legitimate cases and puts them in the same category as frivolous

lawsuits. H.R. 9 causes fees, and fees on defending infringement would be leveled not on the guys who have committed the crime. We are actually leveling fees on the people who are trying to enforce their rights. We are asking people to pay more money in order to enforce their rights.

It destroys, for example, the treble damage awards. Now, what does that mean? If you are a little guy, to get a lawyer to help you, that lawyer has to know he is going to make a profit when getting involved in a suit against a big corporation. Today, they have what they call triple damages. If the corporation knows that it is infringing on the little guy, there are triple damages. They are trying to get rid of those triple damages and say, ''No, only actual damages.''

What does that mean? The little guy can never afford to hire a lawyer. The lawyers won't get involved. You can see these big corporations, they certainly have all of the legal help they need. Basically, that provision alone neuters the leverage that a small inventor has to get some legal help in his battle to defend his or her own property rights.

This bill, by the way, fails to identify—and it even sometimes protects—lawyers who are operating on bad faith with frivolous lawsuits, as compared to trying to help—let's deter frivolous lawsuits, but let's not do it by eliminating the rights of people who have legitimate claims against big corporations.

There is another bill now emerging. In the House, it is H.R. 9. It is a disaster. We need to make sure people know that the American people have been tipped off and that we are not going to let this happen by the major, huge corporations like Google, which is one of the main groups behind this trying to rip off these little guys. We are not going to allow that to happen, and they are not going to rip us off either.

This has been recognized in the Senate. Like I said, it was stopped the last time, so there is a bill in the Senate, S. 632. Senator COONS has put this bill in. This bill reasserts the condition of willful infringement. Basically, it reinforces the idea that, if a company is willfully infringing, this is something that someone needs to be paid for and compensated for because someone intentionally stepped on his rights. It gives the PTO the discretion to award damages in these cases when you see that a big company has willfully said, We will ignore the fact that we know this group invented it. Ignore that. Just go ahead, and if they try to sue us, we will step on them, or we will get the rules of the game changed in Congress so that they don't have a chance to sue us.

S. 632, the Coons bill in the Senate, specifically allows higher education and smaller entities to be identified as legitimate owners. Thus, we are protecting the actual little guys and their educational institutions. What we also have in the Senate bill is something that identifies bad faith in these demand letters. There are frivolous lawsuits. It actually gives strength and power to thwart these frivolous lawsuits without damaging the rights of the small inventor and the traditional rights of the American people.

We are up against a major fight, but here we have a good piece of legislation in the Senate, in the Coons bill, S. 632, and in a crony capitalism bill, H.R. 9, here in the House. The American people have to at times get involved or things will go haywire in our country. We don't have the rights and privileges that every American enjoys simply because they are in the Constitution. Over the years, the American people have stepped up when they have seen that their rights were being trampled upon.

The big guys were always around, trying to steal from the little guys, but as we saw in the case of Philo Farnsworth, we have a commitment to America's little guys. As for the men and women who maybe are not rich but who have a creative genius that will uplift all of us, we have made a commitment to them. H.R. 9 breaks that commitment and destroys their ability to actually benefit from their own creative genius.

I would ask my colleagues to spend time reading H.R. 9 and consider the straw man argument—the trolls. Get beyond the slogan, and see what effect it will have, and ask small inventors—independent inventors—and educators what impact the changes in H.R. 9 will have. Once the legislators here in the House do, and once they understand the damage that this will do to the American people and how the little guy is going to be stepped upon, they will vote against it, but they have to have their attention drawn to this.

People are busy here in Washington. The biggest problem is getting the attention of our colleagues to pay attention to a bill like H.R. 9. That is part of what the citizenry has to do if our process is going to work. They need to be talking to their Congressmen. They need to be talking to their Senators. Whether you are an educator and you deal with patents of your educational institution or whether you are an independent inventor and have an idea that will make Americans more productive and more competitive or make our country safer, you are the treasure house of this country, and they are trying to destroy that treasure right now.

I call on my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 9 and to work with the Senate to try to have the Senate bill intertwined and to come to a compromise so we can have a positive bill here in the House and so we can move forward in a positive way to make sure that Americans remain prosperous, that Americans remain secure, and that Americans remain free. That is what our Constitution was all about. That is what Thomas Jefferson was all about, and that is what Benjamin Franklin was all about. That is what we are supposed to be all about.

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

IN MEMORY OF FIREFIGHTER DANIEL CORRIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of local Santa Barbara, California, firefighter Daniel Corrigan.

Dan was born and raised in Hayward, California, where he played football and attended Moreau Catholic High School. Dan earned his degree in mechanical engineering from Cal Poly Pomona, and he began his firefighting career with the Fresno Fire Department in 2007. In 2013, Dan joined the Santa Barbara City Fire Department, where he made a tremendous impact not only on his colleagues but on the entire community.

Throughout his career, Dan was recognized by his colleagues for his hard work ethic, his considerable intelligence, and enjoyable sense of humor.

That is why we were all so deeply saddened by the unexpected news when Dan passed away 2 weeks ago. He was just 35. His loss came much too early for a beloved hero who devoted so much of himself to serve his community.

Dan is survived by his pregnant fiancée, Sarah; by his son, Jack; by his sisters Debbie and Rosanne; and by his parents, John and Anne.

Our thoughts and prayers are with them all at this sad time.

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

WOMEN'S AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, every year during the month of March, we celebrate the contributions to events in history and modern society by women. We call it Women's History Month, but in my district, in the U.S. Virgin Islands, the month of March is also commemorated as Virgin Islands History Month.

So, in keeping with both customs, I would like to take the time to recognize a few Virgin Islanders who have broken the glass ceiling for women in the upper echelons of law in the territory and, indeed, in the United States, and who inspired generations of young women to do the same:

The Honorable Eileen Ramona Peterson, who became the first female judge in the U.S. Virgin Islands in 1971; the Honorable J'ada Finch-Sheen, who later became the first female sworn in

as attorney general of the Virgin Islands; and the Honorable Wilma Lewis, who, among a long list of noteworthy accomplishments, was the first African American woman to serve as inspector general to the U.S. Department of the Interior and, later, as the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. Judge Lewis currently serves as the chief judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands.

Our fight for law and justice and equality comes from our history, and that fight has often been led by women, women such as Queen Mary Thomas, who, along with three other women, led a revolt in the streets of St. Croix to protest unfair labor wages and deplorable working conditions in 1878.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize these women because their work and their contributions have allowed many Virgin Islands women to ascend through the glass ceiling. Their contributions made it possible for a young girl from the Virgin Islands—myself—to become a New York assistant district attorney, to be at the Justice Department and to later serve as the fifth-elected Delegate to Congress from the U.S. Virgin Islands.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, it troubles me to see the political gamesmanship that is delaying the confirmation of Loretta Lynch as the next Attorney General of the United States. By all accounts, she is highly qualified and regarded, and would make a great Attorney General. I am urging my colleagues in the Senate Chamber to bring Ms. Lynch's confirmation to a vote. Place your objections on the record.

□ 1330

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the story out in a number of media, like this from Breitbart, ''First Details of Iran Deal: Allows 6,000 Centrifuges, Rolls Back the U.N. Arms Embargo.'' That story talks about in order to entice Iran to cut back to 6,000 or 6,500 centrifuges, elements of the U.N. arms embargo against Iran could be rolled back.

I think it is important to recall, it hasn't been that long ago that a principal cornerstone of the discussions between the Obama administration and the—I have to be careful the words I use here on the House floor—America-killing Iran administration was going to require them to dismantle their efforts toward nuclear production, and now they are floating a draft that is going to allow them to have thousands of centrifuges.

Now, I have been advised by people at the IAEA in Vienna that, actually, if they just have 3,000 centrifuges, with all of the uranium that has been enriched to 5 percent, they only need 3,000 to take it up to 90 percent. Once you are at 5 percent, it seems like it would be a long way to get to 90, but actually it is just a matter of weeks.

You could do it easily in a facility that would be easy to hide, because you could take those 3,000 in a facility 30 meters by 70 meters and you could enrich from 5 to 90 percent at weapons grade uranium, have the nukes that at least at one time Ayatollah Khamenei has indicated—I understand still believes—that they can hasten the return of the 12th imam, the Mahdi, to rule over this world caliphate, and they can do so because they believe the prophecy is that he will arise—the 12th imam, as the Mahdi, the head of the caliphate, this world caliphate, he will arise out of chaos, and they believe that could be nuclear chaos.

So, in effect, if this administration agrees to allow even 1,500 centrifuges to continue to spin in Iran, he is hastening the demise of millions of people, ultimately. A new Holocaust. Now, it is one thing when leaders in the United States could say, ''Gee, we didn't know that millions of Jews were being killed by Hitler; gee, we just didn't know,'' but there came a point where it became very clear, and Hitler and his subordinates really tried to hide what they were doing.

Iran has made no bones about what they want to do. They want to wipe Israel off the map. First of all, they are never going to eliminate all of the Jews in the world; it will not happen. As God is my witness, that will not happen. What will happen, as anybody, including this administration, if they are intent on going there, to allow Iran to continue to move toward nuclear weapons under this so-called nuclear agreement, they move there, it will cause judgment to come down on our country for allowing something so horrific to become possible when we had the means to stop it.

This is no time for anyone who is a civilized individual, who believes in the rights of men, the rights of women, the rights of children, to be cutting a deal with these cutthroats in Iran. Nobody seems to want to talk about it, but Iran has drug this thing out for over a year.

Perhaps Valerie Jarrett was working a deal even longer than that. There were reports that she was negotiating with them early on, trying to see if something could be done. Whether that is true or not, clearly what Iran has done is drug out the talks, continued to increase the number of centrifuges it has spinning, continued to move toward the ability to have a tremendous amount of 5 percent enrichment so that it very quickly can move to 90 percent and develop the nukes.

They would likely develop a number of them at the same time, not just do one. They would do a number and then spread them out so that, once they move into nuclear mode, they have several. You try to take them out at that point; you are going to find one or more of them in cities that you care about. So we should never allow that to even become possible.

When I see this deal, I see all these articles about it, then I see this article ''Obama Planning Drastic Shake-Up in Policy Toward Israel.'' So because the people of Israel, in their election, made clear, ''We would prefer not to be wiped out by Iran, and we can tell that the deal that the Obama administration is cutting is bad for Israel and puts us at extreme risk,'' they gave more seats than were expected to the Likud Party, Netanyahu's party.

What is the response of the Obama administration after they threw everything they possibly could, threw temper tantrums about Prime Minister Netanyahu speaking from right here just to tell us his perspective on the Iranian deal because his country is most at risk? Those that refused to understand—it isn't just Israel at risk—may pay at the cost of thousands or millions of lives. These people have no respect for the lives of people who are not radical Islamists, as they are.

So you might think: Oh, gee, maybe the Obama administration learned a lesson; let's don't try to interfere in the election process in a foreign country. It does make you wonder, you know, there were all those rumors about since the Obama money was never audited in his original campaign in 2008 and there were massive numbers of $50 contributions with credit cards, where did those come from? Were any of those foreign?

We have seen allegations about money coming in to Hillary Clinton's campaign from foreigners. We know in Bill Clinton's campaign they got caught redhanded with money from monks that was given to Vice President Al Gore, but, you know, foreigners are not supposed to be able to influence our elections. It appears that potentially they have.

If that were true—don't know for certain because there wasn't an audit done, but maybe that would help explain why this administration is so quick to get involved in the election process in Israel to try to destroy Netanyahu, who was more concerned with the preservation of the nation of Israel than he was in getting another Nobel Peace Prize for this administration.

But this, dated today, by Melanie Batley says:

> The White House on Wednesday suggested it could reverse its decades-old policy of using its veto in the United Nations Security Council to protect Israel. It could refuse to veto resolutions related to the Palestinians or introduce a measure of its own, The Wall Street Journal reported.
>
> The U.S. could also lend its support to a two-state solution based on Israel's 1967 borders, a senior White House official told The New York Times: ''We're currently evaluating our approach,'' State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said, according to the Journal. ''We're not going to prejudge what we would do if there was a U.N. action.''

She should have said ''if there were,'' but she said ''if there was.''

The article also says:

The Obama administration in the past has shielded Israel at the Security Council, using a veto to strike down a resolution condemning Israeli settlement activity in Palestinian territory.

Now, Obama officials may decide to allow Israel to be exposed to more international pressure in an attempt to force them back into negotiating.

This is what I would call a deal to hasten the attempted demise of Israel.

It is interesting, though, ''We're currently evaluating our approach,'' the State Department said, because we were told by a Muslim Brothers publication in December of 2012 that—yes, I believe it was 2012. It was before the fall of Muslim Brother Morsi as President of Egypt, but it was a Muslim Brothers-approved publication in Egypt that bragged about the six top advisers in the Obama administration who they bragged were Muslim Brothers.

Now, some in the media don't want to do anything but vilify me for pointing out what the Muslim Brothers have pointed out, but for a number of years I tried to advise the Homeland Security Department that you have elevated a man to the top advisory council, given him a secret security clearance, allowed him to access documents, which I was told by people, I believe, including the director of DPS in Texas, that we know that this man downloaded two documents. We know he downloaded them with his personal computer at his home, and then the report from Patrick Poole, the reporter, that he had direct indication from a national media outlet that Mr. Elibiary had shopped those documents to this national media outlet, who happened to refuse.

I asked Secretary Napolitano about it. She said she knew nothing about it. That was interesting, because her chief told the director of Texas Department of Public Safety the night before, who advised me the night before, that she had been totally briefed on what Elibiary had done. When I brought it up the next day, either she lied in front of our committee or her close staff member lied to the Department of Public Safety director in Texas the night before.

But we do know this. Later when I again asked her about it and if it had been investigated, she said that DHS had looked into it and there was nothing to it. Yet, when there was a FOIA request for the documents pertaining to the investigation, there were no documents that supported that there ever was an investigation. So either, again, the Department of Homeland Security Secretary lied, committed a crime, or DHS lied and there were documents about that investigation.

In any event, last September, the Homeland Security Department, after years of being warned about this person they kept elevating, after one of the ISIS videos hit television and showed the Islamic State cutting off the head of an American, this top adviser to our Homeland Security Department tweeted out, basically, the caliphate's inevitable; people just need to get used to the idea. That was the basis of it. So at Homeland Security, they allowed him to go ahead and not be renewed as a top adviser to Homeland Security.

We also know that Imam Magid, who had been head of the Islamic Society of North America, which Islamic Society of North America was aimed as a coconspirator in the largest prosecution for supporting terrorism in the history of the United States in going after the Holy Land Foundation in Dallas, Texas, Federal Court. The Islamic Society of North America was named as a co-conspirator, as was the Council of American Islamic Relations, CAIR.

□ 1345

Although, we saw a story last year where they were thinking about changing their name to—I forget what the words were—but instead of CAIR, it would be WTF. I guess they thought better of having WTF be their symbolic letters representing who they are.

In any event, CAIR, ISNA, they were named coconspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial. When an effort was made to remove their names from being listed as coconspirators, the judge in the Federal court there in Dallas reviewed the evidence and said, No, there is evidence that supports having their names as coconspirators.

They appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals for the United States and all those judges looked at it and said, No, there is plenty of evidence here to support that these groups are coconspirators with the Holy Land Foundation—whose principals were convicted of supporting terrorism and sent to prison.

This administration gets sworn in within 2 months of the conviction, and instead of being careful about these groups that U.S. Federal courts had said we had plenty of evidence to show that they support terrorism, this administration neglected—refused—to consider that because they thought they knew better.

They brought the leaders of CAIR and ISNA into the realm of their close advisers; so is it any mystery that when Prime Minister Netanyahu was coming to Washington in May of 2011, the President sought advice—got advice—from the leader of this named coconspirator supporting terrorism, Imam Magid?

When the President gave this speech in the State Department itself, Imam Magid was there. This administration had obviously given him credentials to allow him not only in the White House, but in the inner sanctum of the State Department.

When I read, ''We are currently evaluating our approach,'' from the State Department, I can't help but wonder: Have you got Imam Magid in there—which this Egyptian Muslim Brother-approved article said was a Muslim Brother, a top adviser—have you got him in there helping advise you on how to go after Netanyahu and how to put Israel more at risk than you already have?

''We are evaluating our approach'' scares me—should scare others—when you know the kind of people that are giving this administration advice.

This article says:

The Obama administration in the past has shielded Israel at the Security Council, using a veto to strike down a resolution condemning Israeli settlement activity in Palestinian territory. Now, Obama officials may decide to allow Israel to be exposed to more international pressure in an attempt to force them back into negotiating a peace deal.

Well, Israel has eyes wide open as Iran continues to spin centrifuges and enrich uranium. They understand that their very existence is at risk; yet we have people here in Washington—this administration—that apparently are hearing from people saying, Oh, no, it's no problem. Israel is the real problem here.

Never mind the people that are advising this administration are more upset with Israel wanting to continue to exist than they are with Iran for wanting to wipe out Israel and the United States.

This should scare people in the United States because, as Prime Minister Netanyahu pointed out—though he didn't have to—he cares about the United States. He was educated here. He would like to see us continue to exist and be friends with Israel.

He pointed out, Look, they are developing intercontinental ballistic missiles. Those are not to hit us in Israel, he says, they are coming after us, but they really don't even need intercontinental ballistic missiles.

They can put them on a cargo ship and bring them right into our ports, bring them right up the Potomac River, into the Houston Ship Channel, into New Orleans. In between New Orleans and Houston, they can wipe out 70 percent of our refined gasoline, so we could be in a world of hurt in a real hurry.

The President's job is to help provide for the common defense, and it seems that his initiative is more to be opposed to anything Israel knows in its collective heart will keep them protected.

Unfortunately, that is not all the news. We look here and find this article from Newsmax:

Islamic State jihadists may have committed genocide in trying to wipe out the Yazidi minority in Iraq, the U.N. said Thursday in a report laying out a litany of atrocities. The Islamic State ''may have committed all three of the most serious international crimes—namely, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide,'' the United Nations human rights office said in a statement.

The agency published a horrifying report detailing killings, torture, rape, sexual slavery, and the use of child soldiers by the extremists. All of these crimes, it said, were

violations of international human rights and humanitarian law, and some may amount to ''crimes against humanity'' and ''war crimes.''

Further down, it says:

In numerous Yazidi villages, men and boys over the age of 14 were rounded up and shot, while the women and girls were abducted as the ''spoils of war.'' The report, which was ordered by the U.N. Human Rights Council last September, following a request from the Iraqi Government, pointed out that some villages ''were entirely emptied of their Yazidi population.''

Many Yazidi women and girls were sold into sexual slavery or handed over to Islamic State members as ''gifts,'' the report said, adding that witnesses had described hearing girls as young as 6 screaming for help as they were raped in a house used by Islamic State fighters.

A pregnant 19-year-old had told the investigators she had been repeatedly raped by a Islamic State ''doctor'' over a period of 2½ months and that he deliberately sat on her stomach, saying, ''This baby should die because it is an infidel. I can make a Muslim baby.''

We had the report in the last few weeks from a Catholic source in Nigeria where they have begged the United States for any help that it will give to try to stop Boko Haram and their efforts to wipe out Christians in Nigeria.

This source indicated that they had heard from the United States—from the Obama administration—that the Obama administration will only help them against Boko Haram if Nigeria will change its laws to allow same-sex marriage.

Well, apparently, once this administration got through ObamaCare, it promised the Catholic leaders, Christian leaders: Hey, we will never, ever refuse to allow you to practice your religious beliefs.

Well, that turned out to be a lie because, of course, they went after Catholic nuns, they went after the Catholic Church—well, at least those who actually practice what they hear preached in the Catholic Church—and any other Christian who believes that abortion is religiously wrong.

I guess after the administration broke its promise and went after and used the full force of the government to prevent people from practicing their religious beliefs and being able to conform their conduct to their religious beliefs, it was a no-brainer that they would then try to impose their religious beliefs—or lack thereof—upon countries like Nigeria or others in Africa or around the world.

There will be a price for the United States as a country to pay when we know about Jews being wiped out, when we know about Christians being wiped out, and God has blessed us with the ability to protect ourselves and to stop such genocide; not only do we do nothing to stop it, we demand that they abandon their Christian beliefs before we will offer any help.

There will be a price to pay for the United States of America for being so callous as Christians and Jews around the world are suffering in numbers like never before.

I applaud my friend BRAD SHERMAN. This article from Pam Key today quotes Sherman as saying:

I fear that you have misled this committee in telling us that once Iran has the rights of a nonnuclear state subject to additional protocol, that you'll be able to stop sneak-out, because you've said first that, well, they can't develop a nuclear weapon because that would be illegal. That's a preposterous argument. Obviously, they're willing to break the law.

My friend Mr. SHERMAN and I disagree on so much, but I know him to be an honorable man, and he understands Iran doesn't care about breaking deals. Any deal with Iran is like a deal with Hitler. The Soviet Union thought they could cut a deal with Hitler. The thing that their leaders were most mad about was that Hitler reached the agreement before they did because they had intentions, apparently, of breaching it.

We are somewhere between Neville Chamberlain and Stalin in trying to reach a deal with a modern-day Hitler, except Hitler didn't have some crazy religious idea that he should wipe out everybody in the world that didn't have the exact same religious beliefs that he did.

Look, we are on the side of right. President al-Sisi in Egypt is on the side of right. Saudi Arabia, the UAE, all over the Middle East, they are becoming afraid because this administration is on the verge of cutting a deal that will allow Iran to continue moving forward to not just one nuke, but many nukes, and a breakout could be a matter of weeks.

I know people are talking about it could be years, but when you hear from people that know that you could have a facility 30 meters by 70 meters and that you could sneak that 5 percent into a secret facility without people knowing and you could enrich it to 90 and have nuclear weapons, we ought to take notice.

We have been blessed with much, and to whom much is given, of them much is required. The world deserves better with what we have been blessed with in the way of power, and they deserve to have us stand up against Iran. It is time for us to bomb Iran's nuclear facilities.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, March 23, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning hour-debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for March 18 and today on account of a family medical emergency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 23, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

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. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, 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. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr.

POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 12. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Science, Space, and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 1457. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide for direct payment of statutory sound recording performance royalties to record producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 1458. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide bundled payments for post-acute care services under parts A and B of Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1459. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 1460. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study with respect to stormwater runoff from oil and gas operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1461. A bill to repeal certain provisions of titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1462. A bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1463. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a one-year employment restriction for ex-employees of the Securities and Exchange Commission seeking to work for companies against which the Commission brought enforcement actions that were participated on by such ex-employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1464. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1465. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health screening before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1466. A bill to repeal the USA PATRIOT Act and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Armed Services, 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. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HILL, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1467. A bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for pre-employment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 1468. A bill to galvanize United States Government programs in support of brain health for global victims of autism, hydrocephalus and Alzheimer's and other forms of dementia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1469. A bill to improve, coordinate, and enhance rehabilitation research at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes; 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. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1471. A bill to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1472. A bill to establish a modernized national Integrated Public Alert and Warning System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 1473. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1474. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the reissuance of Social Security account numbers to children in cases in which the confidentiality of the number has been compromised; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1475. A bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private

contributions to fund that Wall of Remembrance; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 1476. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from providing bailouts or other financial assistance to a pension plan of a State or political subdivision thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. YODER, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1477. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1478. A bill to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength or when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation places a lien against an insurance company's assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1479. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply budget neutrality on a State-specific basis in the calculation of the Medicare hospital wage index floor for non-rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1480. A bill to ensure access to certain information for financial services industry regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1481. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the small business industrial base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1482. A bill to repeal the exemption for hydraulic fracturing in the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1483. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to repeal wage requirements applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1484. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands to the State of Nevada in fulfillment of the Nevada Statehood Enabling Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1485. A bill to improve the control and management of invasive species that threaten and harm Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 1486. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to bring the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1487. A bill to free the private sector to harness domestic energy resources to create jobs and generate economic growth by removing statutory and administrative barriers; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, the Judiciary, and 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. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JONES, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 1488. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to include firearms in the types of property allowable under the alternative provision for exempting property from the estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 1489. A bill to seek the establishment of and contributions to an International Fund for Israeli-Palestinian Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1490. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1491. A bill to reform the housing finance system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and improve the credit for dependent care expenses and to provide a credit for education of employees of child care centers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1493. A bill to protect and preserve international cultural property at risk due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, 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. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit rollovers from retirement plans to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 1495. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for limitations on expenditures in elections for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1496. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the access to child care for certain veterans receiving health care at a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 1497. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require reporting by the Secretary of the Treasury of reduction measures being used to avoid defaulting on Government obligations in the event that the debt limit is reached, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. COOK, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 1498. A bill to direct the President to designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States citizens who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 1499. A bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 1500. A bill to ensure that certain TRICARE program beneficiaries may enroll in TRICARE Prime regardless of the location of their residence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1501. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the United States Postal Service may not close, consolidate, or sell any historic postal facility without prior congressional approval, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1502. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years payment parity with Medicare for primary

care services furnished under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1503. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, to establish a program to provide for workforce training and education, at community colleges, in sustainable energy; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JONES, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BARR, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 1504. A bill to prohibit regulations establishing certain limits for the school lunch program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1505. A bill to make the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass available at a discount to certain veterans; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1506. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate rules in an open proceeding with respect to updating its competitive bidding rules; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 1507. A bill to incentivize State support for postsecondary education and to promote increased access and affordability for higher education for students, including Dreamer students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. POSEY (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 1508. A bill to promote the development of a United States commercial space resource exploration and utilization industry and to increase the exploration and utilization of resources in outer space; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1509. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act to require the reinstatement of the draft whenever an authorization on the use of military force or declaration of war is in effect and to provide for the registration of women with the Selective Service System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1510. A bill to require that overseas contingency operations be paid for; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 1511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified elementary and secondary education tuition; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 1512. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate at least one city in the United States each year as an ''American World War II City'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 1513. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to provide whistleblower protection for union employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1514. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide protections for active duty military consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1515. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require testing of underground sources of drinking water in connection with hydraulic fracturing operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 1516. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1517. A bill to provide greater clarity in the regulation of electronic nicotine delivery systems, including electronic cigarettes, cigars, cigarillos, pipes, and hookahs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1518. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a limitation on the time for the use of contributions or donations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1519. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1520. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus and a Medicare Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Medicare surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in such Accounts until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Funds in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security and Medicare Part A Investment Commission to make recommendations for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 1521. A bill to rename the Captain William Wylie Galt Great Falls Armed Forces Readiness Center in honor of Captain John E. Moran, a recipient of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1522. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and improve the Indian coal production tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution effectuating the Compact for a Balanced Budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 160. A resolution welcoming the Seventh Summit of the Americas, to be held in Panama City, Panama, April 10, 2015, and April 11, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CLARKE of

New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 161. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 18 as ''National Innovation in Education Day''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. LEWIS:

H.R. 12.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8: ''The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries. . . .''

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the Unites States Constitution. This provision permits Congress to make or alter the regulations pertaining to Federal elections;

2) Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision grants Congress the authority to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans; and

3) The Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision prohibits excessive bail, excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 1461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 and Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1465.

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 14 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.''

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 1466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to establish post offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section, 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to interstate compacts).

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and clause 17 (relating to authority over the district as the seat of government), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 1474.

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 1, related to providing for the general welfare. Additionally, it is enacted under the authority provided in Article I, Section 8 related to Congress' ability to ''[carry] into Execution the foregoing powers.''

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1475.

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 dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 1476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, clause 7, which states that, ''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by the law.''

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Power vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 1480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 1482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. FOXX:
H.R. 1483.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Because the legislation would change the formula for government contracts on federal-aid highway and public construction transportation projects, it is authorized under clause 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution which states'' [t]he 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. AMODEI:
H.R. 1484.
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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. AMODEI:
H.R. 1485.
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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. BARR:
H.R. 1486.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: 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. BRIDENSTINE:
H.R. 1487.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 gives Congress the power to ''make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper'' to execute the enumerated power of regulating ''Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.'' The titles of the American Energy Renaissance Act deal with existing laws affecting the production and transportation of energy among the states and Indian tribes and the export of energy to
By Mr. COLLINS of New York:
H.R. 1488.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. CROWLEY:
H.R. 1489.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution
By Mrs. DAVIS of California:
H.R. 1490.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. DELANEY:
H.R. 1491.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Ms. EDWARDS:
H.R. 1492.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section I.
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.
By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 1493.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.
By Mr. FORTENBERRY:
H.R. 1494.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. HIGGINS:
H.R. 1495.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 4, Clause 1
By Mr. HIGGINS:
H.R. 1496.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. HUELSKAMP:
H.R. 1497.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States.
By Mr. HUNTER:
H.R. 1498.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Artical I Section VIII, Clause XVIII: 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 and the Government of the United States or in any Department or officer thereof.
By Mr. KIND:
H.R. 1499.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8:
To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.
By Mr. KLINE:
H.R. 1500.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This legislation ensures that the Secretary of Defense provides retired military veteran beneficiaries who live beyond 100 miles of a Military Treatment Facility, an opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime. Specific authority is provided by Article I, 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 Ms. LEE:
H.R. 1501.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Mr. LEWIS:
H.R. 1502.
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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:
H.R. 1503.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII.
By Mrs. NOEM:
H.R. 1504.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.
By Mr. NUGENT:
H.R. 1505.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 1, 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; raise and support Armies; 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. PALLONE:
H.R. 1506.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. POLIS:
H.R. 1507.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)
By Mr. POSEY:
H.R. 1508.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''
By Mr. RANGEL:
H.R. 1509.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Congress is given the power under the Constitution ''To raise and support Armies,'' ''To provide and maintain a Navy,'' and ''To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.'' Art.I, §8, cls. 12- 14. See also: ROSTKER V. GOLDBERG, 453 U. S. 57 (1981)
By Mr. RANGEL:
H.R. 1510.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes....
By Mr. ROKITA:
H.R. 1511.

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 defense and general welfare of the United States;

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 1512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

''This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the US Constitution

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 1513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:,

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof,

Or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1517.

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 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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. ZINKE:

H.R. 1521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 1522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 27: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 154: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 170: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 173: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 188: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 232: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 244: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 271: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 283: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 303: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 317: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 353: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 358: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 366: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 383: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 415: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 420: Mr. OLSON and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 430: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 448: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 456: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 465: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 484: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 509: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 531: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 546: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 571: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 577: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 581: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 592: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 599: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 601: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 605: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 606: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 625: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 628: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 649: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 650: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 685: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 696: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 706: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 711: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 721: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 727: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 742: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 745: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 751: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 766: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 775: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 784: Mr. KILMER and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 814: Mr. ROSS and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 815: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 835: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 843: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 845: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 855: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 868: Mr. BABIN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 869: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 879: Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BARR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 880: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 893: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLINE, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 913: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 918: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 919: Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 923: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 928: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 938: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 955: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 969: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BERA, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 973: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 985: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 989: Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 1022: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1062: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1078: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1088: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1096: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1103: Ms. BASS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1105: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1112: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1117: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1132: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1142: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1147: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 1148: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1149: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1170: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1192: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1195: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BARR, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1197: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1210: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1218: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 1220: Mr. LANCE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1247: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1258: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1267: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1269: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1274: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1282: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1294: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1299: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1300: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1301: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1312: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 1320: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1342: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1349: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1354: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1358: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1365: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1369: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1384: Mr. PETERSON and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1389: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HILL, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1404: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1411: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1413: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1425: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1433: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1434: Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. VARGAS.

H. J. Res. 22: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. WALBERG.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. JONES.

H. Con. Res. 23: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. POCAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FARR, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. TORRES.

H. Res. 11: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 12: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Res. 28: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 54: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Res. 139: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 151: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 154: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 157: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

DELETION 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. 976: Mr. BOUSTANY.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2015 No. 47

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of grace, glory, and power, the battle belongs to You. We are grateful that even though storms rage, we can continue to anchor our hopes in You. Forgive us for sometimes painting a caricature of the many because of the pathology of the few.

Inspire our lawmakers to keep their eyes fixed on You. Imbue them with wisdom that they may know the road to take. Lord, rescue them from danger, as You carve tunnels of hope through mountains of despair.

Let the peace we seek in our world be first conceived in our own hearts.

We pray in Your merciful 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1191

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the Calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, throughout the Democratic filibuster of the antislavery legislation, this is basically what they have been telling us: We don't read legislation we vote on. Even so, it was always a stretch to believe that not a single one—not one—of the 13 original Democratic cosponsors of this bill, nor the many Democrats who voted for this bill in committee, nor their well-educated staffs could not have been bothered to make it to page 4 before deciding to support it—well, support it at least until far-left lobbyists told them they could not support it anymore.

So yesterday's revelation that the Democratic side was indeed aware of the language in question could hardly have surprised anyone. It also makes clear that Democrats decided to yank their support for an antislavery bill for one simple reason: Because far-left lobbyists said they needed to—not because the American people said so.

Nearly 70 percent of Americans support the kind of bipartisan provisions Democrats now claim they object to, and many Democrats have voted for similar bipartisan Hyde language many times before in both appropriations and authorizing legislation. They voted for it many times before in other bills, most recently just this past December.

So our Democratic colleagues obviously lack a rationale for this continued filibustering of the antislavery legislation. If Democrats are truly sincere about wanting to move to an Attorney General vote as soon as possible, then they should consider some of the recent advice from the Chicago Tribune.

Here is what the Tribune said. ''Democrats on the Judiciary Committee have endorsed'' the same bill they are now filibustering, the Tribune noted. So ''all they have to do is allow a vote'' on the same bill to move to another vote they claim to want to have.

Yet, as the Tribune also noted, Democrats do not ''want to go on the record against a bill aimed at combating the evils of human trafficking. So they are blocking a vote—yes, blocking a law to combat human trafficking—in hopes that they can get their way.''

Here is how the editorial concluded—and this is the part our Democratic friends should listen to: ''Democrats,. . . . vote to move forward with the human trafficking bill. Then the Senate can get on with approving a new attorney general. And Democrats can resolve never again to vote for a bill they haven't read.''

Just resolve to never again vote for a bill you haven't read. It seems pretty simple. Ignore the lobbyists and vote to give hope to the victims of slavery instead. That is the right thing to do, and today we will give our friends another chance to show where they stand in this debate over modern slavery.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 799 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Democratic leader is recognized.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in a few hours, the Senate will vote for a third time on whether to end debate on human trafficking. The result will be the same the third time as it was the second time and the first time, which indicates to me that this week was a waste of time.

I indicated that the vote will fail, and it will fail because the debate is such that this is an important issue. We are determined to fix this bill, and we will fix it by removing the unrelated abortion provision from the pages of this legislation. I hope we can do that soon.

My friend the majority leader referenced reports that Democratic staffers should have—it should not have been plural—a Democratic staff member knew about the abortion provision prior to the legislation coming to the floor. Perhaps that is true, but I don't really know how the abortion language got in the bill for sure. I think I know. But it got in the bill. I think I know who put it in there, but it really doesn't matter. The fact of the matter is it is in the bill, and I am more concerned about getting the bill out.

We have had some columnists make fun about the fact that we should have read the bill more closely. I will not go into a lot of detail, but page 4 of the original bill—the section to which a lot of people love to point—was eliminated. If you look at it, it is crossed out.

If you go to page 50 or 51, it is stuck back in that part of the bill, and this is where the controversy gets pretty interesting. A Republican Senator who was responsible for this bill in the committee sent out a notice to all Senators, including Democrats, saying that we made some changes in the bill that passed last year—one, two, three, four, five, six changes that were made. The problem is he didn't indicate that they put the abortion language back in. It was really misleading, as was indicated on the floor yesterday by Senator FEINSTEIN.

We can go into why the language is in the bill. I have indicated I think I know who put it in and why they put it in. But they did put it in the bill. It is in the bill. We can have all of these accusations about paper trails and why it is in the bill, but it is in the bill, and it needs to come out.

Remember, Speaker BOEHNER, who has good qualifications for being the protector of abortion rights, as seen by the Republicans, was able to pass a version of this legislation without the abortion language. No one can question BOEHNER's qualifications for being anti-abortion. If they passed it in the House, why can't we do the same thing here?

Were the House Republicans wrong to pass the bill? I don't think so.

So before we embark upon a third iteration of the vote today, which is going to fail, I ask the Republican leadership: Are you interested in working toward a solution on this human trafficking legislation? If so, take this language out.

My friend the Republican leader was talking about leftwing lobbyists. The leftwing lobbyists are women, who—as indicated on the floor yesterday by Senator FEINSTEIN—are concerned about protecting their bodies and reproductive rights. They are interested in protecting themselves, as they should be, and they are protecting women all over America.

So are they only interested in scoring political points by forcing these show votes or are they interested in reaching a solution? If they are interested in a solution, we are willing to work with them, but the abortion language is going to come out of this legislation.

For the first time in the history of our country, we are now focused on not doing what has been done with the Hyde amendment for 30 years, and that is making sure there are no government taxpayer dollars spent for performing abortions. Now they have moved beyond that to private funding. It is wrong and we are not going to go there.

Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

Portman amendment No. 270, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking.

Portman amendment No. 271, to amend the definition of ''homeless person'' under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth.

Vitter amendment No. 284 (to amendment No. 271), to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to address a very serious accusation leveled yesterday against Republican Members of this body by the Democratic whip, the Senator from Illinois. I do so with some regret. The Senator from Illinois and I have been friends for many years. We served in the House together and here in this body, and we have worked together. That is why I was so surprised and disappointed in the comments he made yesterday on the floor of the Senate—comments that are totally inappropriate to be made on the floor of the Senate.

My colleague from Illinois said:

The Republican majority leader announced . . . that he was going to hold this nomination of Loretta Lynch until the bill which is pending before the Senate passes, whenever that may be.

Then he went on to say:

So Loretta Lynch, the first African-American woman nominated to be Attorney General, is asked to sit in the back of the bus when it comes to the Senate calendar. That is unfair. It is unjust. It is beneath the decorum and dignity of the U.S. Senate.

What is beneath the decorum and dignity of the U.S. Senate, I would say to the Senator from Illinois, is for him to come to this floor and use that imagery and suggest that racist tactics are being employed to delay Ms. Lynch's confirmation vote. Such inflammatory rhetoric has no place in this body and serves no purpose other than to further divide us.

Perhaps my colleagues, and the Senator from Illinois in particular, need to be reminded of their own record when it comes to the treatment of African-American women whose nominations were before this body. In 2003, Janice Rogers Brown—an African American—was nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia—a court that had never included an African-American woman judge. The Senator from Illinois voted to filibuster her nomination in 2003 and again in 2005. When she was finally confirmed, after waiting 684 days, the Senator from Illinois voted against the historic nomination. I would never suggest—even with veiled rhetoric—that Judge Rogers Brown's race was the reason for the opposition to her nomination by the Senator from Illinois. And he should extend, I say to my colleague from Illinois, that same courtesy to me and my colleagues.

I would also like to remind the Senator from Illinois about how we were able to fill vacancies in the U.S. District Court of Arizona last year—effectively alleviating a judicial emergency. With tremendous bipartisan support of the nomination of Senator FLAKE and myself, we confirmed a diverse and historic slate of six nominees which included an Hispanic, an African American, and the first Native American woman ever to serve on the Federal bench. But their race had nothing to do with their successful confirmations, just as the race of Ms. Lynch should have no impact on her consideration in this body. Those six judges were approved by this body because each of

them had shown a commitment to justice, public service, and the people of Arizona. Each had also demonstrated the judicial temperament and the professional demeanor necessary to serve with integrity.

I further point out to the Senator from Illinois that at no time has the majority leader ever indicated that he would not bring the Lynch nomination to the floor; in fact, the opposite is true. We have made it very clear time and again that we will consider the Lynch nomination once we have disposed of the bipartisan trafficking bill. Had the Senator from Illinois and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not filibustered this bill over a manufactured crisis, we could have considered the Lynch nomination this week. They chose otherwise.

I deeply regret that the Senator from Illinois chose to come to the floor yesterday and question the integrity and motivation of myself and my Republican colleagues. It was offensive and unnecessary. I think he owes this body, Ms. Lynch, and all Americans, an apology.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am glad I heard the comments of my colleague firsthand and I wish to respond to them directly.

As of today, Loretta Lynch, who is the President's nominee for Attorney General, has had her nomination pending before the U.S. Senate for 131 days. How does that compare to previous nominees for Attorney General? It is three times longer than the period of time that Attorney General Ashcroft was pending before the U.S. Senate, 2½ times longer than the time taken to confirm Attorney General Mukasey, and twice as long as the time taken to confirm Attorney General Holder.

Why? In some cases, these nominees had questions that were raised by Members of the Senate—questions about their political views, their background; legitimate questions requiring time to answer.

I sat in the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing for this nominee, Loretta Lynch. There were no questions raised of any nature, of any kind, questioning her ability to serve as Attorney General. None.

When my colleague from Arizona notes the fact that I have voted against African-American women nominees in the past, it is true. I am not arguing that every Member of the Senate should vote for Loretta Lynch simply because she would be the first African-American woman to serve in that capacity. All I am saying is she deserves the same fair treatment we have given to other nominees for this job.

She has now been pending before the Senate longer than any nominee for Attorney General in the last 30 years. She has been on the calendar now—on the calendar waiting for a vote—for a longer period of time than the last five nominees for Attorney General combined. Why? It has nothing to do with her qualifications for the job, which are the very best.

Why in the world are we taking this important post—Attorney General of the United States of America—why are we taking this important civil rights moment, when the first African-American woman in history is being given an opportunity to serve, and entangling it in the politics of the Senate?

A week ago, the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, said right outside this Chamber he was going to call her nomination this week. We breathed a sigh of relief; she has been waiting so long. Then, over the last weekend, he announced she wouldn't be called until a bill pending on the floor is passed.

Yes, I am upset and frustrated on her behalf to think that she is being treated in this manner. I am not going to use any pejorative terms other than to say I believe it is insensitive for the Senate to hold her up for such a lengthy period of time with no objection to this woman's character, fitness, and ability to continue to serve the United States.

She has served. She is currently in a position as a U.S. attorney in New York. She has the support of the following organizations: the National District Attorneys Association, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, the FBI Agents Association, and a long list of Republican- and Democratic-appointed former U.S. attorneys, including Patrick Fitzgerald and Scott Lassar from the Northern District of Illinois. She has the support of former FBI Director Louis Freeh and former Deputy Attorney General Larry Thompson from the George W. Bush administration.

Under ordinary circumstances, this would have been an easy ask for the President to bring a person of this quality to the Senate for confirmation. She had three votes supporting her on the Judiciary Committee from the Republican side. I don't understand the objections of the others, but I respect whatever their reasoning.

All I am asking for—all the President is asking for and all the Senate is asking for—is a vote. Bring her off the pages of the calendar, before the Senate, for a vote. Don't make it contingent on some bill or some political agreement in the future. Let this woman, who has led such an extraordinary life, have her chance to continue to serve the United States of America. That, to me, is only fair and only just and would be in keeping with the traditions of the Senate to follow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be divided equally between both sides.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we find ourselves in the unusual posture of being stuck on a piece of legislation that had 12 Democratic cosponsors and was supported unanimously by all Republicans and all Democrats on the Senate Judiciary Committee, and which uncharacteristically was brought to the floor without having to jump through the regular procedural hoops that legislation usually has to jump through that requires consent by all 100 Senators.

So when you think about combating human trafficking and particularly the targeting of 12- and 14-year-old girls who are of the typical ages and gender of the people who are victims of human trafficking, you would think that if there is anything that ought to be able to avoid the partisan wars here in Washington, DC, and the divisions that seem to separate us, it ought to be the subject of human trafficking. Well, I guess to say I was disappointed is an understatement. But I am determined to keep our focus on the victims of human trafficking, the people this would help rescue and help heal and get on with their lives. Yes, I am also determined to make sure we can demonstrate that we can function, something I thought Senators wanted to do.

After this last election there were a number of people who said: Gee, we would really like to change the Senate to restore its reputation as the world's greatest deliberative body, where we actually treasured and valued solutions more than we did scoring partisan political points.

I come here today in the spirit of trying to offer a solution that will help us get unstuck from where we have found ourselves. I see my friend, the Senator from Maine, who has been working tirelessly to try to help us get unstuck, and perhaps this will help.

Just to recap: The way this bill was structured is it would deal with the demand side of human trafficking; in other words, it would take the fines and penalties from the people who purchased these services and it would create a crime victims compensation fund, which in essence would be used to help provide the money to faith-based and other organizations that help rescue and help heal these victims of human trafficking. Then we heard from some of our colleagues on the other side that they wanted to change the way this was structured so that it was subject to the routine appropriations process and didn't enlarge the way the traditional limitations on appropriations were treated under the so-called Hyde amendment.

Just to refresh everybody's memory: Since 1976, all funding, all appropriations bills, and many authorization bills, including the Affordable Care Act and the Defense authorization bills, have been subjected to a limitation on the use of tax dollars for abortions except in the case of rape and in the cases where a physician certifies the health of the mother is at stake. The bill we introduced that was passed out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously and has 12 Democratic cosponsors has a reference to an appropriations bill that had that same limitation. The idea was that we wouldn't try to change the status quo; we would try to maintain the status quo which has existed for 39 years. But then some of our colleagues on the other side said, when offered an opportunity to vote on an amendment stripping that language out, they would not even vote. They wanted to obstruct and filibuster this legislation instead.

I, for one, am more interested in getting to a solution than I am engaging in this partisan point scoring. I believe there is a sufficient number of Members of the Senate who are sick and tired of the dysfunction and who don't want to be distracted by the politics but want to focus on how to help those 100,000 victims of human sex trafficking who are estimated to exist on an annual basis.

What I have come to the floor to do is to say let's make this fund subject to the annual appropriations process that will preserve the money for the victims and it cannot be used for any other purpose, but it will be subject to the Appropriations Committee and the usual riders that have existed for 39 years. It won't represent an expansion of the Hyde amendment, as some of our colleagues have expressed concerns about. It would, basically, again, maintain the status quo.

I came to the floor yesterday and my friend, the Senator from California, was here. I pointed out that not only did she cosponsor this legislation, she voted for it in the Judiciary Committee. But she now feels so strongly—and I know it is a matter of good faith and true conviction for her, but she feels like this is the place where we ought to fight this fight—we ought to relitigate the scope of the Hyde amendment. I don't think we have to do that. I am proudly pro-life and I believe the Hyde amendment represents one little island of consensus in the wars over abortion that we have. That is why for 39 years we have had a limitation on tax dollars. Indeed, fines paid into this fund would be public dollars. It wouldn't be generated from revenue, but it is not private money; once they are paid into this fund they are public dollars under my proposal, subject to appropriation on an annual basis by the Appropriations Committee. So now the money will flow from the victims fund through the relevant appropriations bills. It will be preserved for the victims and cannot be used for any other purpose, and all spending limitations that have routinely applied to those bills would apply to these funds as well.

So the question is, Can our friends who have been obstructing and filibustering this legislation take yes for an answer? Can they take yes for an answer? I think this will also be very revealing, because we will find out whether people are actually interested in a solution or are they trying to shut down the Senate and prevent us from functioning on anything. As I said before, if we can't get the yes on an antitrafficking bill, Heaven help us on issues where there is not consensus, where there are genuine policy differences.

I believe we can do exactly, for example, what Senator LEAHY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, asked for on the floor on March 10. He said ''but let's have it on things it should be on—appropriations bills.'' So I would say yes, my proposal would give what Senator LEAHY asked for.

Then the minority whip, Senator DURBIN, the Senator from Illinois, said on March 16:

> Henry Hyde authored the Hyde amendment that said no Federal funds should be used to pay for abortion procedures except in very limited circumstances: rape, incest, and life of the mother. That has been put in appropriations bills every year since—without question, without challenge.

That was stated by the minority whip, Senator DURBIN from Illinois. My proposal would facilitate exactly what he is arguing for. Can he say yes, take yes for an answer?

The minority leader, Senator REID, said on the 11th: I served in the House of Representatives with Henry Hyde; a very fine man. He has had his name affixed to an anti-abortion bill, anti-abortion legislation for almost three decades. And it's been continued year after year in appropriations bills.

That was spoken by Senator REID, the Democratic leader.

As I pointed out, what has perplexed me so much about all of this is that our Democratic friends have routinely voted for appropriations bills that contain the same restriction. When it was said, well, now you are extending it to an authorization bill, I pointed out that they voted for this very similar restriction in the Affordable Care Act and the Defense authorization bill, so that argument doesn't hold water; but I am giving them a chance to say yes, and, in essence, trying to find a way to break this impasse that has existed now for the last couple of weeks.

So that is the question. Now that we have made a proposal to them to give them what they have asked for and still preserve the 39-year limitation on the use of public dollars for abortion, can they take yes for an answer? I can't wait to hear what their response is to that proposal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, let me first commend the senior Senator from Texas for his efforts to work out a compromise that I hope will allow this bill to go forward. Senator HEITKAMP and I also have been working with the senior Senator from Texas to try to come up with a solution that is similar to what he has outlined, and we will have more to say about that after the vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for the purpose of a bill introduction, unless someone else is seeking the floor to speak on this bill.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 804 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, my neighbor in New England.

We actually still have some debates on this floor. We had an important one yesterday. Someone called it a ''C–SPAN moment.'' It was a focused and memorable discussion of a significant issue now before the Senate. It was an honest discussion about what is at stake in the debate we are having right now. The core question is how we are going to support the survivors, in what every Senator agrees is a heinous and deplorable crime.

Late yesterday, Senator FEINSTEIN spoke with powerful clarity about why the Hyde amendment has no place in what we are trying to do here, particularly when this legislation we are debating does not involve taxpayer funds. The Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund included in S. 178 is funded by a special assessment fine collected from convicted sex traffickers. It is intended to help survivors rebuild their lives.

Now, whether taxpayer dollars should be used to ensure the full range of health care options available to this very vulnerable population is an important debate. We will have that another day. But the application of the Hyde amendment when zero taxpayer dollars are involved is unprecedented. It represents a very significant change in Federal policy.

When asked why the Hyde amendment has resulted in such an outcry, Senator FEINSTEIN said simply but powerfully:

> Because of what this legislation is. This legislation is about the raping . . . of young girls.

Senator FEINSTEIN is right. I encourage everyone to go back and watch her moving remarks that got right to the heart of this debate.

These are children who have been bought and sold like animals. They have had every choice taken away from

them. Now, if they survive, if they escape, we should not put limits on what health services they can seek. I stand with the survivors of these crimes. I stand with Senator FEINSTEIN.

This is a line we should not cross. Human trafficking victims are often not treated as rape victims. Too often these young girls are treated as prostitutes, even though they had no choice in it. That is a fact we are trying to change, but we cannot ignore the reality that many of these girls are put through our juvenile justice system and prosecuted as criminals, rather than treated as victims.

It is easy for some to claim that there is a so-called ''rape exception'' to the Hyde restriction but the reality is that for the survivors of this terrible crime, the rape exception feels more like an overwhelming bureaucracy. In many States, victims are forced to jump through hoop after hoop to qualify for the exception. They have to obtain police reports or certifications from State agencies. They have to relive the details of their trauma again and again. One State even requires the Governor to approve any exception. Another State refuses to recognize the rape exception at all.

The easiest, most appropriate solution here is to simply remove the Hyde restriction so that survivors can make their own health care decisions. That is what the survivors are asking us to do. That is what the professionals who work with human trafficking survivors are asking us to do.

Yesterday, my friend, the senior Senator from Texas, argued that the inclusion of the language was routine, that this does not change the status quo at all. Well that is simply not accurate. The Hyde amendment is about keeping taxpayer dollars out of the abortion debate. We may have different opinions on the issue, but that is not what we are talking about here.

The money at issue in this bill is not taxpayer dollars, it is money collected from sex traffickers. The bottom line is that the offender-financed fund created in this bill relies on zero taxpayer dollars.

So if you want to maintain current practice, you have to remove this provision. The House bill, that passed unanimously almost 2 months ago, does not contain this expansion of the Hyde amendment's reach. It does not apply the Hyde amendment to nontaxpayer dollars. If Speaker BOEHNER could find a way to bring the House together and pass this bill without injecting abortion politics into the discussion, then why can't we do that in the Senate?

Senator FEINSTEIN is right. We have amendments we need to consider if we can simply get past this stalemate, but she is also right that the issue at stake is too important to turn our back on. This is not a provision we can just ignore and dismiss as the status quo. But I believe, as Senator FEINSTEIN and others have said, we can find a path forward. The path forward should not be one that expands restrictions on the health care choices of human trafficking survivors.

These survivors—many are 12 or 13 years old—let's not put further hurdles in front of them. Let's not push for a political agenda on either side. The Hyde amendment will appear on taxpayer-funded matters, as it usually does. That is one thing the Appropriations Committee will face. We are not talking about taxpayer dollars here. We are not talking about taxpayer dollars.

This would be like reaching into a State and saying: Oh, by the way, you have people who have raised money for a particular organization, not taxpayer dollars, but we in Congress are going to restrict what you can use that money for. Well, we do not do that. The reason we do not do it is because our involvement is with taxpayer dollars. If we want to go and appropriate money in this area, that is the time to bring up the issue.

The Appropriations Committee—I have served on that Committee for almost 40 years—we handle that issue there, but not here.

What is the pending parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on consideration of S. 178, with the time until 12 noon equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. LEAHY. Is there a vote scheduled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 12 noon.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time and ask unanimous consent that the vote begin now.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, David Vitter, Richard Burr, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Daniel Coats, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Mark Kirk, Cory Gardner, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Ayotte	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Flake	Perdue
Boozman	Gardner	Portman
Burr	Graham	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Casey	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Hirono	Peters
Bennet	Kaine	Reed
Blumenthal	King	Reid
Booker	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown	Leahy	Schatz
Cantwell	Markey	Schumer
Cardin	McCaskill	Shaheen
Carper	McConnell	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warner
Franken	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Nelson	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Alexander	Boxer

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, David Vitter, Richard Burr, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Daniel Coats, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Mark Kirk, Cory Gardner, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 76 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Ayotte	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Flake	Perdue
Boozman	Gardner	Portman
Burr	Graham	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Casey	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Hirono	Peters
Bennet	Kaine	Reed
Blumenthal	King	Reid
Booker	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown	Leahy	Schatz
Cantwell	Markey	Schumer
Cardin	McCaskill	Shaheen
Carper	McConnell	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warner
Franken	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Nelson	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Alexander	Boxer

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I wish to speak about the bill that I would have thought a few days ago would have passed by now—the bill before the Senate and the bill that addresses this topic of modern-day slavery. This bill came out of the Judiciary Committee in a unanimous fashion before it came to the Senate floor. Then, there was no dissent; we agreed we should get right to the bill and pass it.

I am pleased to cosponsor the Victims for Justice of Trafficking Act, which includes sexual trafficking and labor trafficking. This bill would help innocent victims of trafficking by creating grants for State and local governments to develop comprehensive systems to address these problems in every State, we are told, and certainly in almost every city—if not every city—where this is a problem.

This bill allows law enforcement to deal with the problem by giving them the tools they need to hold the people accountable who are forcing these violent crimes and violent living conditions and the abuse of people's dignity in so many ways on others. Apparently, approximately 100,000 American children each year are victims of commercial sex and child prostitution and child trafficking, according to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. It is like so many numbers that we think of. I would encourage everybody to think of any city they can think of that has 100,000 people. Most of us would see that as a big community and a lot of people—100,000 children every year—100,000 children every year, not every decade or every century—every year, in the United States of America, not all over the world.

I would guess most Americans would assume if this is a problem, it has to be a bigger problem in any other country, but 100,000 children here among us are victims of this tragedy.

The Justice Department says there are more human trafficking cases prosecuted by Federal attorneys in Missouri's Western District, the district where the U.S. Attorney's office is in Kansas City, MO, than anywhere else in the country. I hope that means the people in the Western District of Missouri who run that office are doing an extraordinary job, but I think it would be foolish for me to think that this isn't also an extraordinary problem. My house in Springfield, MO, is in that district, as are Springfield, Joplin, and Kansas City. These are places one wouldn't think, what is the No. 1 prostitution area for victims of human trafficking in the country? The Western District of Missouri.

St. Louis, MO, is also one of the top 20 cities, we are told, for human trafficking, according to the Department of Justice. These are bad statistics, as every single statistic any of us could look at in our State could be. Of course, one case of human trafficking is one case too many, but we are not, unfortunately, just talking about one case; we are talking about lots of cases.

Earlier this month the FBI arrested a person in my State who was charged with transporting a minor across State lines with the intent to engage in prostitution. The FBI reported the man involved was physically abusive, verbally abusive, emotionally abusive, and sexually abusive to this young person he was using for himself and offering to others. This modern-day slavery should not be allowed to continue.

The bill that is before the Senate right now, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, has been endorsed by 200 different advocacy groups, including the NAACP, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Exodus Cry, a Grandview, MO, group, Rights4Girls, the National Association to Protect Children, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Conference of State Legislatures. We can't vote on it here on the Senate floor? We can't get this bill on the President's desk? Why is that?

Why again today did the minority refuse to provide the votes we needed to get from where we are to 60? We did have a few Members from that side join us this week, but we are still short.

Let's deal with this problem. They say it is because there is a section of the bill that deals with the Hyde amendment. OK, the Hyde amendment has been around now for part of four decades. What does the Hyde amendment do? It bans taxpayer-provided abortions.

One of the things we have done in this country is to say because there is vast disagreement on this—we understand there is vast disagreement. Surely we are not going to take money from some taxpayers who are totally opposed to this and use it to pay for something they are totally opposed to. There is a provision in this bill. It was there when the bill was voted out of committee. It was there when everybody voted to move to the bill. Suddenly, it is a provision that nobody was aware of before. In fact, in committee, there was at least one amendment that amended the sentence right below this sentence. So are we not doing our job? Are we not reading these bills, or, are we just looking for a reason not to get anything done? Surely the Senate in the last half dozen years has proven to the country that the Senate can be dysfunctional. Surely we don't need to continue to make that case.

So let's get to work. Let's get down to business. Let's look at what needs to be done here. Let's see what we could do to set an example for the world. Frankly, there were colleagues who had amendments that could have been at least debated that would have talked about what could be done to carry this beyond our borders to deal with this modern-day slavery—whether for labor or for sex—in ways this issue should be dealt with.

I would love to see the President step forward and encourage the leaders of

his party to get together and get the votes needed to pass this. Let's move to a conclusion and put this on the President's desk. I think without the language that some people now suddenly find objectionable, this bill wouldn't pass the House. But the bill will pass the House as reported out of committee, if the Senate would pass it, and it would be on the President's desk. There is nothing new here.

I hope we get this done. I think people are ready to see the Senate work. Let's get this done.

Let's get on with a budget for the first time in 7 years, if we could join with the House of Representatives and say, OK, let's present a plan to the country of how we are going to get back to a balanced budget and what our priorities are.

But one of our priorities should be to end the nightmare for victims of human trafficking, and we can't do that unless we face reality and get on this bill.

LETTER ON IRAN NEGOTIATIONS

Also, Madam President, while I am here, I want to talk a little bit about the letter I signed along with Senator COTTON and 45 others a few days ago. I thought the interesting thing about that letter is that the letter was essentially addressed to the Foreign Minister of Iran but released to every newspaper in America. In many ways it was an idea that is important that the American people understand.

I am sure the Iranian Foreign Minister, by the way, already understood it. If one had any interest in reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or watching C–SPAN or reading any newspaper in the last 6 months, you would have seen that the Senate was very concerned in a bipartisan way that the President was negotiating an agreement with another country and was refusing to come to the Senate and ask for the approval that the Constitution anticipates should be there.

I was surprised by the Iranian Foreign Minister's response, which was: Well, really, when you are dealing with this kind of situation, it is international laws that prevail. The laws of any individual country don't matter. Well, we all take an oath when we are sworn in to the Senate that the law and the Constitution of the United States do matter and it is our job to uphold and defend the law and the Constitution of the United States. There was nothing I saw that suggested the Iranian Foreign Minister or anybody else should interpret that for me. The Constitution is pretty clear, by the way, that there is an advise-and-consent responsibility. Frankly, advise means to talk to the Senate while you are negotiating.

I read somewhere the other day that, well, it is so presumptuous for the Senate to want to give advice to the President before he has negotiated an agreement. Well, the Constitution says that we are in a position to do that. The traditions of the country say if the President doesn't keep at least the right people in the Senate informed—the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the minority senior person of that committee, the chairman of the defense committee, the Armed Services Committee—if they aren't kept informed, you are not going to bring people along as you should. That is obviously part of trying to make the government work.

No matter what the President thinks, the Senate is not just an inconvenience; the Congress is not just an inconvenience. There is a reason for these branches of government.

Actually, in another interesting response, the Secretary of State said: Well, obviously this agreement is not binding on anybody but the person who signs it. That is what I have been saying for about a year, but it was interesting that it took this letter for the Secretary of State to say that. This agreement really doesn't bind anybody. If the President signs this agreement, it is an agreement, not a treaty. What does that mean? It means if it is not a treaty, then the government of the United States hasn't agreed to it. Only the President of the United States has agreed to it. President after President have brought agreements about nuclear weapons to the Senate—the START treaty, all the treaties which were approved by the Senate. It would have been unthinkable just a few years ago that one would even think about committing our country to something that involves nuclear weapons potential and not involve the U.S. Senate.

So I think getting these issues on the table is a good thing. Frankly, I think a nuclear-weapons-capable Iran is the most destabilizing thing that could happen in the world today. Not only our great ally and friends in Israel, but countries all over the Middle East will immediately be concerned. Countries within reach of those potential future weapons in Europe and other places would soon be concerned. We are headed down a bad path here, negotiating not that Iran will never be allowed to have nuclear weapons but apparently negotiating how long it will be from the moment they start until they can have the enriched material it would take to have a nuclear weapon.

There are many countries in the world today that have nuclear power that don't enrich in a way that would allow them to ever have a nuclear weapon. Iran, if it wanted to, could have added itself easily to that list. Iran, one of the most energy-rich places in the world, could easily have added itself to that list, if it wanted to add to all that nuclear energy power. I think it is obvious the shadow that Iran would like to cast over the next decade in the region they are already dominating in a handful of capitals is a shadow of nuclear weapons capability. The United States should be very concerned, and this discussion at the highest levels is the right kind of discussion for the country to be having.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President and colleagues, in my professional life I always considered myself to be a numbers guy. As I have sat back and listened to the debate over these past 17 days since the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Act was reported out of the Judiciary Committee, I decided I would maybe try a different take on the numbers we should be concerned about.

As I said, it has been 17 days since the bill we are considering came out of the Judiciary Committee—56 days since the bill was first introduced on January 13th. Now, some of my colleagues on the other side have said that somehow between when the bill was introduced on January 13th and when it was reported out of Committee on March 10th, there was a provision placed in the bill that they were not made aware of. This is simply not the case. My colleagues had days to review this bill, but unfortunately, some of them are in the habit of passing something and then finding out later what they were actually voting for.

It has been 39 years since the Hyde language we are currently discussing was first passed into law. It was so long ago I was even young—16 years old. The Hyde language was first enacted in 1976, and since then, has become known, well-settled law. Obviously, this is not some sort of new concept. It is language that everybody who is in this body—and every staffer who has served somebody in this body—should know about.

Now, with the Hyde amendment being around for some four decades, I was trying to figure out: Well, maybe we are talking about Members who are familiar with the Hyde language, but never voted for it.

So I decided to go back to my numbers and take a look at the voting history of the Senators in this Chamber today, many of whom—all of whom, actually—on this graphic are now preventing this very important human trafficking legislation from moving forward.

The minority leader has voted in support of the Hyde amendment 14 times, and all these other Senators on my chart at least a dozen times, with the exception of Senator BOXER who has voted in support of the Hyde language 10 times. Senator BOXER stood on the floor last week and said it was offensive language. However, Senator BOXER has voted for this language 10 times, most recently this past December when they passed the fiscal year 2015 omnibus bill.

So one wonders what they are really trying to accomplish here. I hear them. My Democrat colleagues are very sympathetic to the content of the bill. I hear them say that human trafficking is horrible, and we need to do something about it. But their words do not fit their actions. Their words say we ought to move forward and end these horrible situations—and I will talk a little bit more about those numbers later—but their actions are just burning time in this body preventing us from moving on to the many other important things we need to address—such as our national security, our economic security, and our energy security. But no, we have spent 17 days on a bill that my colleagues in the Democratic caucus say we should act on, but are at the same time impeding the process.

Now, as confusing as these numbers are, as confusing as it is to hear so many Senators say that this language is offensive and needs to be taken out—despite the fact that they have regularly voted for it in the past—the very sad result of their actions are what we are not getting done, and that is getting the human trafficking bill passed so we can end the horrible conditions that are imposed on the many people who are enslaved on a daily basis.

I'm going to give my colleagues a couple of numbers to think about. The State Department and other agencies estimate that there are 600,000 to 800,000 people trafficked across global borders each year. That is about 1,600 to 2,200 boys, girls, men, and women being enslaved every single day in this world.

Now, in our country, it is estimated that 17,500 people are trafficked across our borders into the U.S. sex trade every year and that there are about 100,000 people already here.

Think about that in terms of the numbers. Every day that goes by, there are another 50 victims from overseas trafficked into the U.S. for sex trade—every single day another 50 people.

This week, we have had five votes on this bill. This means, another 250 young girls, young boys, women, and men will have been trafficked into our country for sex trade.

This is a good bill, and it works to stop the growth of human trafficking and free those who are currently enslaved.

Colleagues, I am a freshman. I have been here fewer than 70 days. When I read the human trafficking bill, I knew that the Hyde amendment was in it. Anybody who is doing their job in the Senate should have been able to figure that out.

So it raises a very interesting question—how could we come out of the Judiciary Committee, which I serve on, with a unanimous vote? As a matter of fact, there are 12 Democrat cosponsors of this bill. Certainly, those Members of the Democratic Caucus read the bill and their staffs had time to read the bill in the months that the language has been public.

So, colleagues, I wonder if it is really about the human trafficking bill and the language or if it is about a strategy just to slow the process down, but what I think is so sad is the human consequences of this inaction, and we need to move forward.

I just came from the Senate steps to take a picture with about 100 students from my great State of North Carolina.

While I had time before the photographer arrived to let them ask me few questions, I said: I am going to have to go to the Senate floor soon and speak. They said: What are you going to speak on?

I was really at a loss for words. I was wondering how I was going to tell them I am trying to help pass legislation that makes them safer, but we are having a petty fight in the Senate over process.

So I really ask Members of the Democratic caucus to look into their hearts and to understand the human tragedy this legislation is attempting to correct and join with us to pass this bill and move on to the many other things we need to do for this great Nation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have had a lot of discussion regarding the pending bill. I thought again I would emphasize what Senator FEINSTEIN said earlier, which was so good, and I hope people will listen to her words. I would just follow on to that to say my good friend—and he is my friend—the distinguished senior Senator from Texas has suggested that we make the funds collected from traffickers subject to the appropriations process to get around this impasse, but that does not solve the problem.

The pending legislation came out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, an authorizing committee that does not appropriate funds. We should be telling appropriators that we believe services to trafficking victims are important by authorizing funds. As the most senior member of that Appropriations Committee I can tell you that this is an important process that results in real money for victim services.

It is a process that works well. Under Democratic leadership of the Senate Appropriations Committee, total appropriations for trafficking victims' services more than doubled from $28.1 million in FY2014 to $58.1 million for FY2015.

Senator CORNYN's proposal to simply funnel fees collected from traffickers through the appropriations process still presents the same problem—this is not taxpayer money, and subjecting it to the Hyde amendment would expand the amendment's reach to an offender-financed fund meant for women and children who should have all options available to them when it comes to health services after being sexually exploited.

I would quote what the House Republican author of this bill, Congressman POE, said today:

> We passed a bill. The Senate should take it up and pass it.

That could be done immediately. I don't think there would be anybody trying to block it. The Republican House of Representatives passed this bill unanimously. We could take up and pass it, and not waste 2 weeks of having this dance on the floor, vote after vote, which both sides know isn't going anywhere. The easiest and best thing to do is to remove the Hyde restriction so survivors can make their own health care decisions.

I will not do it again today, but I put into the RECORD letters and statements from hundreds of people—survivors' organizations and the people they represent—and they have said: Let us make our own health care decisions.

Now, to argue what my friend from Texas says, that the inclusion of this language is routine and it does not change the status quo at all, is not accurate. In fact, that is probably why, I suspect, a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives—who support the Hyde amendment—did not include it in the House version of the bill. The Hyde amendment is about keeping taxpayer dollars out of the abortion debate. Now, we can have different opinions on the issue, but that is not what we are talking about here. The money at issue in this bill is collected from sex traffickers.

The bottom line is the offender-financed funds raised in this bill rely on zero taxpayer dollars. Maintaining the current practice, if that is what you want to do, means removing the provision. Maybe we ought to listen to some of the leadership on the Appropriations Committee and how they feel about this. They are not the ones asking to do this. The Appropriations Committee is not asking us to turn them into some kind of a superauthorizing committee, and we should not put them in that position.

I hope cooler heads will prevail and come together on this. I think it will be very easy for both sides who do want to stop sex trafficking to come together, and pass this bill.

Then, let us also take the steps to correct what has been a shameful position in the U.S. Senate and confirm Loretta Lynch as Attorney General. She has waited on the floor much longer than the four men who preceded her put together. This woman has waited longer than those four men before her put together, and yet everybody applauds her as a superb prosecutor. We talk about sex trafficking, and she is about the only person we have seen in here as a nominee who has actually prosecuted sex traffickers. Let's get on with the job.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I saw on television my friend from Vermont, the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, talking about the virtues of the House human trafficking bill, and I thought it would be worthwhile for Members and whoever else is listening to understand the difference between the two bills.

First of all, our bill, the one that is being filibustered by our Democratic colleagues—I should say, all but four of them—contains a $30 million fund that is financed through criminal funds. This is analogous to a crime victims compensation fund. For example, when I was attorney general of Texas, we administered one, and we were able to make grants to various organizations. That is what this $30 million fund would be. The bill on the House side actually has no fund. It is an authorization. It is a $5 million authorization. It has no money. It has no mechanism to generate funds like ours does.

Our bill contains language increasing restitution for trafficking victims by using criminal assets to satisfy these needs and allowing law enforcement to pay witness-assistance award money to victims.

The bill in the House does nothing. In other words, we have an asset-forfeiture provision in our bill to take the people who profit from human trafficking and to forfeit those funds and use that to add to the fines and use that money to help rescue and heal the victims. The House bill has nothing in it in that regard.

Our bill requires law enforcement agencies to file regular reports of human trafficking case totals as part of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. That is important because so much of the human trafficking damage is never reported to law enforcement.

First of all, many victims of human trafficking are children who may or may not actually consider themselves victims. They may be runaways. They may find some adult who has taken them under their wing, only to turn them out on the streets as prostitutes and the like. They may not actually consider themselves victims, at least initially, which they are.

Our bill would make sure the statistics and reports of human trafficking totals are reported in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program so we would actually have a better objective record about the number of cases and so people could appreciate the severity of this problem. The bill in the House has nothing in that regard.

Next, our bill clarifies that child pornography producers are engaged in commercial sex acts. The bill on the House side does nothing in that regard.

Our bill requires persons indicted for human trafficking to be treated as violent criminals for purposes of pretrial, in terms of the availability of bail. The bill on the other side of the Capitol, in the House, does nothing in that regard. Our bill requires prosecutors and judges to undergo training to improve restitution in traffic cases. Again, our friends on the other side of the Capitol—their bill does nothing in that regard.

Finally, our bill requires human traffickers to remain under supervision for at least 5 years after they are released from prison. On the House side, it doesn't touch on that.

I don't say that to criticize the House bill, because I think they have done some good work. But it is important to recognize that the bill over here, which is being filibustered by our Democratic minority, does a lot more and a lot of different things, and things that I think are going to be a lot more helpful to the victims of human trafficking, which I can only imagine should be our collective goal.

I came to the floor this morning, and I said that we would be willing to work with our Democratic colleagues to try to address some of their stated concerns with the original bill. I said that notwithstanding the fact that 12 Democrats cosponsored the bill, the original bill that is now being filibustered. Nine Democrats, along with all of the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, voted to pass the bill out of the Judiciary Committee. Literally all 100 Senators had to consent for the bill to come to the floor without going through the typical procedural hurdles with which we are all very familiar.

Imagine my surprise, when in the middle of last week, these objections came up. What was the nature of the objection? The objection was that this bill contained a reference to an appropriations bill that was passed in 2014 and for which all of our Democratic colleagues voted. But that reference was to a restriction on the use of taxpayer dollars to fund abortions, known as the Hyde amendment. Then after they saw that or after they claimed that this was something new and unbeknownst to them, they objected.

I just simply cannot accept this argument that a provision that colleagues on that side of the aisle have routinely voted for on appropriations bills, that they routinely voted for on Defense authorization bills, and one they voted for on the Affordable Care Act, restricting the use of taxpayer funds under these circumstances—why they would pick this vehicle to object to that very same provision.

I accept at face value that some of our colleagues said that this is something they perhaps should have read more closely but they failed to do. I personally find it a little hard to believe, given the nature of the professional staff we have here in the Senate, that Members did not know that this restriction, known as the Hyde amendment, was part of the underlying bill. But assuming that is the case, what we are now offering them is a middle ground—to say that instead of this fund being a separate pool of money outside of the appropriations process, we would agree that the Appropriations Committee would appropriate money out of this fund in the same manner as they do all appropriations, with the exception that the money would be specifically designated to help the victims of human trafficking and not be able to be used for any other purpose.

So the reports are—after we made this proposal trying to address some of the concerns on this side of the aisle—that they would not be happy unless we stripped out all reference to the Hyde amendment in the bill. That is unacceptable. That is unacceptable for the same reason that they would object to a change in the status quo by an expansion of the Hyde amendment. We have now brought the Hyde amendment back within the appropriations process where it has been for 39 years. But to say we are going to eliminate any reference to those restrictions, which have been the law of the land for 39 years, would be viewed as an erosion of the Hyde amendment—hardly a status quo.

I don't know how long this is going to take. I appreciate the perseverance and commitment of the majority leader who, as you know, determines what bills come to the floor and when and who says we are going to stay on this bill until it passes. We have had a number of votes, and four of our Democratic colleagues have joined us to get to a place where we could actually pass this legislation. We just need a handful more—two or three more—to help us.

I know that a number of Senators are going to be hearing from their constituents back in their States because 200 different organizations—law enforcement organizations and victims' rights organizations that are very concerned about this human trafficking plague—are going to be lighting up the phone lines, sending emails, and communicating with their elected officials—as they should.

There is no reason we cannot get to ''yes'' on this bill unless this whole debate is a phony debate, and what the leadership on the Democratic side is more concerned about is trying to make the Senate as dysfunctional in the 114th Congress as they did in the 113th Congress.

I suspect, unfortunately, because of the phony issues saying take out language we voted for time and again—yes, it was contained in a bill we cosponsored. Yes, it was contained in a bill we voted for already. Now we are going to come to the floor, and we are going to block it.

We know who pays for this political gamesmanship. Sadly, it is the very same victims whom our colleagues

here on the floor say they want to help—the children—the 100,000 children who are subjected to human trafficking each year. Other people who need our help and deserve our help are among the most vulnerable people we can possibly imagine.

All of us are mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers. We all understand this could happen to anybody's family. Why in the world would we want to indulge in this sort of gamesmanship and phony objections to provisions that have been voted for time and again by the same Members who now object to them on this legislation and say to these victims of human trafficking that we don't care and we are not going to help?

I don't believe for a minute that is why Members of the Senate come here. I know virtually all 100 Senators, and I believe that most Senators—if not all Senators—come here because they actually want to do something. They actually want to solve problems. They actually want to help people who need the help. I cannot think of anybody more deserving than the victims of human trafficking.

I see the distinguished Senator from Colorado here. I will yield for him momentarily.

I wanted to come to the floor and respond to the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, that all we need to do is take up and pass the House bill. The House bill doesn't appropriate any money. It is an authorization bill. It authorizes $5 million in appropriations.

The great thing about our bill is it doesn't take any tax dollars. These are all fines and penalties and asset forfeitures from people engaged in the criminal enterprise, and this takes some of the profit out of this terrible crime.

It also does a number of other things, which I mentioned earlier. But the idea that we can somehow just take up and pass the House bill and avoid this bogus objection and somehow solve the problem, I think, just misses the point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, through the Chair, I would like to thank the senior Senator from Texas for his courtesy in allowing me to speak this afternoon.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be our next Attorney General. It has been 131 days since President Obama nominated her for this position. By Monday, she will have waited longer on the Senate floor than the last seven Attorney General nominees combined.

When it comes to Ms. Lynch's nomination, it seems as if we are setting records—but for all of the wrong reasons. The irony of that is that she is probably one of the most qualified and least political Attorney General nominees that this Chamber has seen in decades.

She has spent a significant portion of her career as a Federal prosecutor in the Eastern District of New York, having twice served as the U.S. attorney. There she took on corrupt public officials and expanded the office's national security practice. She has also worked in private practice at one of the country's top law firms, where she specialized in commercial litigation, white-collar criminal defense, and corporate compliance.

In 2011, she was recognized as the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association Foundation honoree of the year. In 2014, she was honored as the recipient of the Women in Federal Law Enforcement Foundation President's Award. She has received support—no surprise—from all across the political spectrum.

Just this week, even former New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani—hardly a great friend of the President—wrote that she was ''balanced, professional and a dedicated public servant.'' He went on to write that he can ''further attest that her skill set seems very appropriate to the tough tasks she would face as attorney general.''

The Major Cities Chiefs Association, which represents the 67 largest law enforcement agencies in the country, wrote this to the Senate: ''Ms. Lynch has overseen many important criminal prosecutions for terrorism, organized crime, corruption, drug and gang related cases. It is clear that her familiarity with the Department, managing a fast-paced and high profile office as well as her integrity and private sector legal experiences make her a qualified candidate.''

What are we waiting for?

Some 25 former U.S. attorneys who worked in both Democratic and Republican administrations wrote to this body saying: ''Ms. Lynch has the experience, temperament, independence, integrity, and judgment to immediately assume this critically important position.'' They should know. They should know. These are the folks with whom she has worked closely, and will continue to work as Attorney General. Both as a Federal prosecutor and in private practice, they have seen firsthand her character, intellect, and her integrity.

I myself once worked for the Deputy Attorney General of the United States at the Department of Justice. I know how close the collaboration is when things are working well between the Attorney General and the U.S. attorneys all throughout the United States of America, and it is something to see.

I know it has become fashionable around this place to continually criticize our Federal employees, but I recommend that our new colleagues, if they ever have the chance, go see the investiture of a new judge in their State, as I have had a chance to do in my State. When you see how the U.S. attorney's office, the Federal public defender's office, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the FBI, and the U.S. Marshals Service are all represented, you will say to yourself: Thank God I live in a country that is committed to the rule of law. Thank God I live in this country instead of most of the countries around the world where they don't even know what the rule of law is.

That is what we have in the United States, and the chief law enforcement officer of this country is our Attorney General.

Everybody who has looked at this nomination from the outside has said she would be an excellent Attorney General. So given all of that, it is awfully difficult to understand why she has had to wait so long just to receive a simple up-or-down vote. Has anyone challenged her qualifications? Come to the floor today and do it. Has anyone questioned her character or integrity? Of course not. Has she failed to provide necessary information to the Senate? It is my understanding that she testified for almost 8 hours and responded to about 900 questions for the record. Is her nomination delayed just to make political points on completely unrelated issues?

I have gotten to the point now that when people come to my office after they have been nominated to be a judge or have been nominated to do something in the Federal Government, the first words out of my mouth are not ''Congratulations'' anymore; the first words to come out of my mouth are ''Don't take it personally. Don't take this process personally.''

We are losing talented people who want to serve the United States of America in these important and in many cases nonpolitical jobs because the Senate cannot confirm them. It is because we tell somebody like Loretta Lynch: Sorry, it is going to be zillions of days before you have a chance to even serve this country.

It is not right. I am amazed at the capacity of people in this place to waste their own time, but we should not waste other people's time.

Unfortunately, the delay in confirming Ms. Lynch is having real-world consequences. Earlier this week, the former Deputy Attorney General expressed his concern that the protracted nomination process is adding unnecessary uncertainty to the Department of Justice. He highlighted the importance of having continuity in undertaking long-term investigations or in developing national security policy and how it is harder to facilitate continuity the longer Ms. Lynch's nomination is delayed.

As I said, this has become in many ways the new norm in our politics where these fights in Congress are having real-world consequences on the people we represent. It is incredibly counterproductive to the people we represent, whether it is shutting down the Department of Homeland Security or running the government on continuing resolutions or passing 2-week tax extender bills, for goodness' sake. There is not a mayor or county commissioner

in the entire State of Colorado who could get away with governing like this, and neither should we. It is obvious to everybody watching the Senate that we have not been productive. We have not really been productive for a long time but certainly not for the last 90 days. We barely managed to keep the Department of Homeland Security open for another 6 months. We passed a resolution of disapproval that the President will veto.

At the very least, we should be able to find the time to confirm Loretta Lynch as the Nation's next Attorney General. Her experience, temperament, and independence make her abundantly qualified for one of the most important positions our country has, and she has waited too long to receive an up-or-down vote.

I am not worried about her; she will be fine no matter what she does. I am worried about the Department. I am worried about our homeland security. I am worried about the willingness of other Americans to put their hand up and say ''Let me serve'' for fear that they will get caught in the crazy politics of the Senate.

I look forward to supporting Ms. Lynch's nomination. I hope we will have the opportunity to consider that nomination in the coming days.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, this is an important subject. For many, it is a matter of life and death. So I am pleased that we are taking up this bill so early in the session.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act can save lives, it can restore dignity to the victims of these heinous crimes, and it can help end modern-day slavery. I believe, without a doubt, every Member of this body wants to see this bill become law. I hope we can overcome this delay and send the bill to the President so we can make it a reality.

As the father of three girls and as a grandfather of granddaughters, I support the bill. I cosponsored it. I am eager to see it become law. By doing so, we will build on our previous efforts that have dramatically reduced instances of human trafficking around the globe.

Since the passage of the landmark Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, the United States has been a leader in the international community's fight to end modern-day slavery. This law ushered in a new strategy that addressed human trafficking on multiple fronts.

Combining strong protection for victims, including shelter and asylum, with tough punishments for traffickers, including long jail sentences and asset confiscation, and, most importantly, sanctions for offending governments, the law has enabled us to crack some of the biggest international human smuggling rings.

The most recent statistics show that during the 12-year period from 2000 to 2012, over 1,100 traffickers were charged in the United States, resulting in 755 successful convictions. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act can replicate these successes in combating international trafficking by helping us take on the traffickers here at home.

This is an effort by my colleagues that we can all agree is worthwhile, which is clear by how easily this passed in committee and by the level of bipartisan cosponsorship it maintains. So I am not quite certain I understand what the Democratic leadership's strategy aims to accomplish. The language they now find objectionable has been in the bill all along. It is standard language that has been around for decades.

On top of that, the majority leader offered a vote to strip the language. Yet the minority continues to block this bill from floor consideration. Not only can they offer an amendment to strip that language, but Members of the minority can offer any amendment they want, any amendment they believe will make the bill stronger. That is the amazing thing about regular order. I know some Senate Democrats are still getting used to the idea after years of being forced to the sidelines by their own leadership, but this is a good change which we should all embrace.

I believe this particular bill was strong from the onset, but I have offered a couple of amendments to make it even stronger and better. Both of these amendments make improvements to our efforts to address trafficking on the global stage.

The first one deals with countries that try to game the system to avoid sanctions. The State Department's tier system for ranking offending countries is an excellent tool for ferreting out the problem governments and prompting positive change. By utilizing the threat of sanctions, we can effect change for the better.

Regrettably, some countries have abused the system and taken advantage of the ''special watch list'' designation that is supposed to be reserved for troubled nations making good-faith efforts to actually change. These nations have been able to get this designation without ever attempting to address human trafficking and, in turn, avoiding the sanctions that they deserve. China is a perfect example.

With this amendment, we can put an end to the games. It will close the loopholes that allow governments to retain the ''special watch list'' designation without making immediate progress to reduce human trafficking or face quick removal. This will force governments to take real action, not just a nod and a wink to the problem to buy sanctions relief.

The second amendment aims to put more teeth in the State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking. This amendment seeks to rename it and elevate it to the status of bureau to increase its effectiveness so that those responsible for this essential diplomatic tool are heard within the State Department.

These two amendments will help our overall strategy to combat trafficking, but again, this bill, as it was introduced, would be a huge help in our efforts to save lives.

The bill has the support of 200 advocacy groups, many of which are law enforcement organizations. These advocacy groups are voicing the same concerns we hear on the local level in our communities back home—that this is a real problem with real victims—and our local officials want this bill passed for that exact reason.

Just last week, I was visiting with some of my State's mayors who were in Washington for the Arkansas Municipal League fly-in, and the issue came up. The mayor of Hot Springs, AR, Ruth Carney, said that this is an issue which is really close to her heart and highlighted that Garland County has a task force to tackle human trafficking. She said: ''It's a great thing to see that Congress is working to help with this situation because I feel like it's very important for our country.'' I imagine that the Senators holding up this bill hear the same thing from their State and local officials. Perhaps they should listen to them about the importance of getting this done.

So why drag this on longer? We could pass this bill within hours if the Democrats would drop this manufactured outrage over language that has been in the bill since its introduction. This language has literally been applied to similar legislation for decades.

The senior Senators from Texas and Minnesota came together in a bipartisan manner to draft this important legislation. It was passed by the committee, in regular order, in a similar bipartisan manner.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the victims, pass this bill, get them help, and get our communities the resources they need to save thousands more from becoming victims.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. 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. HATCH. Mr. President, today, we are continuing our consideration of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. I should note from the outset this is a bill that essentially every Senator—every single one of us—supports. How could we not? Right now in this country there are thousands of human beings living as slaves—stolen from their homes, stripped of their God-given rights, and robbed of their human dignity. A disproportionate number of these victims are women and children, often forced into sex slavery. These are crimes that shock the conscience, and every single one of us

should do everything in our power to stop this scourge and help make the victims whole again.

The legislation we are currently considering makes important steps toward achieving those goals. It treats children trapped in these horrible circumstances for what they are—victims, not criminals. It imposes stiff penalties on traffickers, exactly the sort their despicable crimes merit. It establishes an effective means of restitution for the victims, helping them to begin to rebuild their lives in the wake of enormous suffering.

I applaud the majority leader for his commitment to getting this bill passed. It is exactly the sort of legislation the Senate should be considering. While this may seem an obvious point, it is worth spelling out why this is true.

The majority leader's traditional right to be recognized first gives him control over what sort of legislation we consider. There is always a temptation to bring up partisan bills, so-called messaging bills. These bills are not designed to actually pass; after all, we all know we need 60 votes for cloture and 67 votes to override a veto. Instead, the goal of these messaging bills are to make a political point for the next election or even just for the next news cycle.

In the last Congress, the Democratic leadership called up these sort of messaging votes week after week. They repeatedly moved to bring up highly partisan bills that they refused to let us attempt to amend, with full knowledge that many of us would therefore have to vote against them and in most cases have to make them get at least 60 votes.

In last fall's election, the American people showed just how fed up they were with partisanship and gridlock by voting in a new Republican majority that promised a return to productive legislating through regular order. The majority leader's commitment to passing this human trafficking bill demonstrates how those of us in the new majority are trying our hardest to keep our promise to get the Senate back to work for the American people. This is not about partisan messaging votes doomed for failure. This is about getting a bill with broad bipartisan support passed into law that makes meaningful progress in our fight against the evils of human trafficking. Scoring political points for our party is rightfully taking a backseat for producing important results for our country.

Nevertheless, our majority can only do so much on its own. Simply put, it is hard to get much done in the Senate without bipartisan cooperation. So for all the restraint the majority has shown by bringing up bills such as this one that enjoy broad bipartisan support, we need at least some measure of restraint from the minority. By restraint, I do not mean to call for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to give up all their principles and simply give in to everything the majority wants. Instead, I mean the minority cannot demand getting their way on every single issue, that they should be willing to work through the open amendment process to reach an accommodation. Unfortunately, we find ourselves at an impasse with the minority claiming we somehow ambushed them with supposedly controversial language that they now are demanding we remove. My colleagues and I have come to the floor repeatedly over the past few days to illustrate just how ridiculous that claim is—how the language that is in the bill has been in there every step of the way since its introduction and how the Democrats had voted for it over and over again over the nearly 40 years it has been settled law.

Beyond all of the rhetoric, the pivotal moment in this debate came when the majority leader came to the floor and offered an up-or-down vote to strip out the language in question. This offer should have settled this controversy once and for all. It represented the majority leader extending his hand across the aisle in hopes of cooperation, but the minority leader objected, demanding a guarantee the provision would be removed. Well, that is not the way it works around here. That moment revealed what this logjam is really about. This is about the minority leadership resorting to the same ''my way or the highway'' tactics they abused when they were in the majority, tactics that have no place in a body built on compromise. This is about trying to stir up a fake controversy to fit a discredited war-on-women narrative.

Above all else, this is about scoring political points and trying to embarrass the majority by undermining our efforts to govern responsibly. This behavior is itself embarrassing and unworthy of this great institution in which we all serve, but it comes at a price.

It comes at a price for the victims of human trafficking whose suffering we are all committed to alleviate. It comes at a price for those men, women, and children living in silence, fear, hopelessness, and unspeakable anguish.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not bad people—far from it. They are men and women of great character who want to do the right thing for their constituents and for the Nation. I have enormous respect for each and every one of them, but in this latest maneuver, I feel many of them have gotten so caught up in partisan rhetoric—something that is so easy to do in Washington—that they have staked out an unjustifiable position that is prolonging the suffering of trafficking victims.

Let's be honest about it. The Hyde amendment has been in many bills that we all voted for time after time after time. However, NARAL, the National Abortion Rights Action League, and Planned Parenthood have tried to make this into an issue that it should never have been made into. Unfortunately, we don't have any courage on the other side of the aisle except for a few Senators who are willing to vote with us. We don't have any real courage to take on these people.

My gosh. I mean there comes a time—keep in mind, how do Republicans give in on this when this has been such an established law of our country?

I ask my colleagues to take a step back from the heat of the debate to think about this language that has been in the bill from the very beginning, that they have voted for in so many other contexts, that has been the settled law of the land for nearly 40 years, that they have rejected an up-or-down vote to remove, and that they have demanded be removed as a condition for passing this important legislation.

Is picking this fight really worth it?

Is scoring points against Republicans really worth the costs of victims of human trafficking?

Is trying to undermine our efforts to govern worth sacrificing the opportunity to help these men, women, and children in need?

The choice is clear. I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are pushing to end this stalemate, especially my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are willing to sacrifice temporary political gain to do the right thing for these victims we all want to help. I plead with those who have yet to join our efforts to move this bill forward to realize the suffering they are prolonging and to change their approach at the earliest possible opportunity.

GEOSPATIAL DATA REFORM ACT

Mr. President, in addition to urging the passage of the bill under consideration to fight human trafficking, I want to highlight another important bipartisan bill I have introduced and urge its speedy consideration. It is exactly the sort of productive legislating in which I believe the Senate should be engaged.

I rise in strong support of the Geospatial Data Reform Act, a bipartisan bill that will save taxpayers money while improving public safety, bolstering public development and preserving our natural resources through wider accessibility to geospatial data.

I am grateful for Senator WARNER's collaboration on this bill. Without his partnership this legislation would not have been possible, and I wish to thank him for his support over the past several months. Together we have worked tirelessly to craft bipartisan legislation that streamlines the way Federal agencies collect, manage, and distribute geospatial data to better serve the American people.

Whether we realize it or not, geospatial data is ubiquitous in our everyday lives. Geospatial data is the information that identifies the geographic locations and characteristics of

natural or constructed features and objects. To make this abstract concept more tangible, consider that every time we turn to the GPS on our phones we rely on geospatial data to find our destination. Geospatial data is an invaluable information resource, and we are just beginning to tap its full potential.

Every year, private businesses and government agencies are finding new and innovative ways to use this information to better deliver services to the public and to improve overall quality of life. FEMA's use of geospatial data during Hurricane Sandy is testament to the merits of this information resource.

The tragedy of Hurricane Sandy is still fresh in our memories. In 2012, this late autumn storm ravaged our eastern seaboard, battering buildings, toppling homes, and demolishing power lines, leaving behind a wake of destruction and shattered lives. Sandy was the deadliest hurricane to reach our shores since Katrina in 2005. In addition to the human toll, Sandy extracted a heavy financial cost, with estimated damages exceeding well over $50 billion. By using geospatial data, our government was better equipped to respond to this catastrophe. As victims rummaged through the rubble and wreckage of their broken homes, FEMA set to work analyzing geospatial datasets to identify over 40,000 homes damaged by the storm. This information allowed the Agency to pinpoint the most devastated neighborhoods and dispatch emergency personnel to those areas more quickly and efficiently. The use of geospatial data in response to this tragedy played an integral role in coordinating emergency response and helping families repair their damaged lives.

The way FEMA used geospatial data to aid victims of Hurricane Sandy is just one powerful example of the positive impacts geospatial data has on our lives.

But there are many more. The CDC also uses geospatial data to track disease outbreaks, informing decisions that ultimately save lives, the Department of Education uses geospatial data to analyze test scores from schools across the country to make plans for improvement, and the National Park Service uses geospatial data for resource management and to conserve our Nation's natural treasures.

There is almost no end to the sundry uses and benefits of geospatial data, but as the Federal Government invests billions of dollars every year in the collection and storage of geospatial data, there is a serious problem of interagency duplication. This duplication stems from a glaring lack of coordination between agencies on efforts to collect this information. In short, agencies are spending inordinate sums in taxpayer dollars to collect the same geospatial data other agencies may have already collected.

These duplicative efforts are a monumental and inexcusable waste of taxpayer money. Although the executive branch has been working for decades to reduce duplication and standardize the process for collecting and storing geospatial information, it has received little help from Congress.

The legislation Senator WARNER and I have introduced provides the executive branch the resources and direction it needs to reduce duplication and engender cooperation among agencies to ensure the efficient collection and dissemination of geospatial data across all levels of government. To save the taxpayers money, our bill requires Federal agencies to implement international consensus standards for geospatial data and assist in eliminating duplication.

The Geospatial Reform Act also codifies the implementation of the national spatial data infrastructure and provides agencies with a clear definition for geospatial data and metadata.

In addition, this bill standardizes the collection process by requiring agencies to comply with the Federal Geospatial Data Committee's standards for the development, sharing, and use of geospatial information.

Finally, our bill ensures accountability, transparency, and public access to nondefense-related Federal investments in geospatial data. Already, States, counties, municipalities, and the private sector are discovering dynamic ways to use and share geospatial data with one another.

Collaboration in this sphere is leading the way for new and improved services that were previously impossible to deliver. These entities outside of the Federal Government are finding new ways to coordinate investments and implement common standards. We need to do the same on the national level. We need proper Federal management for these data assets, and we need a national strategy for their many uses.

Our legislation provides the foundation for both. In a political environment clouded by polarization, this bill is a ray of hope. It is an opportunity for us to work together in a bipartisan fashion to pass commonsense legislation that is based on transparency and good governance.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the American taxpayer by supporting this bill. It is the right thing to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business, and that following me, the Senator from Washington be allowed to speak.

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

OSO MUDSLIDE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, almost 1 year ago, on a calm Saturday morning in the small town of Oso, more than a square mile of mud rushed down a mountainside in my home State of Washington. In a matter of seconds, dozens of homes were destroyed, dozens of people were missing, and they were trapped in the debris from the mudslide.

It was unclear at first the extent of the damage, the number of people trapped, and what could be done in the face of such devastation. First responders risked their own lives, braving dangerous conditions to look for survivors. Some were pulled from the rubble, but so many, too many, were lost. Houses over more than a square mile were simply swept away. The main highway to nearby Darrington was blocked, isolating that community. Forty-three people—children, mothers, brothers, and aunts—were killed.

This was the deadliest mudslide in our country's history. A year later, there is not a single person in Oso who has not been affected by this devastating natural disaster. In the blink of an eye, they saw water and earth wipe away their homes and their entire community. Let me tell you what I found when I visited the small nearby town of Arlington, where recovery plans were being made just days after the mudslide occurred 1 year ago.

I saw small towns like so many across the country in all of our States, the types of towns where everybody knows each other, the types of places where everyone stops to say hello and lend a helping hand. What I saw that day last March was a community where there was not a single person who was not doing every single thing they could to help.

Amidst the terrible destruction, I saw hope. I spoke to firefighters who had not slept for days, refusing to stop searching for survivors. I saw neighbors and friends and volunteers providing food and shelter and hugs and prayers, anything to assist the community who had experienced the unthinkable.

I want to tell one story from the days following that awful moment, a story that has been told before but bears repeating. A local woman named Rhonda Cook heard about the slide and she found out that her friend was driving by and was buried when the slide hit. Rhonda spent days digging through that debris looking for that blue car she knew was there somewhere, determined to bring her friend out of the mud.

When that car was finally uncovered and her friend's body was lifted out, Rhonda paused to pay her last respects. But then she kept on digging, looking for others. Rhonda is just one of the many heroes. There were so many, and so many more who continue working to this very day.

Last year, I joined many others in a pledge to stand with the people of Oso and Darrington in the months and years to come and to do whatever we could to help them on the road to recovery. I was proud to work with my colleagues in the Senate and with our friends in the House to make sure the Federal Government was offering a hand, because we are a nation that sticks together when times are tough.

We worked to secure housing grants and FEMA funding and transportation investments to repair State Route 530. More than 600 National Guard soldiers were deployed to help in the emergency response. The main highway through Darrington reopened finally last summer. Homes are now being rebuilt. Lives are being pieced back together. While I am so grateful for all that has been done to aid the recovery, our work is far from done.

Although the devastation will eventually be cleared, injuries will heal, the emotional scars will always remain, and the memory of those who were lost will never leave us. A disaster of this magnitude requires long-term assistance to help these communities respond, rebuild, and cope. Now a year down the long road of recovery, there is one word that comes to mind when trying to explain what the people of Oso and Darrington are at their core: resilient.

Aid workers searched for remains to return to loved ones for as long as 4 months after that mudslide. A man who lost his wife and son gave thousands of dollars in donations to other victims who he thought needed the money more than himself.

The people of Oso and Darrington will look back on March 22, 2014, this weekend, remembering lost homes and lost loved ones and even pets. I want those communities to know that all the way here across the country in the other Washington, I stand with Oso. We stand with Oso. Their resiliency in the face of such unthinkable devastation is an inspiration to us all. We will always remember what it means to be ''Oso strong.'' They have the thoughts and prayers of everyone in the country to continue rebuilding, from Washington State to Washington, DC, and everywhere in between.

I yield the floor to my colleague, Senator CANTWELL, who, as I was, was there time and time again with this community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague from Washington, Senator MURRAY, on the observance of this very solemn milestone. This Sunday will be 1 year since this catastrophic event. I want to thank Senator MURRAY for something she did not mention, which is her leadership on helping us get passed the Green Mountain Lookout legislation in the aftermath of this event, which is legislation that she had championed for a long time and yet had been stuck. When people realized there were things we could do for this community to help restore its recreational and economic activity, she got on it and we were able to pass that very quickly. So I thank her for that leadership.

This Sunday is a very solemn milestone, because 43 Washingtonians lost their lives in a very destructive mudslide that buried the highway between the communities of Darrington and Oso and nearby Arlington. These communities lost loved ones, friends. Their memory will be with us for a long time. These communities have shown that even in the most unimaginable devastation, people can come together in unity and persevere. They showed how light and hope can shine through even in grief.

Now, after many months, stores are reopening, the highway is again bustling, there are new connections of Internet and phone lines being restored, residents are rebuilding, and they are hoping for a brighter economic future.

As my colleague said, we were very inspired by the hope and grace of this community, that continues to demonstrate that on a daily basis. It is hard to believe that a year has gone by. On that morning, it became just like every other morning, a rainy Saturday morning, and people went about their business. But as the heavy rain weakened one of the hills in the Stillaguamish Valley, the resulting landslide was approximately 1 square mile. Forty-nine homes were destroyed, 530 were covered, and the Stillaguamish River was basically rerouted. So many problems arose. But immediately more than 1,000 volunteers descended. Many from the local community, with their own transportation systems, their own rigs, came to the river and devoted thousands of hours to try to help survivors and to help the community recover.

This American flag was hoisted by one of the firefighters. It is tacked to a standing nearby tree, just to show our resilience. Much like the American flag, this community was battered and bruised but was very proud. During those days, many Washingtonians would make sure that every resource was made available to this community. When faced with these immense challenges, these communities of Darrington and Oso pulled together and, yes, Oso became ''Oso strong.''

It was a rallying cry for the volunteers, to the young people, to many people who were working many hours a day. Private companies and individuals, corporations, tribes, charities, nonprofits—all sorts of governments chipped in. Everybody helped. We want to thank them for that help. It was just a year ago that it seemed as though every resource covered the festival grounds and the Forest Service parking lot, FEMA, Snohomish County, the Department of Natural Resources, the National Guard, fire departments up and down the State. They continued to make sure everything was addressed—recovery efforts underway, local people gathered, such as the small business owner there in Darrington, Kevin Ash, who tried to keep a plan for every business to stay open.

We looked at what could be accomplished for the future. Out of these meetings, we were able to secure a $150,000 grant from the Economic Development Administration to draft an economic disaster recovery plan for the community. That plan is set to be unveiled in June and help the local economy that once was heavily dependent on logging that was hit hard by this disaster.

Senator MURRAY and I have worked with Mayor Dan Rankin from Darrington, whose leadership and on-the-job focus for this has helped the community continue to survive this incredible disaster. There are so many strategies Mayor Dan has put into place that are about how the community moves forward.

Over the past year, the Small Business Administration awarded $400,000 in low-interest loans to help rehabilitate businesses in the area. It is helping the Darrington-Arlington economy and others in the affected area. Through their innovation and hard work, everybody is trying to help what is called the Upper Stillaguamish Valley not just get back to where it was but flourish in the future. This is some of the most beautiful territory in our State, from the heights of Glacier Peak to the depths of the Upper Stillaguamish Valley. This typifies the beauty of the Northwest.

I want to make sure we thank the appropriate people who helped us in this response: President Obama, who visited the area; Homeland Secretary Jeh Johnson; FEMA Director Craig Fugate; obviously our Governor; Representative DELBENE, who was there practically every moment of this disaster, from the moment it happened, for days and days and days, and then around the clock, shuttling back and forth between Washington, DC, and the site; Congressman LARSEN; obviously SBA Administrator Maria Contreras-Sweet, who came to the site; the Red Cross; the Oso fire station.

We talk about first responders here. But when you see first responders for small communities step up and address such an incredible natural disaster and coordinate everything—I want to say a thanks to Willy Harper from the Oso fire station, and Travis Hots, who was the incident command leader for the first several days from Snohomish County Fire District, which brought all of the resources together to try to make the planning and recovery efforts for this incredible disaster go as smoothly as possible; County Executive John Lovick and Sheriff Ty Trenary. I also want to say Arlington Mayor Barbara Tolbert did more for the community in using every resource she had to help support the recovery of these Washington residents. Some communities might say, well, that is somewhere down the road, and who is going to help us? But she put every Arlington resource onto this site, knowing it might be months and months and months before she ever saw any of the resources to reimburse them.

We want to thank Arlington for everything they did. So while we will this weekend be having a moment of silence on the site, we have to remember the

individuals we lost, and how we need to move ahead. This hillside bears an unmistakable scar. It has inflicted deep wounds. But it is healing because of the friends and neighbors who have strengthened us in this region.

We want to make sure that the memories of those we lost will fuel our determination to do better. Regardless, it is not going to be easy, it is not going to be quick, but we will continue to build off of the strength this community demonstrated in the aftermath of this disaster.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator HEITKAMP, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, for the past 10 days this body has been engaged in an important debate on a bill that has had widespread, bipartisan support, that was reported unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and that would help to end the scourge of human trafficking.

I am a cosponsor of this bill because I believe it will help equip law enforcement and prosecutors with the tools they need to combat these horrific sex trafficking crimes.

I, along with my colleague, Senator LEAHY, have also introduced a bill—that we have filed as an amendment—that would reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs so we can also have a prevention piece in this legislation.

Many Members of this body have worked very hard on this legislation. Senator CORNYN, whose bill we are considering, has been a real leader in the area of human trafficking. Senator KLOBUCHAR also has a bill I have been proud to cosponsor. Senator GRASSLEY and Senator LEAHY, at the request of all 20 of the women Senators, held a hearing on this issue at which I was privileged to testify, along with Senator AYOTTE, Senator MIKULSKI, and Senator GILLIBRAND.

I applaud the Judiciary Committee for its work in shining a light on some of the darkest stories imaginable. No State is immune from the evils of human trafficking.

Just recently in Maine, a couple was arrested for allegedly trafficking a girl who was only 13 years old. They used the Internet to sell her for sex.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act that Senator LEAHY and I have cosponsored seeks to prevent young people from ever getting trapped in these situations in the first place, and I hope we can move on to that bill, which we have filed as an amendment.

But, regrettably, we find ourselves at an impasse—imagine that—an impasse on a bill that would help curb human trafficking. How can that be?

Senator HEITKAMP and I have joined forces to try to move this bill forward. That is our goal, and the goal of the amendment we have filed.

What our amendment would do, and it is very straightforward, is it would subject the fund that Senator CORNYN has created, and which I strongly support, to the annual appropriations process and to all of the usual restrictions that the Appropriations Committee can and does add to appropriations bills.

There is precedent for taking a fund that is not financed by tax dollars and sending it through the appropriations process. It, frankly, happens all the time. We have seen it with the oil and gas revenues that go to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Those are not tax dollars.

We have seen it with a number of fees and restitution programs that are not tax dollars but go through the appropriations process, where the Appropriations Committee can work its will.

Under out amendment, all of the money collected from special assessments imposed on certain trafficking criminals and deposited into the fund would still be made available to anti-trafficking and victims' services grant programs, but only through the direction of the annual appropriations process. By placing the fund squarely within the jurisdiction of appropriators, each and every penny collected would be subject to the limitations in those appropriations bills. Our amendment would strike the reference that has been the sources of this controversy from this authorizing bill, but does not alter that restriction on federal funds that has existed for 39 years.

Our amendment makes clear that money in the fund, or transferred from the fund, is subject to the limitations provided in appropriations acts.

I believe our amendment, by allowing the Appropriations Committee to put whatever restrictions are appropriate on this fund—and I have no doubt the usual restrictions will be put on by the Appropriations Committee—could get this bill to move forward, and those such as Senator CORNYN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and others who have worked so hard to bring this bill to the Senate floor, will see there is a path forward.

We owe it to the victims of human trafficking. We owe it to the victims of human trafficking. We owe it to them. We cannot fail in this task. If we cannot approve a bill to deal with human trafficking, then what will we be able to deal with?

We have to get past the tendency to score partisan, political points that have affected too many bills on both sides of the aisle. In this case, it is simply too important.

I thank my dear friend and colleague from North Dakota, Senator HEITKAMP, who has been an attorney general, who has dealt with the victims of this terrible crime, for coming forward and joining with me as we attempt to put forth—for our colleagues' sincere consideration—a path forward that will end this impasse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I thank my great friend, the Senator from Maine. She has been so instrumental in achieving compromise in the body, whether it is in the Commonsense Caucus, when we were in shut down, or it is just bridging the gap many times and trying to find a path forward for us to legislate in the Senate. She truly is a champion in her efforts in trying to make this body work.

I wish to start off by saying that as an attorney general, the whole while I was attorney general—for 8 years—there was very little activity on prostitution. When I was running for office, I visited with law enforcement—and I still have a lot of friends in law enforcement—and I asked them: What are your challenges? Every local sheriff, especially those in western North Dakota, and every city chief of police said: We have a growing concern with prostitution.

I started thinking about that. I started thinking about what that meant. Then I started looking behind what those claims of prostitution were, and I began to realize that for very many of these young women—often children—who are in this life of prostitution, it is not by choice. This is some of the most horrific victimization that goes on in America today—the victimization of small children, the dehumanization of small children, the challenge of a recovery once they are given an opportunity to find a different path forward, the addiction that comes with it, the grooming that comes with it, and the shame that comes with it.

Many people say they want to prevent this, but very often we know the victims of human trafficking come from homes that weren't the healthiest of homes. These are very often runaways, they are homeless youth, and they have no other option for recovering, they have no other option for sustaining their life than being part of this horrific experience.

So as my great friend from Maine talks about this, we need to do a better job in getting the tools for prosecution, which is the excellent bill Senator KLOBUCHAR has advanced for promoting safe harbor legislation, which will not only help in the path to recovery but also will give us an opportunity to encourage more and more of these victims to come forward as witnesses for the prosecution. It is very difficult to convince someone who has been told for years and years, as they have been in the life, that ''If you tell about this victimization, what will happen is you will go to jail with me. So we have to

stick together.'' How do we break that cycle of control? We break it by providing opportunity, which these bills do. We break it by passing the homeless youth and runaway bill. We break it by focusing a bright light on this problem.

I could not have been prouder of this body as we moved toward these series of bills on homeless youth and moved forward on these series of bills on trafficking. This body was speaking for some of the most disenfranchised citizens in our country—those victims of human trafficking. So you can imagine my despair and I think the despair of a lot of victims groups and the despair of a lot of people in this body when we reached this impasse.

It is important that we say that the goal now is not to rehash what has happened in the past, it is not to rehash the problems and the concerns everybody has had in the past. We must set aside all of that. Set aside all of the rancor we have heard for the last week and focus on one thing: Focus on a victim who may be watching us. Focus on a victim's advocate who may be wanting and needing and desperately seeking the help we can provide that advocate in providing a secure future for these victims. Let's focus on them. Let's focus on what we can do to bridge this impasse.

My friend Senator COLLINS and I think we have, as she has described it, advanced a proposal that we believe firmly resolves all the issues. It sets forth a path where we can, in fact, move forward and listen to the voices that don't get heard very often in places like Washington, DC, and respond to their concerns, respond to the victimization, be the empathetic body I know we can be by saying: Yes, we can help, and we will help.

So my colleague and I hope this will at least generate enough discussion, provide at least enough of a bridge forward that we can continue to have the dialogue, continue to address amendments—if we can get through this—and actually move this issue forward.

I yield to my great friend from Maine, but I would like to ask her a question. As an appropriator, I know there may be some controversy. She has raised this already. There is some discussion that this may not be an appropriate place to make this decision, and I would like my colleague to elaborate on the appropriations process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. If I could respond through the Chair, Mr. President, I do have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Appropriations, and I have seen the restrictions we have put on funds over the years. One of those restrictions which is at issue here goes back 39 years. So it is not unusual for the Committee on Appropriations to put certain limitations on the use of funds.

As I explained earlier, the Committee on Appropriations also deals with nontax dollars. It is not unusual for us to appropriate money that comes from the collection of fines, of fees, of penalties, from leases. This is common. So what we are proposing in this bill is not anything new, unusual, or unique. It would be part of the standard appropriations process.

Indeed, Senator CORNYN actually raised the idea on the floor today of having the victims fund go through the appropriations process. We differ in language, so I don't want to imply there is any endorsement, but the concept is one the author of the bill has raised.

So in response to my colleague from North Dakota, who has spoken so eloquently of her experience in dealing with the victims of human trafficking, I would assure her that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I know full well that we put restrictions and limitations on funding as a standard course.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I would like to have a moment where we think about this body and how impressed everybody throughout the country is, how proud they are of our system of government, how proud of the great decisions that have been made in this room and of the great deliberations and the great debates. This truly is a remarkable government, and it is a remarkable system. But it has always been remarkable because it is not just the wealthy and powerful who have a voice in this body. With us comes the opportunity to speak for the most disadvantaged Americans, the most disadvantaged people in our system. And I cannot imagine a more horrific life than the life of being sold into prostitution. I cannot imagine a more horrific life than being enslaved through the horrible events of human trafficking.

Let's speak for those victims. Let's speak for those advocates who work so hard, who have been so encouraged that an issue such as this has become a priority issue for the United States of America. Let's try to bridge this gap. Let's work across the aisle, and let's reach to find a way forward because these victims deserve our attention, they deserve this debate, and they deserve our voice.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I again want to thank my colleague from North Dakota for her very eloquent plea to our colleagues.

I know we can do this. I know we can find a path forward. I know we can get a sufficient number of votes so that we can proceed and debate the many amendments that have been filed on this bill. I know we can do it. The victims of this horrific crime deserve no less from the United States Senate, so let's not fail them. Let's not fail them.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor again today to talk about the importance of getting the bill passed, and we have seen today for the first time—I talked I think 3 hours yesterday—the need to change the tone and try to work across the aisle on some ideas to move forward with this bill. That is happening in many conversations in this Senate Chamber and in offices, and I am pleased that we have had a change in tone and that we have some possibility of moving forward. I thank my colleagues for that.

Senator CORNYN and I have worked on this issue for a long time. In addition to the bill that is on the floor today, we also have the important safe harbor bill that I am leading and that Representative ERIK PAULSEN is leading in the House. This is a bill—since it went out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously and has none of the issues and controversy involved in the current bill on the floor—I hope will be able to get through this Senate Chamber in the coming week as either part of this bill or on its own.

This safe harbor bill, of course, is about treating the victims of sex trafficking as victims and not treating them as criminals when they are 12 years old. It is taking a model from Minnesota and 15 States and now creating incentives to bring it out to the rest of the country.

So what is it we have been talking about here over this last week? We are talking about 27 million people around the world who are victims of some kind of trafficking every year. Some of this is labor trafficking, but what we are focused on this week is sex trafficking. It is the third biggest criminal enterprise in the world. The first is illegal trafficking of drugs, the second is illegal trafficking of guns, and the third is illegal trafficking of girls and young boys. And the average age is 12 years old—not even old enough to drive a car, not even old enough to go to their first prom.

Last year, I went to Mexico with Cindy McCain, and we met with a number of officials and prosecutors and victim advocates who were working to fight this crime in Mexico. We visited a shelter for abused girls. We met with the Attorney General and with the Federal Police. But what I most remember of all of those meetings as to how we could better coordinate our focus on sex trafficking was the visit to the Covenant House in Mexico City, where there were girls as young as 11 years old who were victims of trafficking.

There was one girl who truly stood out. Her name was Paloma. She was new to the house which had taken her in and was in the first stage of recovery. Unlike the other girls who spoke

through an interpreter, she could speak English, but all she could say was her name, and then she couldn't stop crying. And while some of the other girls told their stories, she never told her stories in words. She only told her story through her tears. That is a moment I won't forget.

It reminded me of something I heard when I visited a refugee camp once in Jordan, where a mother said she had seen things that would make stones cry. That is what that little girl Paloma was saying through her tears, that the experiences she had had of being trafficked at 11 years old would make stones cry. These are real stories.

When Polaris—one of the major groups working on this issue of sex trafficking—released their State-by-State rankings of efforts to fight human trafficking, here is what they had to say:

> The scope and scale of human trafficking within the United States presents a daunting challenge to policymakers, service providers, law enforcement, and advocates. Originally, human trafficking was thought to be more of a problem in other countries, but now it is known to be happening in our own backyards. It is estimated that there are hundreds of thousands of victims of sex and labor trafficking inside our borders.

But what we know today is that 83 percent of the victims in the United States are from the United States. It is not just girls at the bottom of a ship—which does happen—it is girls right in our country, girls right in Minnesota, on the streets of Rochester, where just in the last few months we had a 12-year-old girl who got a text inviting her to a party, showed up at a McDonald's parking lot where she was supposed to go, a guy puts her in a car, takes her up to the Twin Cities, rapes her, takes sexually explicit pictures of her, puts them on the Internet. The next day she is sold on Craigslist to two other men and raped. That happened in Minnesota. That man has now been indicted by the U.S. Attorney's office. But we have seen these cases over and over again.

People say, why is this getting worse? Why is the Senate debating this issue right now? It is because, as much as we love the Internet, we also know it has provided a vehicle for this kind of activity so that it is much easier for people to do behind closed doors where no one notices them basically get these young girls in their grasp.

Yesterday I spent nearly 3 hours reading from a book by Nicholas D. Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn about international sex trafficking called ''Half the Sky.'' I did that because I felt the tone had gotten so bad in this Chamber on both sides, with people hurling accusations and not even being willing to talk about possible ways to resolve this, and I am glad again that now we are finally talking today.

They have another book about domestic sex trafficking, which is the focus of the bill on the floor today, as well as our safe harbor bill. They tell a story of a girl named Clemmie. The book is called ''A Path Appears.'' They say:

> One of the first women whom Becca helped was Clemmie Greenlee, an African American woman who had been raped repeatedly beginning at the age of five and then systematically pimped from the age of twelve. Clemmie began drinking at the age of eight, dropped out of school in fourth grade, and soon became a heroin addict and an expert at robbing johns. On one occasion she did more than steal. A customer was beating her so badly, so she pulled out a knife and stabbed him. ''I didn't see blood, so I stabbed him again, four more times,'' she said. He almost died, but fortunately for Greenlee he was a married man who begged the police not to press charges, and without his testimony they didn't have a case. She was freed.
>
> By 2001, Greenlee was a gaunt eighty-five pounds, sleeping on the streets or in abandoned buildings, all of her money was going to crack cocaine. She had had a son who was killed in gang violence. She was seen as having so little commercial value that pimps abandoned her. An old friend from the streets found Greenlee in a crack house and dragged her over to see Reverend Stevens at Magdalene.

This is an example of what we are seeing across this country—right in our own country. These stories are so raw and so ugly, but I tell them and read from that book yesterday just so people remember why we are here and what we are dealing with, so we can put some of these issues—extraneous issues, things we need to change in the bill and fix in the bill, that we have some motivation to do it. These girls really don't know how to change the laws in Congress. They need our help to do that.

My good friend Cindy McCain, through her work at the McCain Institute—and I see Senator RUBIO here from Florida, who is also familiar with that work and knows what she has done. They undertook a study looking to get some baseline data on sex trafficking around big events. We have seen what happens where we have increases in Web site advertising and other things, and we have seen what happens when law enforcement actually comes together across all jurisdictional lines—Federal, State, and local—when the private sector engages, like our hotels—hotels like the Radisson Hotels in Minnesota. Marilyn Carlson Nelson has been such a leader on this, and has really set up and helped to fund foundations, because they see it. They know their workers are on the frontline and can actually stop it from happening—or airlines, like Delta, American, United that are on the frontlines and they train employees so they can stop this from happening.

So, yes, these bills will help. The bill we have on the floor right now that Senator CORNYN and I worked on, and many others in this Chamber, will help get funds for the victims and for these shelters. The bill I am leading with Senator CORNYN will actually help to make sure our States get incentives to make sure we are handling these criminal prosecutions in a way that works, that emboldens the victims so they don't go back to the pimps, so they don't go back to that cycle of violence, so they actually feel they are in a safe harbor, that they are in a safe place so they will testify against these perpetrators—the ones running these rings, these crooks, these people who are treating these young girls as chattel. That is what these bills are about.

So we need a path forward. I think for the first time today we are seeing—despite no agreement yet and a lot of ideas out there, we are seeing a different tone. I want people to remember that not only will this bill involve the fund I am talking about, but once we either join it or pass separately our safe harbor law, it will also create incentives for States to change their laws. It will also create a national sex trafficking strategy that is in my safe harbor law. It will also allow these young girls who are victims to be part of job training programs and other things, to make it easier for our law enforcement with an amendment that I included in my bill from Senator SESSIONS and Senator WHITEHOUSE with the U.S. Marshals. There are many good things that are going to help.

Mostly, we are going to send a message from this Chamber, finally, after all of this acrimony over the last days and all of the blame, that we can finally send a message to that little girl named Paloma that this country believes in her. We believe these lives have value, and we must stand by these victims and stand up for these victims—not only in our country but internationally.

I thank the Presiding Officer. I thank my colleagues. I know these conversations are continuing as we work to find a path forward. I thank Senator CORNYN for the work we have done together. I look forward to getting this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, let me begin by acknowledging the work the sponsors of the human trafficking bill are doing. Trafficking is a sanitized way to discuss this issue. It is actually slavery, and I am glad that term is finding its way into the lexicon of how this is discussed.

It is not just the sex trafficking—sex slavery—it is also labor trafficking, which is a major problem in this country as well.

I do hope we can find a way forward on this one. It is an extraordinarily important issue, one that has taken far too long to pay attention to. It is not something that happens just around the world, but it happens here closer than we think.

ISRAEL

Mr. President, I want to talk about a separate topic today as well. It is one a

lot of people have been reading about in the newspapers over the last 72 hours.

As we all know, there was an election in Israel this week, and many people are wondering: What is this aftermath of the election we keep reading about, where there is this controversy and back and forth? Certainly some of that happened a few weeks ago, when the Prime Minister of Israel visited Washington and spoke before the Congress. People are wondering, what is it that is going on here and why is there so much controversy around all this? I want to take a moment to delve deeper into this, because this is important.

First of all, to answer the fundamental question: Why should we care about what is happening with Israel, in Israel, and about Israel? There are two reasons I think we should care.

The first is because Israel represents everything we want that region of the world to be. Israel is a democracy, as evidenced by the vibrant election process they just underwent. Israel is a free enterprise economy, a developed economy, that provides prosperity for its people and its partners in trade and commerce. And Israel is a strong American ally—a democracy, a free enterprise, and a strong American ally.

Don't we wish the entire Middle East looked that way? Don't we wish we had more countries in the Middle East that looked like Israel—that were allies, that were democratic, and had a free and prosperous economy? How much better would the world be if the Middle East looked more like Israel and less like Iraq and Syria and other places look like at this moment?

There is another reason why we should care about Israel. Israel is not just another country. It has a special and unique purpose. It was founded as a homeland for the Jewish people in the aftermath of the Second World War and of the Holocaust, where over 6 million human beings were slaughtered. It was founded on the promise that never again in the history of the world would there not be a place for the Jewish people to go and be safe. It is not just a nation, it is a nation with a special and unique purpose unlike any other nation in the world, and I for one am proud that the United States has stood with Israel for all these years, and I am proud that the American people on a bipartisan basis have stood behind the Jewish State of Israel for all of these years. So the security, safety, and future of Israel is in our national security interest, as well as a moral obligation of every Member of this body and us as a nation.

What are the underpinnings of Israeli security? There are two things. First, the ability of Israel to defend itself; and the second, the reality that if Israel ever has to defend itself, the United States will be there to support them.

There is little doubt about the first pillar of its security. As the Prime Minister reminded us: Unlike many other countries, Israel is not asking us to send American soldiers or aircraft to support them. They are willing to defend themselves. But the second pillar, about strong and unquestionable American support, is increasingly being questioned around the world. And there is good reason why.

Let's begin with the aftermath of this recent election.

As far as I know—maybe this has changed in the last few hours—after this election, the President has yet to call the Prime Minister. That is unlike, of course, the fact that in March of 2012, he was among the first to call and congratulate Putin in Moscow. Or that in June of 2012, he was among the first to call Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood when they won the Egyptian Presidency. Or that in November of 2012, he called to congratulate the top Chinese Communists on their new position—which, by the way, is not elected in the way you and I would consider there to be an election. Or the fact that in 2013, there was an historic phone call. They bragged about how he called the Iranian President and congratulated him on his election. And of course, in August of 2014, he called to congratulate Turkey's President Erdogan.

And on and on.

Time and again, this President has made a habit of quickly calling these leaders when they win. But as of 4:40 p.m. eastern time, as far as I know, that call has yet not been made. Thinking about all the things that have been going on with Israel, we would think he would be quick to make that call. It hasn't happened. Maybe it has already, but it certainly didn't happen fast enough.

But where does this come from? Is this new? Is this something that just happened recently? It isn't. In fact, we can start to see the trends here pretty early.

In October of 2008, then-Senator Obama told an audience in Cleveland:

> There is a strain within the pro-Israel community that says unless you adopt an unwavering pro-Likud [one of the political parties in Israel] approach to Israel that you're anti-Israel.

Which is a silly comment to make, since at that time that party had been out of power.

In January of 2009, the President, upon taking office, makes a quick phone call to the Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas before he even phoned the Israeli Prime Minister. Abbas's spokesman Nabil Abu Rudeina quoted Obama as saying:

> This is my first phone call to a foreign leader, and I'm making it only hours after I took office.

In July of 2009, the President hosted American Jewish leaders at the White House, and he reportedly told them that he sought to put ''daylight'' between America and Israel. Here is the quote that someone at that meeting says he made: ''For eight years [during the Bush administration] there was no light between the United States and Israel, and nothing got accomplished,'' he declared.

In September of 2009, in his first address to the U.N. General Assembly, President Obama devoted five paragraphs to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, during which he declared—to loud applause; by the way, in the United Nations, no surprise—''America does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements.'' He went on to draw a connection between rocket attacks on Israeli civilians with living conditions in Gaza. There was not a single unconditional criticism of Palestinian terrorism.

In March of 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton berated Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu on a now infamous 45-minute call, telling him that Israel had ''harmed the bilateral relationship.'' By the way, the State Department triumphantly shared details of the call with the press. That same month, the Israeli Ambassador was dressed down at the State Department, and Mr. Obama's Middle East envoy canceled his trip to Israel, and the United States under his leadership joined the European condemnation of Israel.

In May of 2011, the State Department issued a press release declaring that the Department's No. 2 official would be visiting ''Israel, Jerusalem, and the West Bank,'' as if Jerusalem was not part of Israel. So they left that separate.

Later in the month, only hours before Mr. Netanyahu departed from Israel to Washington, Mr. Obama delivered his infamous Arab Spring speech, which focused on a demand that Israel return to its indefensible pre-1967 borders with land swaps.

In November of 2011, an open microphone caught part of a private conversation with the President and French President Nicolas Sarkozy. Sarkozy said of the Israeli premier:

> I can't stand Netanyahu. He's a liar.

But rather than defend Israel, the President piled on. He said:

> You're tired of him; what about me? I have to deal with him every day.

In February of 2012, at a conference in Tunis, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was asked about Mr. Obama pandering to ''Zionist lobbies.'' She acknowledged that it was ''a fair question'' and went on to explain that during an election season ''there are comments made that certainly don't reflect our foreign policy.''

In 2014, during the Gaza conflict, the White House and the State Department criticized Israel for the deaths of Palestinians who were being used as human shields by Hamas. But far worse and far more suggestive of the President's true feelings was the White House's decision to try and use arms supplies as a pressure point against Israel.

In October of 2014, an anonymous administration official called Prime Minister Netanyahu ''a chicken——'' I can't even finish it.

That is what has happened up to this point. That is what has happened up to this point. What has happened now? An election just happened 2 days ago. The first thing the White House says is: You used a lot of divisive language in that election. That is saying a lot from someone who has been elected at least once, probably twice, on extremely divisive language.

But what about when Iran had a fraudulent election in 2009 and the people of Iran took to the streets to protest in the famous Green Revolution? You know what the White House said? We are not going to comment on that election because we are not going to interfere in the sovereignty of Iran. They will comment on the elections of an ally, calling the rhetoric of the election divisive. But when an enemy—which is what Iran is—has a fraudulent election and kills people who protest against it, we can't comment. We can't comment because that would be infringing on their sovereignty.

The other thing that has happened is the Prime Minister made a statement about how a two-state solution isn't possible given the current circumstances. What does the White House do? They jump up and say: Well, that means we may have to reconsider. We may have to go to the United Nations Security Council now and support a resolution, and that means not to use our veto authority to stop a resolution that calls on Israel to create a Palestinian State with 1967 borders.

Why would the Prime Minister of Israel say that, by the way? He is right; the conditions don't exist. Do you want to know why the conditions don't exist? First of all, let's go through the history of peace negotiations.

In 2000, at Camp David, Israel offered the Palestinian Authority nearly all of the West Bank, Eastern Jerusalem, and Gaza. The Palestinians said no. In 2000, Israel withdrew from southern Lebanon. Do you know what that is today? That is a place where they launch rockets against Israel.

In 2005, Israel withdrew from Gaza. Do you know what that is today? A place where they launch rockets from against Israel.

In 2008, Israel offered—again, to the Palestinian Authority—nearly all of the West Bank, nearly all of Judea and Samaria and Eastern Jerusalem. The Palestinian authority said no.

What about the Palestinian record? Let's begin with the fact that according to many reports, about 6 percent of the Palestinian budget is diverted to pay the salary of prisoners. That means the salary of terrorists, of people who have blown up centers and killed civilians, including Americans. They are being paid salaries and benefits, including with money from donors, such as the United States, Great Britain, Norway, and Denmark.

Here is another material on how the PA routinely depicts a world without Israel. This is from a Palestinian schoolbook:

> Palestine's war ended with a catastrophe that is unprecedented in history, when the Zionist gangs stole Palestine . . . and established the so-called State of Israel.

Or what about this particularly horrific expression of ideology which appeared in a Palestinian Authority daily as far back as 1998:

> The difference between Hitler and [British Foreign Minister] Balfour was simple: the former [Hitler] did not have colonies to send the Jews to, so he destroyed them, whereas Balfour . . . [turned] Palestine into his colony and sent the Jews. Balfour is Hitler with colonies, while Hitler is Balfour without colonies. They both wanted to get rid of the Jews...Zionism was crucial to the defense of the West, [by] ridding Europe of the burden of the Jews.

This is from a daily of the PA. These are the people with whom we are pressuring them to cut a peace deal.

What about this?

> The Palestinian Authority has named numerous locations and events after Palestinian terrorists responsible for killing Israeli civilians.

What about this? This opinion piece appeared in the New York Times in 2013:

> The Palestinian Authority's television and radio stations, public schools, summer camps, children's magazines and Web sites are being used to drive home four core messages. First, that the existence of a Jewish state . . . is illegitimate because there is no Jewish people and no Jewish history. . . . Second, that Jews and Zionists are horrible creatures that corrupt those in their vicinity. Third, that Palestinians must continue to struggle until the inevitable replacement of Israel by an Arab-Palestinian state. And fourth, that all forms of resistance are honorable and valid, even if some forms of violence are not always expedient. Instead of being schooled in the ''culture of peace,'' the next generation of Palestinians is being relentlessly fed a rhetorical diet that includes the idolization of terrorists, the demonization of Jews and the conviction that sooner or later Israel should cease to exist.

These are the people with whom this President wants to put pressure on them to cut a peace deal. I think Netanyahu is right. The conditions do not exist for a peace deal with people who teach their children that killing Jews is a glorious thing. The conditions for peace do not exist with a people—with a government, I should say, not a people. The people are victims of this government, the Palestinian Authority—not to mention Hamas, which teaches people that killing Jews is a glorious thing, that there is no such thing as a Jewish people, that any methods of destroying them is valid, that pays them salaries and benefits.

This President is making a historic mistake. Allies have differences. But for allies such as Israel, when you have a difference with them and it is public, it emboldens their enemies—to launch more rockets out of southern Lebanon and Gaza, to launch more terrorist attacks, to go to international forums and delegitimize Israel's right to exist. This is what they are doing.

This is a historic and tragic mistake. Israel is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. If this were a Republican President doing these things, I would give the exact same speech. In fact, I would be even angrier. This is outrageous. It is irresponsible, and it is dangerous. It betrays the commitment this Nation has made to the right of a Jewish State to exist in peace. No people on earth want peace more than the people of Israel. No people have suffered more at the hands of this violence and this terrorism than the people of Israel. They need America's support unconditionally. If there are differences, they need to be dealt with privately as we do with other allies.

More than anything else, they deserve to be treated with more respect, not less than the respect this President and this White House is giving the Supreme Leader of Iran. He would not dare say the things about the Supreme Leader of Iran now that he is saying about the Prime Minister of Israel because he wouldn't want to endanger his peace deal or his arms deal that he is working out with them.

I hope he will reconsider. I hope the bipartisan nature of our support of Israel is reinvigorated. I hope that once again this body, this Congress, and this government will recommit themselves to this extraordinarily important relationship, because if America doesn't stand with Israel, who would we stand with? If Israel—a democracy, a strong American ally on the international stage—is not worthy of our unconditional support, then what ally of ours around the world can feel safe in their alliance with us?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, today I want to comment on the recent election in Israel and the Obama administration's outrageous reaction to it. Two days ago Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu's Likud Party won a decisive victory in the Israel election. For myself and on behalf of 3 million Arkansans, I want to offer hearty congratulations to Prime Minister Netanyahu. I have the greatest admiration for the Prime Minister's visionary and courageous statesmanship, as well as his service as a young man in his country's elite special operations forces. Prime Minister Netanyahu and his family have paid the highest price over the decades in the fight against the common enemies of Israel and the United States.

Yet let me also stress that the alliance between the United States and Israel is not an alliance for this or that Israeli statesman nor this or that Israeli political party. Nor, for that matter, does the alliance depend on whom or which party controls the White House or the Congress. Rather, it is an alliance between the American people and the Israeli people, between the ultimate defender of the West and the easternmost frontier of the West. Our alliance rests on our shared experiences and principles: our Judeo-Christian heritage, respect for the natural

rights of mankind, democratic self-government, market-based economics, and strong provision for our common defense. Israel's commitment to democratic elections demonstrated just this week an important distinction from many of their neighbors and why they are our closest ally in the region.

Apparently, President Obama harbors such deep-seated and irrational antipathy for Prime Minister Netanyahu that he is now willing to upend this decades-long alliance. President Obama's antagonism toward Prime Minister Netanyahu is longstanding and well known. Last year, for example, anonymous administration officials used a vulgar epithet to question Prime Minister Netanyahu's courage.

I will point out, as an aside, that anonymity is the Washington coward's shield, just as I am also compelled to point out that, so far as I know, neither the President nor his senior political aides served in our country's elite special operations forces, unlike Prime Minister Netanyahu.

Back to my main point, in the last 48 hours, more anonymous administration officials have suggested a fundamental rethinking of the United States-Israel alliance, citing Prime Minister Netanyahu's simple restatement of fact that there can be no Palestinian State until conditions change. The Palestinian Authority must, at a minimum, eject Hamas from its governing coalition, reclaim control of the Gaza Strip, accept a demilitarized eastern border in Judea and Samaria, and recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State. As Prime Minister Netanyahu has said, if the Palestinians lay down their arms, there will be peace. But if Israel lays down its arms, there will be no Israel.

The Obama administration, though, has gone off the deep end and let their personal bitterness towards the Israeli Prime Minister drive their public foreign policy toward our closest ally. Here are just a few quotes from administration officials suggesting a fundamental change in our relationship with Israel and a willingness to abandon Israel at the United Nations.

One official said: ''We are signaling that [if the Israeli government's position is no longer to pursue a Palestinian state,] we're going to have to broaden the spectrum of options we pursue going forward.''

According to reports, that same official ''wouldn't rule out a modified American posture at the United Nations, where the U.S. has long fended off resolutions criticizing Israeli settlement activity and demanding its withdrawal from Palestinian territories.''

Another senior White House official said:

> The premise of our position internationally has been to support direct negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians. We are now in a reality where the Israeli government no longer supports direct negotiations. Therefore we clearly have to factor that into our decisions going forward.

Finally, State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said:

> We're currently evaluating our approach. We're not going to prejudge what we would do if there was a UN action.

Some observers will dismiss these comments as the petulant response of a President and political operatives who didn't get their way in the elections this week. But there is something much more worrisome underway. While Prime Minister Netanyahu won a decisive victory, he still has just started assembling a governing majority coalition.

These kinds of quotes from Israel's most important ally could very well startle some of the smaller parties and their leaders with whom Prime Minister Netanyahu is currently in negotiations. This raises the question, of course, if the administration intends to undermine Prime Minister Netanyahu's efforts to assemble a coalition by suggesting a change to our longstanding policy of supporting Israel's position with the United Nations.

After all, if you were an elected leader in Israel's parliament, you surely would worry about the United States refusing to exercise its veto at the U.N. Security Council. Consider the United Nations' long and dark history of anti-Semitism.

The U.N. Human Rights Council has condemned Israel in 45 resolutions since its creation in 2006. In 2013, the U.N. General Assembly adopted a total of 21 resolutions singling out Israel for disapproval and just 4 resolutions for the rest of the world.

Fifty percent of all emergency special sessions of the General Assembly over the last six decades were convened to denounce Israel. Meanwhile, no emergency special session has been called for any other state in over 30 years. Given this history and the stakes here and abroad, let me speak bluntly so there can be no misunderstanding. Under no circumstances will I or this Congress allow the Obama administration to abandon Israel to the United Nations or any other international institution or to change fundamentally the terms of our alliance with Israel.

This administration's latest outrageous pronouncement is even more difficult to understand as they simultaneously coddle the terrorist regime in Iran. The people of Israel should know the American people remain in solidarity with them in their quest to exist peacefully with their neighbors and that we will not allow them to be thrown to the jackals at the United Nations—a characterization made famous by a past Member of this body, the late Daniel Patrick Moynihan. I call on all Members of this body, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to join with me in one voice supporting our ally Israel against the jackals.

In the coming days—perhaps as soon as the debate over the budget resolution next week—I will propose legislation that reaffirms the longstanding policy of the United States to continue to defend Israel against attacks at the United Nations and other international agencies. I urge all Members of this body, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have a long history of supporting Israel, to join me in supporting such legislation.

Further, should the United Nations, its subordinate agencies, the International Criminal Court or any other international agency take adverse action against Israel, I will consider introducing legislation to restrict U.S. funding for the offending agency. Finally, if the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations does not exercise the American veto against any anti-Israel resolution, I will also consider introducing similar legislation to restrict funding to the Ambassador's office.

For decades, the relationship between Israel and the United States has transcended political and personal differences. Our shared interests were enough to overcome any ideology or personal disagreement, but I fear mutual respect is of little concern to this administration. The President and all those senior officials around him should carefully consider the diplomatic and security consequences of their words. This Congress certainly will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Maryland.

SYRIAN WAR CRIMES ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the ongoing crisis in Syria. Sunday, March 15, marked the fourth anniversary of the beginning of the Syrian civil war.

Since this brutal war began, more than 3.8 million Syrians have fled Syria, 7.6 million have been displaced within Syria, and 12.2 million Syrians are in need of humanitarian assistance. Most tragically, more than 205,000 people have died as a result of the war. This past year was the deadliest year since the conflict began, with more than 76,000 dying in 2014 alone, including more than 3,500 children.

One thing has remained clear over the last 4 years—the war tactics employed in Syria by both government and opposition forces represent gross violations of human rights and fly in the face of internationally accepted rules of war.

The United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Syria has reported that the progovernment forces have murdered, tortured, assaulted, and raped civilians in Syria. Antigovernment groups have also engaged in murder, execution, torture, hostage-taking, and shelling of civilian neighborhoods. Medical workers and hospitals across Syria have also been targeted, but nowhere was the brutality of this war more evident than the events of August 21, 2013, when the Syrian Army, under the direction of President Assad, launched a chemical weapons attack in the Damascus suburbs killing 1,400 Syrians.

The United States, along with the international community, has a long tradition of upholding international norms, including holding accountable those guilty of crimes against humanity and war crimes. The international community cannot stand by and allow the murder of innocent men, women, and children to go unchallenged. He must immediately bring Assad and all the perpetrators of gross human rights violations in Syria to justice. This cannot wait another year.

Earlier this week, I reintroduced the Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act, along with my colleagues Senators RUBIO, MENENDEZ, SHAHEEN, and PETERS. This bipartisan legislation establishes a Syria-specific standard of reporting and accountability for crimes against humanity. The bill will require the U.S. State Department to report to relevant congressional committees on war crimes and crimes against humanity committed in Syria. This would include an account of war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad and violent extremist groups and other combatants involved in the conflict.

Today, as I stand on the floor of the Senate, the violence is continuing unabated.

Some of my colleagues may be aware of a Syrian defector and photographer named Caesar. Caesar fled from Syria in 2013 with more than 55,000 photos documenting the torture and murder of more than 11,000 civilians. Last week, some of those photos were put on display at the United Nations.

We must shine a light on the atrocities that have been committed in Syria and demand accountability. Ignoring these violations sends a message to the global community that war crimes and crimes against humanity are tolerable. The Syrian people deserve much more than that.

On this fourth anniversary of the beginning of the Syrian war, we must recommit to supporting the Syrian people through humanitarian efforts and by holding those individuals and groups which are guilty of committing war crimes and crimes against humanity accountable for their atrocities.

I ask my colleagues to stand with the Syrian people and join me in supporting the Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. President, I will also take time to urge my colleagues to immediately bring Loretta Lynch's nomination to the floor of the U.S. Senate to be the next Attorney General of the United States.

Ms. Lynch currently serves as the Senate-confirmed U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York. She has already been confirmed by the U.S. Senate. She served with great distinction as the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District.

I had the chance to visit with her last January and talk to her firsthand about her vision to be the next Attorney General of the United States. She is extremely impressive, very well qualified, and has the right values to be the Attorney General of the United States.

I will give a few examples. I know all of us are concerned about equal justice to the law. Well, Ms. Lynch has lived that through her own personal commitments. At Harvard Law School, she was a member of the Legal Aid Bureau, helping people who otherwise would not have been able to afford access to our legal system.

Ms. Lynch has a long and distinguished record of prosecuting terrorists, sex traffickers, organized crime cartels, corrupt politicians, and dangerous gangs. She has been endorsed by a wide variety of law enforcement agencies and individuals.

Put it this way: I have not heard anyone question her qualifications. I have not heard anyone question why she should not be confirmed to be the next Attorney General of the country.

Loretta Lynch's nomination has been pending on the Senate floor as long as the five most recent Attorneys General combined. If we take five of the most recent Attorneys General and add all the time it took for their nominations to be confirmed, Loretta Lynch is now exceeding that. That is not fair.

President Obama is entitled to have his team in place, and we have a responsibility to vote on his nominations. Let's do the right thing and take up this nomination, debate it, and then have Senators vote up or down, not maybe, on her nomination. We owe it to Ms. Lynch, the employees of the Justice Department, and the American people to have a newly designated Attorney General in place as the Nation's chief law enforcement officer and top defender of Americans' constitutional rights.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

BISHOP GORMAN HIGH SCHOOL 60TH DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to honor the 60th anniversary of Bishop Gorman High School in Las Vegas, NV.

In 1954, Bishop Gorman High School opened as the first Catholic high school in Southern Nevada. I congratulate the institution on 60 years of leading our country in first-rate education while positively implementing Catholic values.

Bishop Gorman High School has graduated more than 9,000 students and currently has a 100 percent graduation rate and a college bound rate of 96 percent, making Bishop Gorman a national leader in college preparatory education. The school is equipped with an impressively experienced and credited faculty, with nearly 70 percent holding advanced degrees. The administration and the faculty's dedication to providing excellent education in a Catholic setting, in addition to a low student-teacher ratio, has contributed to Bishop Gorman's success and helped ensure that its students can reach their full potential.

The school takes pride in providing its students with a well-rounded education that includes strong academic principles, faith, and competitive athletic opportunities. Over the past 60 years, students have won 97 State athletic championships and received State and national recognition in academics, fine arts, and extracurricular activities.

Bishop Gorman High School also gives back to the local community and the State. Every year they organize multiple service events, and this past year, art students designed a beautiful courtyard for a transitional home in Las Vegas. Additionally, the National Honor Society students volunteered each week at a local food bank.

I applaud Bishop Gorman High School President John Kilduff and Principal Kevin Kiefer for their strong leadership and recognize this year's Knight of the Gaels honoree, Jack Raftery, Sr. I am pleased that through your joint efforts and the dedication of those before you, this remarkable institution has been a part of our community for 60 years. Best wishes for continued success, and congratulations on this great achievement.

BLACK WOMEN'S HISTORY WEEK

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I request that the U.S. government officially recognizes the last week in March as Black Women's History Week. During the week of March 23, as part of Women's History Month and in honor of the U.N. declaration of 2015 as the decade of Afro descendants, this week marks the perfect occasion on which to begin an annual recognition and celebration of Black women's history and contributions to American society.

Black women have long gone above and beyond the call of duty in their contributions to American society through civic engagement, high voter turnout, and stepping up as leaders and bulwarks in their communities. Even in the face of grave oppression throughout our Nation's history, Black women have continued to stand strong

and contribute to the well-being of their families, communities, and our country as a whole. A recognition of Black Women's History Week on the part of the Obama Administration and Congress would send a critical message that the government wishes to elevate their role in history and contemporary society and recognizes the unique struggles they continue to experience today.

Black women have consistently played a critical role in this Nation's history, often with little thanks or recognition. Harriet Tubman escaped slavery and bravely returned to the enslaved South 13 times to herald her people to freedom on the Underground Railroad. A century later, Rosa Parks witnessed the oppression of her people—specifically her fellow Black sisters—and took an active role in organizing the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Today, a Black woman is our nation's First Lady. Recognition of Black Women's History Week would honor and uplift the sacrifices of women such as Harriet Tubman and Rosa Parks, who paved the way for Barack and Michelle Obama to reach the White House, and me to address you on their behalf today.

Yet at the same time that Black women from our Nation's history have become inspirational symbols of strength and perseverance, Black women today continue to face the necessity to persevere through undue burdens as they navigate American society. They must try to hold their families together as primary caregivers when family members are incarcerated or killed, support their children as they grow up in food deserts and attend failing schools, they must continue to persevere when our society does not provide them with adequate support and equal rights. All the while, many Black women struggle to forward their own careers and provide for their families. Recent U.S. Department of Labor data shows that while job prospects are improving for nearly every group in America, one glaring exception remains: Black women. Since August 2013, Black women are the only group for whom unemployment rates have not fallen.

Karen McLeod's experience as a 59-year-old college graduate with two degrees who cannot find steady employment sheds light on the economic tribulations many Black women face. Karen went from making $30 per hour as a respiratory therapist to $16 per hour at a nonprofit, to $8.67 per hour, working only 4 hours per week. In her current circumstances, she has had to make a series of tough decisions to get by. Karen sold her jewelry to pay for gas, pawned her television for food, and was forced to ask local nonprofits for rent assistance. Karen's story represents the experiences of a growing number of Black women, whose conditions are not improving with economic recovery. White House recognition of Black Women's History Week will serve to acknowledge and call attention to the continued struggles Black women face in our society today and will send the critical message that their government cares about what they are going through.

This year, a coalition of organizations advocating for the well-being of women and communities of color will partner to elevate the stories, histories, and realities of Black women's lives. Each day of the week, starting on March 23 and continuing through March 29, will focus on a different issue Black women face in American society today, from economic disparities to educational achievement to police violence. Exploring these issues and acknowledging the centrality of Black women to our history and social fabric, along with recognizing the uniquely gendered and racialized inequities they face, is critical as we seek to extend equal rights to all Americans. I hope and request that this will be the first year in what will become an annual tradition of celebration and intentional recognition of our sisters through Black Women's History Week.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DON SHORT

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I would like to recognize an exceptional Iowan who has been devoted to the State and to our agricultural heritage. After serving as president of Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area since 2001, Don Short has announced his retirement.

Don Short was raised in Winthrop, IA, where he took over the family farm. From early on, Don has dedicated his efforts to farming and agricultural policy. He was employed with Moews Seed Company, a family owned business since 1927 that specializes in corn seed production. Afterward, Don worked for DuPont Seed Company.

Don's experiences in agriculture have provided him the insight necessary to lead the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area. For 15 years, he has been able to protect and promote natural, cultural, and historic areas. He spearheaded efforts to maintain and strengthen the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area and has been a dogged advocate on its behalf. He is a farmer whose desire is to keep agricultural heritage alive through partnerships, such as historic sites, tourist attractions, and businesses that bring economic benefits to Iowa.

I want to congratulate Don Short on his retirement and his success over the years. Silos and Smokestacks will no doubt miss his daily contributions; however, he plans on remaining a consultant on a parttime basis. I thank him for his unwavering commitment to improving agricultural policies and making Iowa a better place.•

REMEMBERING WILLIAM DAVID ROTH

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to speak today in remembrance of William David Roth, who passed away on March 17, 2015.

William ''Bill'' David Roth, 71, of Albany, NY, lived an extraordinary life and made major contributions to U.S. public policy. He was the son of Dr. Oscar Roth and Dr. Stefanie Zeimer Roth, refugees from Vienna who arrived in the United States just prior to the onset of World War II. Bill graduated magna cum laude from Yale University in 1964 after majoring in mathematics, economics, and politics. This is all the more remarkable given the fact that a neuromuscular disorder from the age of 8 left him unable to write. He performed complex mathematical equations and logical formulae in his head. He was also a formidable presence at Yale and later at the University of California, Berkley, where he received his Ph.D. in 1970. He was that rare person who was both a man of thought and action and who inspired others by overcoming great odds and obstacles. From 1971 to 1972 he taught political science at the University of Vermont. He very well may have averted a Kent State tragedy in 1972 by permitting himself to be arrested at the Federal building in downtown Burlington during a nonviolent student protest against the Vietnam war. While Roth was offered immediate release because of his disability, he chose instead to remain until all the students had been released from the Burlington city jail. In this way he showed one of the virtues of civil disobedience, conducted with dignity and without violence, thus serving as an example and inspiration to others.

Subsequently, he went to work on the Carnegie Council on Children in Connecticut. He coauthored a landmark book that dealt searchingly with children with disabilities. His first major work was called ''The Unexpected Minority: Handicapped Children in America.'' He also coauthored ''The Grand Illusion: Stigma, Role-expectations, and Communication.'' These are widely acknowledged as providing the analytical basis for the disability rights movement as well as fostering a new academic discipline, disability studies.

Bill's work emphasized the disability movement's core vision: the most socially incapacitating aspects of disability are not the inescapable consequence of biology but the result of countless social decisions that do not acknowledge the needs of people with different bodies and, indeed, discriminate against people whose bodies are different. Bill went on to pioneer the use of computer technology for people with disabilities and in 1984 founded the Center for Computing and Disability at SUNY, Albany, one of the first such centers in the Nation. Bill was widely acknowledged through his scholarly research, technological

imagination, and progressive politics, as one of the founders of America's disability rights movement. He helped establish the framework for the Federal Disabilities Act and his work over the years addressed the architectural, transportation, and technological barriers to living with a disability in the United States.

As a longtime professor at the University at SUNY School of Social Welfare he taught courses in social policy and disability studies. In recent years, Bill's research and writing focused on illuminating the damage done in the aggressive pursuit of dismantling of the U.S. welfare state. His book, ''The Assault on Social Policy,'' Columbia UP, is now in its second edition. It is recommended reading for all of my colleagues. Bill Roth fought not only with issues in disability but with his own neuromuscular disorder. He was a little like the phoenix—the bird that kept coming back. He was one of the most courageous people I have ever known. He was brilliant, imaginative, inventive, and utterly fearless. Bill inspired those of us who had the good fortune to know him. As Senator Joe Lieberman noted upon hearing of Bill Roth's death:

> Bill was an extraordinary person—gifted, strong, funny, inspiring. We were blessed to know him.

As lawmakers, we have benefited from his many contributions to public policy and discourse. We remember and honor him for these accomplishments. Bill Roth overcame serious illnesses as well as disabilities. He served as a courageous example to his family, friends, colleagues, and students.●

RECOGNIZING HELM PAINT & DECORATING

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses often set the bar for quality and service across the United States. When quality and customer service are at the forefront of a business's mission, viable, sustainable jobs are created for countless members of our communities. Such is the case with the Small Business of the Week, Helm Paint & Decorating of Hammond, LA.

Ronald ''Bunky'' Helm opened shop in 1970 on Earhart Boulevard in New Orleans. Despite having to move from their original location after Hurricane Katrina in 2005, the Helm family has continued to bring excellent service and paint colors to south Louisiana. Today, Helm Paint is more than just a paint store—offering a wide variety of specialized paint, decoration, and accessory consultation. Helm's self-proclaimed goal is for their customers to have a customized and quality experience.

Last week, I had the distinct honor of officiating the grand opening ribbon cutting of Helm in Hammond, LA. The Hammond store is one of six locations serving south Louisiana communities. Each store participates in its surrounding community, holding events throughout the year in support of local charities and other organizations. Helm Paint & Decorating is also a testament to how vital small businesses are for creating jobs for Louisianians. Much of the company's staff are second, third or even fourth generation employees who serve second, third, and fourth generation customers. Because Helm employees are experts in the products they sell, the majority of customers only have to complete a project once. As the locals like to say, Helm Paint & Decorating is not just a business, it is an experience.

Congratulations again to Helm Paint & Decorating for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your commitment to customer service and creating quality jobs in communities across the State.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1030. An act to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1030. An act to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

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

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–988. A communication from the President of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2014 Annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Assessments from the Secretaries of Defense and Energy, the three national security laboratory directors, and the Commander, United States Strategic Command (OSS–2015–0289); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–989. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''NASA FAR Supplement, Contractor Whistleblower Protections'' (RIN2700–AE08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–990. A communication from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual management report relative to its operations and financial condition for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–991. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–992. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–993. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from January 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–994. A communication from the Chief, Administrative Law Division, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Central Intelligence Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

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 Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 796. A bill to incentivize State support for postsecondary education and to promote increased access and affordability for higher education for students, including Dreamer students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 797. A bill to amend the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of

1976, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 798. A bill to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength or when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation places a lien against an insurance company's assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 799. A bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HATCH, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 800. A bill to improve, coordinate, and enhance rehabilitation research at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COATS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HATCH, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 801. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for appropriate designation of collective bargaining units; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 802. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 803. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide employees in the private sector with an opportunity for compensatory time off, similar to the opportunity offered to Federal employees, and a flexible credit hour program to help balance the demands of work and family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 804. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 805. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to make Hispanic-serving institutions eligible for technical and financial assistance for the establishment of preservation training and degree programs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 806. A bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for preemployment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BENNET, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and reset the excise tax on beer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 808. A bill to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 809. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified elementary and secondary education tuition; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 810. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 811. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require States to develop policies on positive school climates and school discipline; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 812. A bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 813. A bill to provide the Secretary of Defense with authority to transfer funds in order to mitigate the effects on the Department of Defense of a sequestration of funds available to the Department of Defense , and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 814. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 815. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 816. A bill to amend the Coquille Restoration Act to clarify certain provisions relating to the management of the Coquille Forest; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 817. A bill to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Siletz Tribe in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

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

S. 818. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 819. A bill to reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 821. A bill to establish requirements with respect to bisphenol A; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 822. A bill to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 823. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 206 West Commercial Street in East Rochester, New York, as the ''Officer Daryl R. Pierson Post Office'' ; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 824. A bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 825. A bill to terminate the authority to waive certain provisions of law requiring the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran, to codify certain sanctions imposed by executive order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 826. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to sunset rules after 10 years unless agencies undergo notice and comment rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 827. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 828. A bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs.

GILLIBRAND, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 105. A resolution recognizing the 194th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. Res. 106. A resolution designating March 22, 2015, as ''National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 148

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of S. 148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Health Coverage Tax Credit.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 615

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 624, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to enable hospital-based nursing programs that are affiliated with a hospital to maintain payments under the Medicare program to hospitals for the costs of such programs.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 688

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 688, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

S. 737

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 737, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings.

S. 793

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 793, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 797. A bill to amend the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform

Act of 1976, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, our Nation faces an infrastructure investment crisis across the board, but one aspect of our infrastructure that has been particularly neglected by the Federal Government is rail. While the Nation's large freight rail carriers are able to invest in infrastructure with their own funds, the infrastructure used by passenger and many smaller freight railroads is deteriorating at an alarming rate. We need to be doing more to repair and modernize these tracks, roadbeds, bridges, tunnels, and train cars.

Nowhere is the investment crisis more pressing than in New Jersey, where a set of tunnels constructed under the Hudson River in 1910—badly damaged by Hurricane Sandy—must either be replaced or shut down sometime over the next two decades. The shutdown scenario is unacceptable to the economy of not only my State, but the entire northeast region, if not the country.

Amtrak has a plan, known as the Gateway Program, to replace these tunnels, as well as the century old Portal Bridge. Executing the Gateway Program will take a significant funding commitment from the Federal Government, and I stand ready to fight for that funding. But, given the significant upfront cost, and the long-term benefits and revenue potential, it makes sense to explore financing opportunities in addition to funding.

The Federal Government already has an established financing program in the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program, or RRIF. However, the RRIF program is fraught with limitations, particularly in its ability to finance fixed infrastructure projects like a bridge or tunnel. The program is significantly underutilized, especially relative to other Federal financing programs.

That is why I am introducing the Railroad Infrastructure Financing Improvement Act. This bill would incorporate into RRIF the policies that make other Federal loan programs more successful. For instance, it will establish new creditworthiness criteria focused on the merits of the project, increase repayment flexibility, help leverage private financing opportunities, speed up the process of applying for and receiving a loan, and improve access to the program particularly for smaller applicants.

The bill is meant to start a conversation about the tools we currently have available for investing in rail infrastructure, and the improvements we can make to start getting critical projects like the Gateway Program off the ground. I look forward to working with my colleagues and rail stakeholders to build upon this proposal and move forward on a comprehensive passenger rail reauthorization bill.

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

S. 799. A bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, next month I look forward to hosting our Nation's newest drug czar at a forum in Covington, KY. It is a forum that will allow Director Bottecelli to hear firsthand accounts of the devastating impact of one of America's most significant public health challenges and one that continues to hit my State particularly hard—the growing epidemic of prescription drug and heroin abuse.

It is hard to overstate the challenge. Drug overdoses, largely driven by pain killers, now claim more Kentucky lives than car accidents, and rising heroin overdose rates now account for nearly one-third of all drug overdose deaths in Kentucky.

While statistics such as these are devastating enough, they hardly paint the full picture because they don't account for the thousands of innocent children born dependent on opioids. The numbers are hard to hear. Nationwide we have seen a staggering 300-percent increase in the number of infants diagnosed with newborn withdrawal since 2000. But in Kentucky, we saw similar numbers grow by an almost unbelievable 3,000 percent.

It is a tragic challenge, and I say that especially as a father of three daughters. But it is a challenge we can do something about. If Washington enacts the bipartisan Protecting Our Infants Act that I am introducing today, along with Senator CASEY of Pennsylvania, it is a challenge we will do something about.

This bipartisan bill will do a number of important things. It will direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop recommendations both for preventing prenatal opioid abuse and treating infants dependent on opioids. It would direct the Secretary to help develop a strategy to address research and program gaps—a step recommended by GAO in one of their reports released last month—and it would encourage the Director of the CDC to work with States to help improve surveillance and data collection activities in this area.

Obviously, no piece of legislation would ever solve the challenge overnight, but the bipartisan Protect Our Infants Act can help move the country in the right direction. That is why it is supported by the March of Dimes, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. That is why an identical bill will also be introduced in the House today by Congresswoman KATHERINE CLARK of Massachusetts and Congressman STEVE STIVERS of Ohio.

I commend these Representatives and Senator CASEY for their leadership on this issue. I look forward to working with them to advance this important measure through Congress, and I look forward to discussing it with Director Botticelli during his visit to Kentucky in the next few weeks.

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. 799

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 ''Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Opioid prescription rates have risen dramatically over the past several years. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in some States, there are as many as 96 to 143 prescriptions for opioids per 100 adults per year.

(2) In recent years, there has been a steady rise in the number of overdose deaths involving heroin. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the death rate for heroin overdose doubled from 2010 to 2012.

(3) At the same time, there has been an increase in cases of neonatal abstinence syndrome (referred to in this section as ''NAS''). In the United States, the incidence of NAS has risen from 1.20 per 1,000 hospital births in 2000 to 3.39 per 1,000 hospital births in 2009.

(4) NAS refers to medical issues associated with drug withdrawal in newborns due to exposure to opioids or other drugs in utero.

(5) The average cost of treatment in a hospital for NAS increased from $39,400 in 2000 to $53,400 in 2009. Most of these costs are born by the Medicaid program.

(6) Preventing opioid abuse among pregnant women and women of childbearing age is crucial.

(7) Medically-appropriate opioid use in pregnancy is not uncommon, and opioids are often the safest and most appropriate treatment for moderate to severe pain for pregnant women.

(8) Addressing NAS effectively requires a focus on women of childbearing age, pregnant women, and infants from preconception through early childhood.

(9) NAS can result from the use of prescription drugs as prescribed for medical reasons, from the abuse of prescription drugs, or from the use of illegal opioids like heroin.

(10) For pregnant women who are abusing opioids, it is most appropriate to treat and manage maternal substance use in a non-punitive manner.

(11) According to a report of the Government Accountability Office (referred to in this section as the ''GAO report''), more research is needed to optimize the identification and treatment of babies with NAS and to better understand long-term impacts on children.

(12) According to the GAO report, the Department of Health and Human Services does not have a focal point to lead planning and coordinating efforts to address prenatal opioid use and NAS across the department.

(13) According to the GAO report, ''given the increasing use of heroin and abuse of opioids prescribed for pain management, as well as the increased rate of NAS in the United States, it is important to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of planning and coordination of Federal efforts on prenatal opioid use and NAS''.

SEC. 3. DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREVENTING AND TREATING PRENATAL OPIOID ABUSE AND NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary''), acting through the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (referred to in this section as the ''Director''), shall conduct a study and develop recommendations for preventing and treating prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome, soliciting input from nongovernmental entities, including organizations representing patients, health care providers, hospitals, other treatment facilities, and other entities, as appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall publish on the Internet Web site of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality a report on the study and recommendations under subsection (a). Such report shall address each of the issues described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (c).

(c) CONTENTS.—The study described in subsection (a) and the report under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a comprehensive assessment of existing research with respect to the prevention, identification, treatment, and long-term outcomes of neonatal abstinence syndrome, including the identification and treatment of pregnant women or women who may become pregnant who use opioids or other drugs;

(2) an evaluation of—

(A) the causes of and risk factors for opioid use disorders among women of reproductive age, including pregnant women;

(B) the barriers to identifying and treating opioid use disorders among women of reproductive age, including pregnant and postpartum women and women with young children;

(C) current practices in the health care system to respond to and treat pregnant women with opioid use disorders and infants born with neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(D) medically indicated use of opioids during pregnancy;

(E) access to treatment for opioid use disorders in pregnant and postpartum women; and

(F) access to treatment for infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(3) recommendations on—

(A) preventing, identifying, and treating neonatal abstinence syndrome in infants;

(B) treating pregnant women who are dependent on opioids; and

(C) preventing opioid dependence among women of reproductive age, including pregnant women, who may be at risk of developing opioid dependence.

SEC. 4. IMPROVING PREVENTION AND TREATMENT FOR PRENATAL OPIOID ABUSE AND NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.

(a) REVIEW OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall lead a review of planning and coordination within the Department of Health and Human Services related to prenatal opioid use and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(b) STRATEGY TO CLOSE GAPS IN RESEARCH AND PROGRAMMING.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop a strategy to address research and program gaps, including such gaps identified in findings made by reports of the Government Accountability Office. Such strategy shall address—

(1) gaps in research, including with respect to—

(A) the most appropriate treatment of pregnant women with opioid use disorders;

(B) the most appropriate treatment and management of infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(C) the long-term effects of prenatal opioid exposure on children; and

(2) gaps in programs, including—

(A) the availability of treatment programs for pregnant and postpartum women and for newborns with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(B) guidance and coordination in Federal efforts to address prenatal opioid use or neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the review described in subsection (a) and the strategy developed under subsection (b).

SEC. 5. IMPROVING DATA ON AND PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE TO NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.

(a) DATA AND SURVEILLANCE.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall, as appropriate—

(1) provide technical assistance to States to improve the availability and quality of data collection and surveillance activities regarding neonatal abstinence syndrome, including—

(A) the incidence and prevalence of neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(B) the identification of causes for neonatal abstinence syndrome, including new and emerging trends; and

(C) the demographics and other relevant information associated with neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(2) collect available surveillance data described in paragraph (1) from States, as applicable; and

(3) make surveillance data collected pursuant to paragraph (2) publically available on an appropriate Internet Web site.

(b) PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall encourage increased utilization of effective public health measures to reduce neonatal abstinence syndrome.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 804. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as the founder and the cochair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, I have learned much about this devastating disease affecting nearly 29 million Americans. Fortunately, due to the Special Diabetes Program and to increased investments in diabetes research, we have seen some exciting breakthroughs and we are on the threshold of a number of important new discoveries.

This is particularly true for the estimated 1.2 million Americans living with type 1 diabetes. Advances in technology such as continuous glucose monitors are helping patients control their blood glucose levels, which is key to preventing costly and sometimes deadly diabetes complications. We are moving closer and closer to our goal of an artificial pancreas.

The National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration have been extremely supportive of these innovations in diabetes care. I was, therefore, shocked and troubled to learn that insulin-dependent Medicare beneficiaries are being denied coverage for continuous glucose monitors because the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has determined that they do not meet the definition for durable medical equipment and do not fall under any other Medicare category. As a consequence, we are seeing situations similar to what we saw with insulin pumps in the late 1990s, where individuals with type 1 diabetes have had coverage for their continuous glucose monitors on their private insurance, only to lose that coverage when they get old enough to become eligible for Medicare.

Let me give some brief background. A continuous glucose monitor is a physician-prescribed, FDA-approved medical device that can provide real-time readings and data about trends in glucose levels every 5 minutes, thus enabling someone with insulin-dependent diabetes to eat or take insulin and prevent dangerously high or low glucose levels.

There has been essential and extensive clinical evidence that shows that individuals using this device have improved overall glucose control and, thus, reduced rates of hypoglycemia or low blood glucose levels. That is why professional medical societies have recognized the clinical evidence and have published guidelines recommending that these monitors be used in appropriate patients with type 1 diabetes.

Now, here is the fact that is astonishing to me. About 95 percent of commercial insurers provide coverage for continuous glucose monitors, but Medicare is refusing to provide coverage for those devices. I recently heard about this problem from one of my constituents, 74-year-old Prudence Barry of Portland, ME. Diabetes treatments have changed dramatically since Pru was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes back in 1954. Back then, it was very difficult for her to control her insulin levels and to get her glucose levels properly read. Well, Pru has led an active and fulfilling life. Living with type 1 diabetes for more than 60 years has taken its toll.

Today, Pru no longer feels it when her blood glucose levels drop to dangerous levels, causing her to lose consciousness and suffer seizures more frequently. Nighttime low sugars are particularly troubling. She fears the possibility of her blood sugar developing so low during the night that she never wakes up. The continuous glucose monitor is a potential lifesaver for Pru because it prevents these dangerously high or low blood glucose levels by alarming the wearer when the glucose levels fall outside of the safe range.

So even though 95 percent of private insurers cover this technology, Medicare does not. As a consequence, Pru does not have access to the potentially lifesaving device because she cannot afford to pay for it out of pocket. Pru is not alone. There are thousands of seniors with type 1 diabetes who like my constituent are denied access to this

technology that would help keep them healthy and safe.

The ironic thing is it is only because of advances in diabetes care, such as continuous glucose monitors, that people with type 1 diabetes can expect to live long enough to become Medicare beneficiaries. So I am very concerned about this decision by CMS. It makes absolutely no sense. It contradicts all the work NIH and the FDA are doing to get new innovative treatments and technologies to patients.

I brought this up in a recent hearing of the HELP Committee and asked the outgoing FDA Commissioner what she thought. She expressed her regret about the lack of consultation between her agency and CMS about payments for FDA-approved devices and drugs. I am particularly concerned given the implications that this coverage decision will have for future decisions regarding artificial pancreas systems, which will combine a continuous glucose monitor, insulin pump, and sophisticated algorithm to control high and low blood sugar around the clock.

This coverage decision on the part of CMS—which, after all, is also part of the Department of Health and Human Services—directly counteracts all of the work that the NIH and the FDA are doing to get new innovative treatments and technologies to patients. As I said, I recently had the opportunity at a HELP Committee hearing to ask outgoing FDA Commissioner Hamburg whether CMS consults with her agency when making these kinds of coverage decisions. In response to my question, Commissioner Hamburg expressed regret that her agency does not routinely consult with CMS about payments for FDA-approved drugs and devices, saying that the FDA should ''look at the whole ecosystem of biomedical product development and use, and recognize that each of the different components that often operate in silos actually are very interdependent.'' I completely agree with her assessment.

I am therefore joining my colleague from New Hampshire and the Co-Chair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus in introducing the Medicare CGM Access Act of 2014 to create a separate benefit category under Medicare for the continuous glucose monitor and require coverage of the device for individuals meeting specified medical criteria.

Our legislation is strongly supported by a coalition of organizations, including the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, the American Association of Diabetes Educators, the Endocrine Society and the JDRF.

I encourage my colleagues to join us as cosponsors of this important legislation.

I see Senator LEAHY has come to the floor and undoubtedly wants to speak on the pending business. Let me conclude my remarks by saying I am very pleased the Senator from New Hampshire, JEANNE SHAHEEN, who is the co-chair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, is joining me in introducing the Medicare CGM Access Act to create a separate benefit category under Medicare for these monitors and to require coverage of the device for seniors who are meeting specified medical criteria.

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

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

MARCH 15, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. JEANNE SHAHEEN,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND SHAHEEN, Therapy innovation is moving forward at a rapid pace for those living with insulin-dependent diabetes. As leaders of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, you have worked to catalyze these efforts by ensuring American patients have access to these life-saving technologies that can transform quality of life. Advancements in integrated insulin pump and continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) technologies are progressing toward closed-loop ''artificial pancreas'' systems that will enable greater patient care and improved health outcomes. With these technology advancements, thankfully, most children with type 1 diabetes will be Medicare beneficiaries one day, something that could not have been said with such certainty even 20 years ago.

While thousands of people with insulin-dependent diabetes benefit from advanced diabetes technologies, including CGM, Medicare beneficiaries do not. CGM is covered by nearly all private health plans. Numerous studies have demonstrated conclusively that use of CGMs improves glucose control, enabling better patient care, thereby improving patient health. Studies have also shown that use of CGM devices reduce severe hypoglycemia events, which particularly impact elderly patients and can lead to falls, fractures and other complications. The average cost of an inpatient hypoglycemia admission is over $17,500.

The undersigned organizations strongly support your legislation, the Medicare CGM Access Act that would remedy this disparity for those in Medicare. Your legislation creates a new benefit category for FDA approved CGM devices, including stand-alone CGM, CGM integrated with an insulin pump, and future artificial pancreas device systems. This therapy would be covered for those meeting appropriate medical criteria consistent with private coverage and professional clinical guidelines. Again, thank you for your continued leadership on behalf of those with diabetes and we look forward to working with you to move this legislation forward quickly.

American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists (AACE); American Association of Diabetes Educators (AADE); Dexcom; Endocrine Society; JDRF; Johnson & Johnson; Medtronic.

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

S. 814. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce five unique Oregon tribal bills S. 814, S. 815, S. 816, S. 817, and S. 818, that each deliver on promises made to the tribes long ago. By introducing these bills today I am renewing my commitment to the five Oregon tribes who will benefit greatly from passage of these bills—the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Coquille Indian Tribe, the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde.

For the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, their bills put land into trust, the last two remaining federally-recognized Indian tribes in Oregon without a land base. The third bill amends the Restoration Act of the Coquille Indian Tribe to make forest management activities on tribal lands uniform with the management of other tribal forests. The final two bills streamline the Bureau of Indian Affairs process for putting land into trust for the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde. These five unique bills honor and respect tribal sovereignty and support each tribe's right to be self-sufficient, build their economies, and support and provide for their communities. I am pleased to be joined on these bills by my colleague Senator MERKLEY and look forward to working with our Senate and House colleagues to advance the bills and to finally send them to the President's desk.

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. 814

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 ''Oregon Coastal Land Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONFEDERATED TRIBES.—The term ''Confederated Tribes'' means the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

(2) OREGON COASTAL LAND.—The term ''Oregon Coastal land'' means the approximately 14,408 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance'' and dated March 27, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Oregon Coastal land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Confederated Tribes.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 4. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Oregon Coastal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this Act, nothing in this Act affects any right or claim of the Confederated Tribes existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 3.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100–497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) LAWS APPLICABLE TO COMMERCIAL FORESTRY ACTIVITY.—Any commercial forestry activity that is carried out on the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 3 shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

(d) AGREEMENTS.—The Confederated Tribes shall consult with the Secretary and other parties as necessary to develop agreements to provide for access to the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 3 that provide for—

(1) honoring existing reciprocal right-of-way agreements;

(2) administrative access by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(3) management of the Oregon Coastal land that are acquired or developed under chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, consistent with section 200305(f)(3) of title 54, United States Code.

(e) LAND USE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), once the Oregon Coastal land is taken into trust under section 3, the land shall not be subject to the land use planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

SEC. 6. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes under section 3.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located in the vicinity of the Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(c) MAPS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register 1 or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) RECLASSIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

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

S. 815. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. 815

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 ''Cow Creek Umpqua Land Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNCIL CREEK LAND.—The term ''Council Creek land'' means the approximately 17,519 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance'' and dated June 27, 2013.

(2) TRIBE.—The term ''Tribe'' means the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Council Creek land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 4. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Council Creek land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this Act, nothing in this Act affects any right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Council Creek land.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100–497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) FOREST MANAGEMENT.—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Council Creek land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

SEC. 6. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under section 3.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located in the vicinity of the Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(c) MAPS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register 1 or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) RECLASSIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

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

S. 816. A bill to amend the Coquille Restoration Act to clarify certain provisions relating to the management of the Coquille Forest; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. 816

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT.

Section 5(d) of the Coquille Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 715c(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(5) MANAGEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, shall manage the Coquille Forest in accordance with the laws pertaining to the management of Indian trust land.

''(B) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(i) UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Unprocessed logs harvested from the Coquille Forest shall be subject to the same Federal statutory restrictions on export to foreign nations that apply to unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land.

''(ii) SALES OF TIMBER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all sales of timber from land subject to this subsection shall be advertised, offered, and awarded according to competitive bidding practices, with sales being awarded to the highest responsible bidder.'';

(2) by striking paragraph (9); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (12) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively.

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

S. 817. A bill to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Siletz Tribe in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. 817

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

SECTION 1. PURPOSE; CLARIFICATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to facilitate fee-to-trust applications for the Siletz Tribe within the geographic area specified in the amendment made by this Act.

(b) CLARIFICATION.—Except as specifically provided otherwise by this Act or the amendment made by this Act, nothing in this Act or the amendment made by this Act, shall prioritize for any purpose the claims of any federally-recognized Indian tribe over the claims of any other federally-recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE SILETZ TRIBE OF THE STATE OF OREGON.

Section 7 of the Siletz Tribe Indian Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 711e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) TITLE.—The Secretary may accept title to any additional number of acres of real property located within the boundaries of the original 1855 Siletz Coast Reservation established by Executive Order dated November 9, 1855, comprised of land within the political boundaries of Benton, Douglas, Lane, Lincoln, Tillamook, and Yamhill Counties in the State of Oregon, if that real property is conveyed or otherwise transferred to the United States by or on behalf of the tribe.

''(B) TRUST.—Land to which title is accepted by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the tribe.

''(2) TREATMENT AS PART OF RESERVATION.—All real property that is taken into trust under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) be considered and evaluated as an on-reservation acquisition under part 151.10 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

''(B) become part of the reservation of the tribe.

''(3) PROHIBITION ON GAMING.—Any real property taken into trust under paragraph (1) shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).''.

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

S. 818. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. 818

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL LAND FOR RESERVATION.

Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to establish a reservation for the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, and for other purposes,'' approved September 9, 1988 (Public Law 100–425; 102 Stat. 1594; 102 Stat. 2939; 104 Stat. 207; 106 Stat. 3255; 108 Stat. 708; 108 Stat. 4566; 112 Stat. 1896), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Subject to valid'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid''; and

(B) by adding after paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (A)) the following:

''(2) ADDITIONAL TRUST ACQUISITIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may accept title to any additional number of acres of real property located within the boundaries of the original 1857 reservation of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon established by Executive Order dated June 30, 1857, comprised of land within the political boundaries of Polk and Yamhill Counties, Oregon, if that real property is conveyed or otherwise transferred to the United States by or on behalf of the Tribe.

''(B) TREATMENT OF TRUST LAND.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Applications to take land into trust within the boundaries of the original 1857 reservation shall be treated by the Secretary as an on-reservation trust acquisition.

''(ii) GAMING.—Any real property taken into trust under this paragraph shall not be eligible, or used, for any Class II or Class III gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), except for real property within 2 miles of the gaming facility in existence on the date of enactment of this paragraph that is located on State Highway 18 in the Grand Ronde community of Oregon.

''(C) RESERVATION.—All real property taken into trust within those boundaries at any time after September 9, 1988, shall be part of the reservation of the Tribe.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''in subsection (a) are approximately 10,311.60'' and inserting ''in subsection (a)(1) are approximately 11,349.92''; and

(B) in the table—

(i) by striking the following:

''6	7	8	Tax lot 800	5.55'';

and inserting the following:

''6	7	7, 8, 17, 18	Former tax lot 800, located within the SE ¼ SE ¼ of Section 7; SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 8; NW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 17; and NE ¼ NE ¼ of Section 18	5.55'';

(ii) in the acres column of the last item added by section 2(a)(1) of Public Law 103–445 (108 Stat. 4566), by striking ''240'' and inserting ''241.06''; and

(iii) by striking all text after

''6	7	18	E ½ NE ¼	43.42'';

and inserting the following:

''6	8	1	W ½ SE ¼ SE ¼	20.6
6	8	1	N ½ SW ¼ SE ¼	19.99
6	8	1	SE ¼ NE ¼	9.99
6	8	1	NE ¼ SW ¼	10.46
6	8	1	NE ¼ SW ¼, NW ¼ SW ¼	12.99
6	7	6	SW ¼ NW ¼	37.39
6	7	5	SE ¼ SW ¼	24.87
6	7	5, 8	SW ¼ SE ¼ of Section 5; and NE ¼ NE ¼, NW ¼ NE ¼, NE ¼ NW ¼ of Section 8	109.9
6	8	1	NW ¼ SE ¼	31.32
6	8	1	NE ¼ SW ¼	8.89
6	8	1	SW ¼ NE ¼, NW ¼ NE ¼	78.4
6	7	8, 17	SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 8; and NE ¼ NW ¼, NW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 17	14.33

6	7	17	NW¼ NW ¼	6.68
6	8	12	SW ¼ NE¼	8.19
6	8	1	SE ¼ SW ¼	2.0
6	8	1	SW ¼ SW ¼	5.05
6	8	12	SE ¼, SW ¼	54.64
6	7	17, 18	SW ¼, NW ¼ of Section 17; and SE ¼, NE ¼ of Section 18	136.83
6	8	1	SW ¼ SE ¼	20.08
6	7	5	NE ¼ SE ¼, SE ¼ SE ¼, E ½ SE ¼ SW ¼	97.38
4	7	31	SE ¼	159.60
6	7	17	NW ¼ NW ¼	3.14
6	8	12	NW ¼ SE ¼	1.10
6	7	8	SW ¼ SW ¼	0.92
6	8	12	NE ¼ NW ¼	1.99
6	7	7	NW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 7; and	
6	8	12	S ½ NE ¼, E ½ NE ¼ NE ¼ of Section 12	86.48
6	8	12	NE ¼ NW ¼	1.56
6	7	6	W ½ SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 6; and	
6	8	1	E ½ SE ¼ SE ¼ of Section 1	35.82
6	7	5	E ½ NW ¼ SE ¼	19.88
6	8	12	NW ¼ NE ¼	0.29
6	8	1	SE ¼ SW ¼	2.5
6	7	8	NE ¼ NW ¼	7.16
6	8	1	SE ¼ SW ¼	5.5
6	8	1	SE ¼ NW ¼	1.34
			Total	11,349.92''.

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

S. 821. A bill to establish requirements with respect to bisphenol A; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I remain concerned about the high levels of exposure Americans have to Bisphenol-A, BPA, an endocrine-disrupting chemical. BPA is a synthetic estrogen, which means that it mimics this hormone when in the body. Scientific studies continue to show cause for concern, especially for the health effects on babies, children, and expectant mothers. While these studies continue to examine the exact effects that BPA has on humans, consumers deserve more information.

BPA is most commonly found in food products, such as the lining of canned goods like string beans, but consumers have no clear way of knowing this. The BPA in Food Packaging Right to Know Act is a simple solution to fix this problem. This legislation requires that food packaging that uses BPA include a clear label that reads, ''This food packaging contains BPA, an endocrine-disrupting chemical, according to the National Institutes of Health.'' This is basic information that consumers have the right to know so they can make informed decisions about the products they wish to purchase.

This legislation also directs the Department of Health and Human Services to do a safety assessment of food containers that use BPA to determine if there is reasonable certainty that no harm will come from exposure, including from low doses over the long term. This safety standard would also apply to the evaluation of alternatives to BPA to ensure that replacement chemicals are not simply causing the same harm by a different name. The legislation calls specific attention to the effects of exposure on vulnerable populations, such as infants, children, pregnant women, and workers who are exposed through production practices or handling of final products.

I am particularly concerned about the negative health effects to children who are exposed to chemicals both while they are developing in the womb and in the first few years of their lives. Children are particularly susceptible to toxins while their bodies are developing at such a rapid pace.

According to Dr. Heather Patisaul, a biologist at North Carolina State University, when pregnant women are exposed to BPA and other endocrine-disrupting chemicals, three generations are impacted: the mother, the fetus, and the reproductive cells in the fetus. She cites that nearly 100 studies have shown an association between BPA exposure and negative health effects in humans. These include reproductive disorders, behavioral problems in children, and heart disease. In addition, there are over 1200 published animal studies on effects of BPA that show potential links to cancer, tumors, and brain development disorders.

A recent study published in Hypertension, a journal by the American Heart Association, found that individuals who drank beverages from containers made with BPA had an acute increase in their blood pressure, compared with individuals who drank the same beverage from containers that did not use BPA. This shows the potential for an increased risk for heart disease.

Another recent study, published in Endocrinology, a journal by the Endocrine Society, shows a link between fetal exposure to BPA and increased oxidative stress—an imbalance in the body's ability to protect against and repair cell damage.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 93 percent of Americans have BPA in their bodies. As a society we are constantly exposed to low doses of this chemical over a long timeframe. Consumers deserve the opportunity to have more control over their own exposure and at the least should be provided information about if BPA is in the food products that they purchase.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the BPA in Food Packaging Right to Know Act and stand up for the rights of consumers to have this basic information.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 822. A bill to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2015 with my colleagues Senators RISCH, MERKLEY, MURKOWSKI, and CRAPO.

This bipartisan bill will allow for the rapid expansion of already identified geothermal resources without the additional delays of competitive leasing and without opening up those adjacent properties to speculative bidders who have no interest in developing the resource. At the same time that the bill streamlines the leasing process, it also protects the taxpayer by requiring that developers pay fair market value for the new lease, and limiting the amount of adjacent Federal land that can be leased to 640 acres.

The Bureau of Land Management, which manages geothermal projects on federal land under lease agreements, estimates about 250 million acres of federal land contains geothermal power potential. Geothermal energy projects that are producing geothermal power under the BLM's management make up about half of the total geothermal generating capacity in the United States. This legislation takes an important step to speed the development of this tremendous clean energy potential on public lands, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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. 822

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 ''Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. NONCOMPETITIVE LEASING OF ADJOINING AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES.

Section 4(b) of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1003(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) ADJOINING LAND.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) FAIR MARKET VALUE PER ACRE.—The term 'fair market value per acre' means a dollar amount per acre that—

''(I) except as provided in this clause, shall be equal to the market value per acre (taking into account the determination under subparagraph (B)(iii) regarding a valid discovery on the adjoining land) as determined by the Secretary under regulations issued under this paragraph;

''(II) shall be determined by the Secretary with respect to a lease under this paragraph, by not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date the Secretary receives an application for the lease; and

''(III) shall be not less than the greater of—

''(aa) 4 times the median amount paid per acre for all land leased under this Act during the preceding year; or

''(bb) $50.

''(ii) INDUSTRY STANDARDS.—The term 'industry standards' means the standards by which a qualified geothermal professional assesses whether downhole or flowing temperature measurements with indications of permeability are sufficient to produce energy from geothermal resources, as determined through flow or injection testing or measurement of lost circulation while drilling.

''(iii) QUALIFIED FEDERAL LAND.—The term 'qualified Federal land' means land that is otherwise available for leasing under this Act.

''(iv) QUALIFIED GEOTHERMAL PROFESSIONAL.—The term 'qualified geothermal professional' means an individual who is an engineer or geoscientist in good professional standing with at least 5 years of experience in geothermal exploration, development, or project assessment.

''(v) QUALIFIED LESSEE.—The term 'qualified lessee' means a person that may hold a geothermal lease under this Act (including applicable regulations).

''(vi) VALID DISCOVERY.—The term 'valid discovery' means a discovery of a geothermal resource by a new or existing slim hole or production well, that exhibits downhole or flowing temperature measurements with indications of permeability that are sufficient to meet industry standards.

''(B) AUTHORITY.—An area of qualified Federal land that adjoins other land for which a qualified lessee holds a legal right to develop geothermal resources may be available for a noncompetitive lease under this section to the qualified lessee at the fair market value per acre, if—

''(i) the area of qualified Federal land—

''(I) consists of not less than 1 acre and not more than 640 acres; and

''(II) is not already leased under this Act or nominated to be leased under subsection (a);

''(ii) the qualified lessee has not previously received a noncompetitive lease under this paragraph in connection with the valid discovery for which data has been submitted under clause (iii)(I); and

''(iii) sufficient geological and other technical data prepared by a qualified geothermal professional has been submitted by the qualified lessee to the applicable Federal land management agency that would lead individuals who are experienced in the subject matter to believe that—

''(I) there is a valid discovery of geothermal resources on the land for which the qualified lessee holds the legal right to develop geothermal resources; and

''(II) that thermal feature extends into the adjoining areas.

''(C) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(I) publish a notice of any request to lease land under this paragraph;

''(II) determine fair market value for purposes of this paragraph in accordance with procedures for making those determinations that are established by regulations issued by the Secretary;

''(III) provide to a qualified lessee and publish, with an opportunity for public comment for a period of 30 days, any proposed determination under this subparagraph of the fair market value of an area that the qualified lessee seeks to lease under this paragraph; and

''(IV) provide to the qualified lessee and any adversely affected party the opportunity to appeal the final determination of fair market value in an administrative proceeding before the applicable Federal land management agency, in accordance with applicable law (including regulations).

''(ii) LIMITATION ON NOMINATION.—After publication of a notice of request to lease land under this paragraph, the Secretary may not accept under subsection (a) any nomination of the land for leasing unless the request has been denied or withdrawn.

''(iii) ANNUAL RENTAL.—For purposes of section 5(a)(3), a lease awarded under this paragraph shall be considered a lease awarded in a competitive lease sale.

''(D) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2015, the Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this paragraph.''.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 826. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to sunset rules after 10 years unless agencies undergo notice and comment rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, when I travel across the State of Montana, from Alzada to Whitefish, I meet many different people and small businesses. Although the diversity of thought in Montana is self-evident to anyone who has spent time there, everyone agrees on one thing. Regulation dictated by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. is stifling entrepreneurial creativity, pushing opportunities overseas, and killing jobs.

While many burdensome regulations are new, through adoption of laws such as the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act and the Affordable Care Act, still many more have been on the books for years without review. In an evolving and dynamic economy, regulators should, at the very least, review their regulations on a periodic basis, allow for public input, and eliminate any rules that are either obsolete or unnecessary.

Oftentimes, regulation has unintended consequences on Montana's small businesses. In discussions about the harmful impacts of regulations with Montanans, Vicki Bertelsen, who is the President of K&K Trucking in Great Falls, said, ''Burdensome reporting requirements eat up too many business hours every month. I would rather be growing my business than sending redundant [and] antiquated paperwork to the government.''

With nearly 175,000 pages in the Code of Federal Regulations, it is easy to understand how regulations are keeping people from getting back to work.

That is why today I am introducing the Regulatory Examination Vital for Improving and Evaluating Working Solutions, REVIEWS, Act. While this bill recognizes that many regulations serve a noble purpose in protecting consumers and natural resources, it also seeks to address a structural deficiency in government agencies which allow obsolete and unnecessary regulations to remain in the Code of Federal Regulations. Because agencies operate on limited resources, they focus their efforts on drafting new regulatory rules, rather than monitoring the rules that already exist. While most agency employees are well-intentioned, this structural deficiency places a greater emphasis on creating rules, rather than monitoring the application and effectiveness of existing rules, only to the detriment of Americans.

The REVIEWS Act will require agencies to periodically review each regulation every ten years using the Notice and Comment process. This requirement will ensure that obsolete regulations are recognized and eliminated and that regulatory cost considerations are properly evaluated. If a rule is not reviewed at least every 10 years, it cannot be enforced in court. This requirement will provide public accountability and force regulators to periodically examine existing rules.

It is my hope that this common sense bill will ultimately reduce the regulatory burden on Americans and allow them to freely pursue their ends, independently of government intervention.

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. 826

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 ''Regulatory Examination Vital for Improving and Evaluating Working Solutions Act of 2015'' or the ''REVIEWS Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms ''agency'' and ''rule'' have the meanings given those terms in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3. REGULATORY SUNSET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) EFFECTIVE DATE OF RULES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any rule required to be promulgated in accordance with this section shall cease to be effective on the date that is 10 years after the date on which the agency promulgates the rule.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The effective period of a rule described in paragraph (1) may be extended for additional periods of not more than 10 years if, before the date on which the rule ceases to be effective, the agency that promulgated the rule complies with the procedures under this section as if the rule were a new rule to be issued by the agency.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made under subsection (a) shall apply to a rule promulgated by an agency after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RULES.

(a) ACTIONS REVIEWABLE.—Section 704 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''Agency action'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Agency action''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) CLARIFICATION OF FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'final agency action' includes interpretative rules, general statements of policy, and rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice issued by an agency.''.

(b) REVIEW IN COURT OF APPEALS.—Section 2342 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

''(8) all rules of an agency (as defined under section 551 of title 5) that—

''(A) ceased to be effective under section 553(f) of such title; and

''(B) the agency continues to enforce.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 105—RECOGNIZING THE 194TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 105

Whereas the people of ancient Greece developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the founding fathers of the United States, many of whom read Greek political philosophy in the original Greek language, drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming the representative democracy of the United States;

Whereas Petros Mavromichalis, the former Commander in Chief of Greece and a founder of the modern Greek state, said to the citizens of the United States in 1821, ''It is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode and . . . in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you.'';

Whereas the Greek national anthem, the ''Hymn to Liberty'', includes the words, ''most heartily was gladdened George Washington's brave land'';

Whereas the people of the United States generously offered humanitarian assistance to the people of Greece during their struggle for independence;

Whereas Greece heroically resisted Axis forces at a crucial moment in World War II, forcing Adolf Hitler to change his timeline and delaying the attack on Russia;

Whereas Winston Churchill said, ''if there had not been the virtue and courage of the Greeks, we do not know which the outcome of World War II would have been'' and ''no longer will we say that Greeks fight like heroes, but that heroes fight like Greeks'';

Whereas hundreds of thousands of the people of Greece were killed during World War II;

Whereas Greece consistently allied with the United States in major international conflicts throughout the 20th century;

Whereas Greece is a strategic partner and ally of the United States in bringing political stability and economic development to the volatile Balkan region, having invested billions of dollars in the countries of the region and having contributed more than $750,000,000 in development aid for the region;

Whereas the government and people of Greece actively participate in peacekeeping and peace-building operations conducted by international organizations, including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, and have more recently provided critical support to the operation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Libya;

Whereas Greece received worldwide praise for its extraordinary handling during the 2004 Olympic Games of more than 14,000 athletes and more than 2,000,000 spectators and journalists, a feat the government and people of Greece handled efficiently, securely, and with hospitality;

Whereas Greece, located in a region where Christianity meets Islam and Judaism, maintains excellent relations with Muslim countries and Israel;

Whereas the Government of Greece has taken important steps in recent years to further cross-cultural understanding, rapprochement, and cooperation in various fields with Turkey, and has also improved its relations with other countries in the region, including Israel, thus enhancing the stability of the wider region;

Whereas the governments and people of Greece and the United States are at the forefront of efforts to advance freedom, democracy, peace, stability, and human rights;

Whereas those efforts and similar ideals have forged a close bond between the people of Greece and the United States; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable for the United States to celebrate March 25, 2015, Greek Independence Day, with the people of Greece and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which those two great countries were founded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends warm congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 194th anniversary of the independence of Greece;

(2) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Greece are committed; and

(3) notes the important role that Greece has played in the wider European region and in the community of nations since gaining its independence 194 years ago.

SENATE RESOLUTION 106—DESIGNATING MARCH 22, 2015, AS ''NATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS APPRECIATION DAY''

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 106

Whereas rehabilitation counselors conduct assessments, provide counseling, support families, and plan and implement rehabilitation programs for individuals in need of rehabilitation;

Whereas the purpose of professional organizations for rehabilitation counseling and education is to promote the improvement of rehabilitation services available to individuals with disabilities through quality education for counselors and rehabilitation research;

Whereas various professional organizations have vigorously advocated up-to-date education and training and the maintenance of professional standards in the field of rehabilitation counseling and education, including—

(1) the National Rehabilitation Association;

(2) the Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Association;

(3) the National Council on Rehabilitation Education;

(4) the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association;

(5) the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association;

(6) the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification;

(7) the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation; and

(8) the Council on Rehabilitation Education;

Whereas, on March 22, 1983, the president of the National Council on Rehabilitation Education, testified before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, and was instrumental in bringing the need for qualified rehabilitation counselors to the attention of Congress; and

Whereas the efforts of the National Council on Rehabilitation Education led to the enactment of laws that require rehabilitation counselors to have proper credentials, in order to provide a higher quality of service to those in need of rehabilitation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 22, 2015, as ''National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day''; and

(2) commends—

(A) rehabilitation counselors, for the dedication and hard work rehabilitation counselors provide to individuals in need of rehabilitation; and

(B) professional organizations, for the efforts professional organizations have made to assist those who require rehabilitation.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 320. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 320. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 48, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 63, line 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 101. DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 3014. Additional special assessment

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 and ending on September, 30 2019, in addition to the assessment imposed under section 3013, the court shall assess an amount of $5,000 on any non-indigent person or entity convicted of an offense under—

''(1) chapter 77 (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons);

''(2) chapter 109A (relating to sexual abuse);

''(3) chapter 110 (relating to sexual exploitation and other abuse of children);

''(4) chapter 117 (relating to transportation for illegal sexual activity and related crimes); or

''(5) section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324) (relating to human smuggling), unless the person induced, assisted, abetted, or aided only an individual who at the time of such action was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter (and no other individual) to enter the United States in violation of law.

''(b) SATISFACTION OF OTHER COURT-ORDERED OBLIGATIONS.—An assessment under subsection (a) shall not be payable until the person subject to the assessment has satisfied all outstanding court-ordered fines and orders of restitution arising from the criminal convictions on which the special assessment is based.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the 'Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund' (referred to in this section as the 'Fund').

''(d) DEPOSITS.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, or any other law regarding the crediting of money received for the Government, there shall be deposited in the Fund an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section, which shall remain available until expended.

''(e) APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available for obligation or expenditure only when specified in appropriations Acts for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

''(2) EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Fund made available for obligation or expenditure pursuant to paragraph (1) may only be used to award grants or enhance victims' programming under—

''(A) sections 202, 203, and 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a, 14044b, and 14044c);

''(B) subsections (b)(2) and (f) of section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105); and

''(C) section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

''(3) GRANTS.—Of the amounts in the Fund made available for obligation or expenditure pursuant to paragraph (1), not less than $2,000,000, if such amounts are made available in the Fund during the relevant fiscal year, shall be available for grants to provide services for child pornography victims under section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)), as provided in appropriations Acts.

''(4) LIMITATIONS.—Amounts in the Fund, or otherwise transferred from the Fund, shall be subject to the limitations on the use or expending as provided in appropriations Acts.

''(f) TRANSFERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the day after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, on September 30 of each fiscal year, all unobligated balances in the Fund shall be transferred to the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601).

''(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts transferred under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be available for any authorized purpose of the Crime Victims Fund; and

''(B) shall remain available until expended.

''(g) COLLECTION METHOD.—The amount assessed under subsection (a) shall, subject to subsection (b), be collected in the manner that fines are collected in criminal cases.

''(h) DURATION OF OBLIGATION.—Subject to section 3613(b), the obligation to pay an assessment imposed on or after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 shall not cease until the assessment is paid in full.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3013 the following:

''3014. Additional special assessment.''.

SEC. 102. CLARIFYING THE BENEFITS AND PROTECTIONS OFFERED TO DOMESTIC VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

''(F) NO REQUIREMENT OF OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of trafficking to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in this subsection or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled.''; and

(3) in subparagraph (H), as redesignated, by striking ''subparagraph (F)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (G)''.

SEC. 103. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may award block grants to an eligible entity to develop, improve, or expand domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims' services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

''(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

''(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

''(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

''(B) address the unique needs of child victims of human trafficking;

''(C) facilitate the rescue of child victims of human trafficking;

''(D) investigate and prosecute acts of human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking; and

''(E) utilize, implement, and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of child sex trafficking victims for prostitution offenses, and other laws aimed at the investigation and prosecution of child human trafficking;

''(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child human trafficking offenses and to rescue victims, including—

''(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer's time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

''(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

''(i) wire taps;

''(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;

''(iii) travel; and

''(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

''(C) dedicated anti-trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for State and local prosecutors, including assisting in paying trial expenses for prosecution of child human trafficking offenders, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall be not more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking;

''(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims' services through coordination with—

''(i) child advocacy centers;

''(ii) social service agencies;

''(iii) State governmental health service agencies;

''(iv) housing agencies;

''(v) legal services agencies; and

''(vi) nongovernmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking; and

''(E) the establishment or enhancement of other necessary victim assistance programs

or personnel, such as victim or child advocates, child-protective services, child forensic interviews, or other necessary service providers; and

''(3) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for trafficking victims that include—

''(A) mandatory and regular training requirements for judicial officials involved in the administration or operation of the court program described under this paragraph;

''(B) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking, including case worker or child welfare supervision in collaboration with judicial officers, who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

''(C) the development of a specialized and individualized, court-ordered treatment program for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—

''(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;

''(ii) life skills training;

''(iii) housing placement;

''(iv) vocational training;

''(v) education;

''(vi) family support services; and

''(vii) job placement;

''(D) centralized case management involving the consolidation of all of each child human trafficking victim's cases and offenses, and the coordination of all trafficking victim treatment programs and social services;

''(E) regular and mandatory court appearances by the victim during the duration of the treatment program for purposes of ensuring compliance and effectiveness;

''(F) the ultimate dismissal of relevant non-violent criminal charges against the victim, where such victim successfully complies with the terms of the court-ordered treatment program; and

''(G) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, and nongovernmental organizations with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking to provide services to victims and encourage cooperation with law enforcement.

''(c) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

''(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

''(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

''(B) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant;

''(C) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section; and

''(D) disclose—

''(i) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

''(ii) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period ending on the date of the submission of an application under this section.

''(3) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

''(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b); or

''(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award.

''(d) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall expire 3 years after the date of award of the grant.

''(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 2 times and for a period of not greater than 2 years.

''(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall—

''(1) enter into a contract with a nongovernmental organization, including an academic or nonprofit organization, that has experience with issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct periodic evaluations of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section;

''(2) instruct the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to review evaluations issued under paragraph (1) to determine the methodological and statistical validity of the evaluations; and

''(3) submit the results of any evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

''(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

''(f) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity awarded funds under this section that is found to have used grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the block grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost is reported.

''(g) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if within the 5 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section, the grantee has been found to have violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

''(h) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount expended to carry out this section.

''(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section shall be—

''(1) 70 percent in the first year;

''(2) 60 percent in the second year; and

''(3) 50 percent in the third year, and in all subsequent years.

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated not more than $7,000,000 of the funds available in the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund, established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examining the Regulatory Regime for Regional Banks.''

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BLUNT. 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 March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled ''Examining the Evolving Cyber Insurance Marketplace.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Affordable Care Act at Five Years.''

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Patent Reform: Protecting Innovation and Entrepreneurship.''

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH POLICY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The U.S.-Africa Leader's Summit Seven Months Later: Progress and Setbacks.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, AGENCY ACTION, FEDERAL RIGHTS, AND FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights, and Federal Courts, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 19, 2015, at 3:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Reining in Amnesty: Texas v. United States and Its Implications.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examining Federal Rulemaking Challenges and Areas of Improvement Within the Existing Regulatory Process.''

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

NATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 106, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 106) designating March 22, 2015, as ''National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 106) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

REPORTING AUTHORITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, on Friday, March 20, between 12 noon and 2 p.m., it be in order for the Budget Committee to report out a concurrent resolution and that it be in order for the Senate to proceed to that resolution on Monday, March 23.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Monday, March 23; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on Monday at 12 noon, the Senate will proceed to consider the budget resolution. Senators should expect at least one vote on an amendment to the budget at 5:30 p.m. on Monday night.

For the information of all Senators, the budget resolution is privileged and therefore will not displace the pending trafficking legislation. Once the budget resolution has been adopted, the trafficking bill will be the pending business before the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:50 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 23, 2015, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

FRANCINE BERMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2020, VICE GARY D. GLENN, TERM EXPIRED.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

RICHARD CHRISTMAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2017. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SHELLY COLLEEN LOWE, OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018, VICE JANE M. DOGGETT, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JUAN M. GARCIA III, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE JESSICA LYNN WRIGHT, RESIGNED.

STEPHEN P. WELBY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ZACHARY J. LEMNIOS, RESIGNED.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

ANDREW J. READ, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 13, 2016, VICE DARYL J. BONESS, TERM EXPIRED.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DOUGLAS J. KRAMER, OF KANSAS, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE MARIE COLLINS JOHNS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

LAVERNE HORTON COUNCIL, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY), VICE ROGER W. BAKER.

DAVID J. SHULKIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE ROBERT A. PETZEL, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN N. T. SHANAHAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JACK WEINSTEIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOSEPH P. DISALVO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN W. BAKER
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER S. BALLARD
BRIG. GEN. JOHN W. CHARLTON
BRIG. GEN. ROGER L. CLOUTIER, JR.
BRIG. GEN. EDWARD M. DALY
BRIG. GEN. JASON T. EVANS
BRIG. GEN. JOHN G. FERRARI
BRIG. GEN. ANTHONY C. FUNKHOUSER
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM K. GAYLER
BRIG. GEN. DAVID B. HAIGHT
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH P. HARRINGTON
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM B. HICKMAN
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTIOHER P. HUGHES
BRIG. GEN. CLAYTON M. HUTMACHER
BRIG. GEN. DONALD E. JACKSON, JR.
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL L. KARBLER
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. KRAFT, JR.
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL E. KURILLA
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH M. MARTIN
BRIG. GEN. PAUL M. NAKASONE
BRIG. GEN. MARK J. O'NEIL
BRIG. GEN. ANDREW P. POPPAS
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. RAINEY
BRIG. GEN. KENT D. SAVRE
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN A. SHAPIRO
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. SIMPSON
BRIG. GEN. MARK R. STAMMER
BRIG. GEN. SEAN P. SWINDELL
BRIG. GEN. LEON N. THURGOOD
BRIG. GEN. KIRK F. VOLLMECKE
BRIG. GEN. FLEM B. WALKER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. RONALD P. CLARK

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. HERMAN A. SHELANSKI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RACHEL S. THEISEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT A. BLESSING
JOHN D. LAING
PAUL L. MINOR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOANNE S. MARTINDALE
ROBERT J. PAMULA
JAMES A. THOMAS
CHARLES YOST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JAMES L. BOGGESS

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY AS DEPUTY COMMANDANT FOR MISSION SUPPORT UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SANDRA L. STOSZ

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LIFE OF RANDY M. HITI

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Randy M. Hiti of Rice Lake, Minnesota.

Mr. Hiti died suddenly on Wednesday while responding to a fire call as a member of the Rice Lake Volunteer Fire Department. During his 26 years of service, I am told that it was a very rare occasion that you would not see him show up when the Fire Department called. He was awarded the Firefighter of the Year Award and taught fire prevention to the Homecroft Elementary School third graders for over ten years.

He wasn't just a firefighter. He was a friend to many in all his volunteer activities, which included the Rice Lake Halloween Carnival and Rice Lake Day. Randy also was an eager volunteer for the Grandma's Marathon each year. He was the kind of guy who would drop anything for a family member, friend in need or anyone he saw outside of his driving hours to provide roadside assistance or help with day-to-day tasks. It was only recently that his daughter, Katherine Hiti, was inducted into the Volunteer Fire Department and I am sure it was a very proud moment.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Laura, his daughters Anne and Katherine, his mother Millie, and his brothers Brian and Leon.

He will be missed in his community as he touched so many lives with his spirit of generosity and time.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MATTHEW EVERETT GREENLEE, MARK ALLEN GREENE, AND ROBERT WAYNE VON BOKERN

HON. THOMAS MASSIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three of my constituents from Owenton, Kentucky: Matthew Everett Greenlee, Mark Allen Greene, and Robert Wayne Von Bokern. These three outstanding power linemen from Owen Electric Cooperative recently volunteered for a project in Haiti that, when completed, will provide safe, affordable, and reliable power to 1600 consumers.

The goal of the project is to build a distribution system that will connect three towns in Haiti and establish its first electric cooperative, the Cooperative Electrique de l'Arrondisement des Côteaux. Upon completion, this diesel-solar hybrid electricity distribution system will provide safe, affordable, and reliable power to rural consumers.

Tragically, less than 15 percent of Haiti has regular access to electricity. So, Mr. Greenlee, Mr. Greene, and Mr. Von Bokern generously gave of their time for two weeks in the town of Roche-à-Bateaux to help solve this terrible problem. My constituents upgraded and installed new lines and service drops. They also trained locally hired linemen in proper construction methods, pole climbing techniques, proper handline use, and important safety practices.

Electricity is essential to the quality of life for those in Haiti's rural communities. It assists in the provision of clean water, healthcare, education, and general economic opportunity. Therefore, I salute my constituents for contributing their time and efforts in Haiti on this critical project. Their selfless service for others truly helps make this world a better place.

HONORING WILLIAM 'ZEKE' GRADER, JR.

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, MIKE THOMPSON, to recognize the incredible legacy of William 'Zeke' Grader, Jr., who has tirelessly served California's fishermen and coastal communities and as an environmental champion and community leader for many decades. Always willing to share his vast knowledge and expertise with others, Zeke has helped fishermen to define their interest in battles over offshore oil and gas development, land-use, timber harvesting, water allocation, and other issues of social equity and sustainability.

From an early age, Zeke Grader grew up in the coastal fishing community. His father founded Grader Fish, Co., in Fort Bragg, California, to buy, process, and broker fresh, local fish. Zeke spent much of his childhood on the family dock, helping fishermen to unload their catch. He graduated from Fort Bragg High School and moved south to attend Sonoma State University, where he studied political science and graduated in 1970.

Zeke Grader served his country in the United States Marine Corps before obtaining a law degree from the University of San Francisco and passing the California State Bar in 1975. At that time, Congress was deliberating how to assert our national sovereignty over a two-hundred mile wide economic zone in order to curb foreign overfishing in U.S. waters, allow depleted stocks to recover, and conserve fishery resources. Amidst such explosive public interest in natural resource protection, some in the fishing industry felt threatened by the burgeoning environmental movement. Zeke Grader was asked to serve as the executive officer of the newly formed Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (PCFFA), and he led the organization in a more productive and effective direction by embracing efforts to protect the coastal environment.

With Zeke at the helm, the PCFFA took a leading role in crafting important state and federal legislation to preserve the coastal fishing industry. Zeke lobbied strongly for California's 1988 Salmon, Steelhead Trout, and Anadromous Fisheries Program Act, which called for a statewide salmon conservation plan to double the present numbers of wild salmon. He pushed for modernization of the federal Fishery Conservation and Management Act, litigated to expedite water quality restoration under the federal Clean Water Act, and fought for protections of fishing grounds by organizing for the prevention and clean-up of petroleum spills.

In 1988, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration honored Zeke Grader with its prominent Environmental Hero award. For many Zeke has been a hero over many decades and his tireless efforts to protect the wild California Coast have ensured the present vitality of our fishing communities.

Our friend and former colleague George Miller is one of those who counts Zeke as an inspiration. He passed along this message to us to include in the RECORD: "Zeke Grader has been my friend almost my entire time in the Congress. During that time Zeke has been a leader in our state, on the Pacific Coast and in our nation to give voice and rights to the men and women of our vital and historic commercial fishing industry. The Pacific coast fisheries from time to time are threatened with droughts, economic downturns, high fuel prices, habitat destruction, and bad public policy. Through it all, Zeke Grader has led this magnificent group of fishers to maintain and grow our fisheries. So many people in California's diverse economy are dependent on their success. The commercial fishers of the Pacific coast must both catch and protect this magnificent species. Zeke Grader for so many years has successfully advocated for both the fish and the fishers. All of us owe him great thanks."

Today, Zeke continues his strong advocacy by working with and advising leaders at every level of industry and government. His legacy shows us the lasting positive impact that one man can have on countless others and he has shown that you can build a thriving and sustainable economy without depleting natural resources for future generations. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we honor Zeke today for his work in representing the fishing community, and we express our deepest appreciation for his friendship and his service.

RECOGNIZING THE SKANEATELES HIGH SCHOOL BOYS HOCKEY TEAM

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of the Skaneateles High

School Boys Hockey team in the New York State Championship game on Sunday, March 15th. The Skaneateles Lakers defeated Williamsville East High School by a score of 5–2 for its first title in 26 years.

The Lakers fought back from a 2–0 deficit, working as a cohesive team to score 3 goals in under 6 minutes. Sophomore Raymond Falso received the tournament's Most Valuable Player Award, after having missed six weeks of the regular season due to an injury. Senior Captain Owen Kuhns, sophomores Raymond Falso, Reggie Buell, and Patrick Major were named to the All-Tournament team. The Lakers finished their season with a 22–3–1 record due to the hard work of seniors: Briggs Carter, Owen Kuhns, Jarrett McDonald, Cullen McGlynn, James Motyl, Brett Singler, and Trey Wirth; juniors: Karl Adams, Devin Callahan, Sam Clymer, Reece Eddy, Erik Huba, Bennett Morse, Kyle Ochsner, Jacob Patalino, and Benn Russell; sophomores: Matt Benson, Reggie Buell, Dimitris Christou, Ray Falso, Adam Lupo, Patrick Major, and Nick Rottger; freshmen: Matt Leveroni and Marc Welch; and eighth-grader: Luke Lynn. The team was coached by Mitch Major, a former captain of the 1989 Skaneateles Lakers team.

The Lakers have played with dedication and respect throughout the entire season. I commend the hard work, commitment, and teamwork these players have displayed throughout the season and the example they have set for youth throughout the 24th District. Excellence on the ice translates into excellence off the ice and the practice of sacrificing for the common goal, builds character in our children. I could not be more proud to congratulate these young men on their tremendous season.

CONGRATULATING NATHAN ECKERT ON RECEIVING THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE RACHEL CARSON INDIVIDUAL AWARD

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor Nathan Eckert, the recipient of the 2014 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Rachel Carson Individual Award. This award is bestowed upon employees of the Service whose outstanding contributions improve the Service's knowledge and management of fish and wildlife resources. Nathan is a mussel biologist at the Genoa National Fish Hatchery in Genoa, Wisconsin, and this recognition—considered one of the highest honorary awards in the Service—is well deserved for his extraordinary work in freshwater mussel conservation.

At the Genoa Fish Hatchery, Nathan has been researching and implementing new techniques and rearing systems for imperiled freshwater mussels. As an expert in mussel identification, Nathan has helped the Genoa facility produce nearly 15 million mussels of 17 species, and his endeavors have directly resulted in the release of more than 50,000 threatened or endangered mussels into waterways in the Upper Mississippi River Basin. Nathan's work also includes assisting various mitigation efforts involving projects that impact freshwater mussel populations, providing rare mussel species to partners such as the U.S. Geological Survey and many toxicology labs to study the effects of pesticides and contaminants on mussel survival.

Nathan's dedication and leadership has proved critical to protecting and sustaining the rich biodiversity of the Mississippi River. It is with great pride today that I rise to congratulate Nathan for receiving the Rachel Carson Individual Award and to sincerely thank him and the Genoa Fish Hatchery for building a legacy of conservation for generations to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF EL CENTRO STUDENTS THIRD PLACE PRIZE IN C-SPAN'S VIDEO DOCUMENTARY COMPETITION

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Andrea Vallejo, Shelbie Verbrugh, and Kennent Sandoval, seniors at Southwest High School in El Centro, California, for their outstanding achievement in winning Third Prize at C–SPAN's National 2015 StudentCam Competition. StudentCam offers students across the nation an opportunity to showcase their talents in a friendly national competition.

All aspects of the video production, including the research and planning in their documentary, ''Salton Sea Restoration,'' demonstrated the highest level of critical thinking, initiative, and ingenuity. The ''Salton Sea Restoration'' placed third out of the 2,280 videos submitted, by more than 5,000 students around the country.

This competition is one of our nation's best platforms for our youth to express their opinions on national issues, provide eye-opening and inspiring views of the country, and contribute to the construction of a beloved community.

I want to congratulate these award recipients and encourage more youth involvement in the greater discourse about our communities.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH PASTORAL ANNIVERSARY OF REV. DR. RONALD L. OWENS

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rev. Dr. Ronald L. Owens as he celebrates his 25th Pastoral Anniversary as Senior Pastor of New Hope Baptist Church in Metuchen, New Jersey. Pastor Owens continues to provide outstanding spiritual leadership to the Metuchen community.

Dr. Owens attended New Hope Baptist Church as a child and in 1990 was called back to serve as its pastor. Under his leadership, the membership of New Hope Baptist Church has grown immensely. He has encouraged his congregants to practice faith in action, serving the needs of people through several worship and outreach ministries.

In addition to his service to New Hope Baptist Church, Dr. Owens is also a leader in the Baptist church and an active member of the community. He has served as General Secretary of the General Baptist State Convention of New Jersey, Moderator of the Middlesex Central Baptist Association, Inc. and past president of the Metuchen/Edison Clergy Association. He is also the first Chaplain of the Metuchen Police and Fire Departments, where he continues to counsel, former Vice-Chairman of the Middlesex County Democratic Party and is a member of The Prince Hall Masons of New Jersey, among others.

Dr. Owens is married to Sister Cheryl Owens, formerly Cheryl Jones, and together they are blessed with two daughters and four grandsons. An active member of her faith, Sister Cheryl Owens is also celebrating her 25th anniversary of First Lady of New Hope Baptist Church and I would like to join with the church and community in thanking her for her service.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in celebrating the 25th Pastoral Anniversary of Rev. Dr. Ronald L. Owens. His leadership, service and dedication to the church and community are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

CONGRATULATING ELLIE CAMPBELL FOR HONOR ORCHESTRA OF AMERICA SELECTION

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ellie Campbell from Richmond, Texas for her selection to the Honor Orchestra of America. She is one of only two Harpists who performed at the Orchestra America National Festival in Indianapolis.

Ellie performs with Virtuosi, a Houston-area orchestra, and the Region 13 Philharmonic Orchestra. With Virtuosi, she had the opportunity to perform the prelude music for Violinist Itzhak Perlman's performance with the Houston Symphony in Jones Hall. Music plays an important role in our lives and talented musicians like Ellie contribute to our ability to appreciate the beauty of classical music.

I commend Ellie for all of her musical accomplishments in Houston and beyond. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again Ellie Campbell for her achievements.

HONORING MS. GAYE LEBARON, SONOMA COUNTY WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gaye LeBaron as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district, and I am proud to recognize Gaye as one of them.

Ms. LeBaron is a renowned columnist for the Press Democrat newspaper, the best known historian of Sonoma County, and has been prolifically telling the story of our county, with over eight thousand articles published. Ms. LeBaron posses a rare gift: a genuine interest in people and their stories. In even the smallest stories, she saw the larger truth. Her influence and acclaim have grown over the years because of this focus and the level of trust she has built with the general public through her constancy.

As one of Ms. LeBaron's colleagues at the Press Democrat put it: ''Readers trust her to tell them the truth about what is going on in their community. The depth of her commitment is palpable and readers respond to that.''

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. LeBaron not only for her commitment to telling the story of Sonoma County, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. LeBaron's unyielding dedication to the people and places that make our region unique is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 4, 2015, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

''no'' on roll call vote No. 110 (on agreeing to the McClintock amendment to H.R. 749),

''yes'' on roll call vote No. 111 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 749, with instructions), and

''yes'' on roll call vote No. 112 (on passage of H.R. 749).

EXEMPLARY VOLUNTEERISM: PAM KLEINSCHMIDT AND JERRY LAWSON

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two citizen volunteers from the Lincoln Park neighborhood in Duluth. The have used their talents to give back to the community by assisting with policing efforts.

Pam Kleinschmidt regularly staffs the Lincoln Park and West Duluth police stations by answering phones and assisting with walk-in traffic. Pam, who is often referred to as the ''Mayor of Lincoln Park,'' goes out of her way often at her own expense to take phone calls from concerned citizens at all hours of the day and night. In addition to helping the police build relationships with residents and small business owners in the neighborhood, she organizes monthly meetings for citizens and makes sure their concerns are addressed. Pam has been instrumental each week in keeping an eye on problem areas in the neighborhood and works with the police to help find solutions.

When the police department found itself needing help with managing seized cars used to commit crimes, they were fortunate to find a multi-faceted volunteer in Jerry Lawson. They needed a mechanic, an accountant and a customer service representative. He fulfills all these tasks and the police department frankly says they couldn't manage the impound lot without him. Jerry's volunteer efforts as he helped establish the ''Vial of Life'' program, which provides medical information to first responders as well as helping expand and improve the citizen patrol program.

They were recently honored by receiving the Police Chief's Citizen Partnerships Awards by Duluth's Police Chief Gordon Ramsay. I stand today to salute these exceptional volunteers who are making a true difference in their community.

DEMOCRACY RESTORATION ACT OF 2015

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Democracy Restoration Act of 2015. This legislation will serve to clarify and expand voting rights, as well as assist former felons with their reintegration into our democracy.

The Sentencing Project reports that, since 1997, 23 states have amended felony disenfranchisement policies in an effort to reduce their restrictiveness and expand voter eligibility. These reforms have resulted in an estimate of 800,000 citizens regaining their voting rights. Yet, despite these reforms, an estimated 5.85 million people continue to be ineligible to vote in Federal elections, including more than 4 million who reside in the 35 states that still prohibit some combination of persons on probation, parole, and/or people who have completed their sentence from voting.

I believe that there are three grave discrepancies in State laws regarding felony convictions that lead to unfairness in Federal elections. First, there is no uniform standard for voting in Federal elections, which leads to an egregious disparity and unequal participation in Federal elections based solely on where a person lives. Second, laws governing the restoration of voting rights after a felony conviction are unequal throughout the country and persons in some States can easily regain their voting rights while in other States persons effectively lose their right to vote permanently. Third, State disenfranchisement laws disproportionately impact ethnic minorities, thus adversely infringing upon citizens of these communities constitutional right to vote.

These concerns about ex-offender disenfranchisement are not rhetorical. In the past two election cycles, flawed voter purges have deprived thousands of legitimate voters of their rights. For example, an erroneous interpretation of state law by the Ohio Secretary of State deprived thousands of ex-felons in that state of even the right to register. Only Federal law can conclusively resolve the ambiguities in this area plaguing our voting system.

Like the States, Congress has recognized the need to address the barriers to full citizenship faced by ex-offenders. This voting legislation is the next step in restoring the ex-felon community to full citizenship. Denying voting rights to ex-offenders robs them of the opportunity to fully participate and contribute to their society. Disenfranchisement laws isolate and alienate ex-offenders, and have been shown to serve as one more obstacle in their attempt to successfully reintegrate into society. Moreover, these obstacles adversely impact the voting participation of their families, further undermining the effectiveness of our voting system.

This legislation is a narrowly crafted effort to expand voting rights for ex-felons, while protecting State prerogatives to generally establish voting qualifications. This legislation would only apply to persons who have been released from prison, and it would only apply to federal elections. Consequently, the bill is fully consistent with Constitutional requirements established by the Supreme Court in a series of decisions upholding Federal voting rights laws.

In past Congresses, voting restoration legislation has been supported by a broad coalition of groups interested in voting and civil rights, including the NAACP, ACLU, the National Council of Churches (National and Washington Office), the National Urban League, the Human Rights Watch and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, among many others.

The practice of many states denying voting rights to former felons represents a vestige from a time when suffrage was denied to whole classes of our population based on race, gender, religion, national origin, and property. Ex-felons who have been lawfully released from prisons have paid their debts to society. To continue denying them the ability to reclaim rights as citizens resurrects historic unenlightened practices of our society. Ultimately, I believe that we fail not only ex-offenders by denying them the right to vote, but the rest of a society that has struggled throughout its history to be legitimate and inclusive. Just like poll taxes and literacy tests, it is long past time that these restrictions be relegated to unenlightened history.

EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rotary Club of Katy for receiving the Katy Area Chamber of Commerce Award for Exceptional Service. Formed in 1946, the Rotary Club has served Katy for nearly sixty years.

The Katy Area Chamber of Commerce selected the Rotary Club of Katy because of their dedication to our community. Every year they hold two large fundraisers. To date, they have raised and donated over $110,000 to local schools and charities in Katy. I thank the Rotary Club of Katy for their selfless dedication and focus on giving back to our community. With an emphasis on community service, Rotary Clubs across America play a vital role in strengthening our local communities.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Rotary Club of Katy for being presented the Katy Area Chamber of

Commerce Exceptional Service Award. We look forward to their continued success in Katy, TX.

HONORING THE LIFE, ACHIEVEMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF MINNIE MINOSO TO AMERICAN BASEBALL

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great baseball player and human being who passed away on March 1, 2015, Saturnino Orestes Armas Arrieta who was better known as Minnie Minoso, the Cuban Comet and Mr. White Sox.

Minnie Minoso was born November 29, 1925 in Cuba. He played baseball there and had the opportunity to play baseball here in the U.S. in the Negro Leagues, for, being a Black Cuban, he wasn't allowed to play in the Major Leagues. He played three years with the New York Cubans and then because of Bill Veeck, who was one of the leaders in integrating baseball—the American League's Branch Rickey, Minoso had the opportunity to play in the Major Leagues. He was originally signed to the Cleveland Indians but was traded to the Chicago White Sox in 1951, where, because of his unlimited exuberance and effort, he became known as the ''Cuban Comet.''

Minoso was a great White Sox player, one of the greatest players of the 1950s and a great emissary of Latin American baseball players. He was the first Black Latin American player and superstar, the first black White Sox player and the third American League player of African descent.

Minnie Minoso had a great career. He did everything in baseball. He hit for average, he hit for power, he had speed, he was a great fielder, and a great competitor. In his career, Minoso batted .300 eight times, had a career batting average of .298 with 1023 RBIs and hit 186 home runs. He was a seven-time major league All-Star, a three-time Gold Glove Award winner and was one of only two players to play in the Major Leagues for five decades. In 1990, the White Sox wanted him to play in his sixth decade, which would have placed him in a league of his own. At the time, I placed a call to MLB Commissioner Fay Vincent and argued for Minnie being allowed to play in just one game and accordingly have six decades under his belt. Unfortunately Commissioner Vincent respectfully declined.

In addition to Minnie being one of the greatest baseball players of the 1950s, he was simply a great human being. In 1955, I lived in Memphis, Tennessee and was recovering from childhood polio. I went to an exhibition baseball game at Russwood Park where the White Sox were playing the Cardinals. I had a White Sox cap kind of like this one—this is a Minnie Minoso cap—and I had a White Sox t-shirt. I was on crutches and getting autographs when a player came and gave me a baseball. I went to my dad and told him about it; we went down to thank the player. He was a white pitcher for the Cardinals named Tom Poholsky. He said, ''Don't thank me. Thank that player over there.'' That was number nine for the White Sox, Minnie Minoso. In the entire baseball field of 50 players or more, one cared about a young boy with polio who was a White Sox fan and wanted to do something for him. But in segregated Memphis, a black player didn't feel comfortable doing that, so he did it through a white player. The experience taught me at a very early age about the horrors of discrimination, prejudice and racism.

After that, Minnie became my friend. I visited him in Chicago and went into the White Sox locker room where he gave me his bat and cap. When he came to Memphis in 1960, I visited him at the Lorraine Motel, which was where the black players stayed while the white players were at the Peabody—another lesson in discrimination that taught me well and has taught me to this day to be vigilant against all forms of racism and discrimination. The Lorraine was where Dr. King was killed and now is a great Civil Rights museum in Memphis.

I followed Minnie my whole life. He was like a part of my family. We moved to Los Angeles and we went and visited him at Chavez Ravine. He came up to my dad, and he said ''Doc, how's the kid's leg, how's he doing?'' He always was concerned.

Minnie was denied one of his life's goals of being voted into the Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum. I tried to help him with that. Baseball made a mistake; they should have put Minnie in the Hall of Fame for his Sporting News Rookie of the Year season in 1951 and for all his great years on the diamond where he was unquestionably one of the premiere players of the game through 1961, in addition to being the first Black Latin American Major Leaguer and the first Latin American star. While he was not afforded this honor during his lifetime, Minoso's achievements were recognized through his induction into the Cuban Baseball Hall of Fame in 1983, the Hispanic Heritage Baseball Hall of Fame in 2002, the Latino Baseball Hall of Fame in 2010, and having had his number nine retired by the White Sox, his statue placed at U.S. Cellular Field as he was ''Mr. White Sox,'' and over 35 years of being the White Sox ambassador to Chicago. It is my hope that Minnie will soon be inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum as it needs Minnie to remember this groundbreaking and popular diamond star.

Minnie Minoso died Sunday, March 1, 2015. Visitation was Friday, March 6th at Holy Family Church in Chicago and the funeral was that Saturday. I'll miss Minnie Minoso. He is a lesson in why sports are bigger than runs, hits and errors. It is about human beings and humanity and young kids. Thank you, Minnie. Yours was a life well-lived.

HONORING FRANK DEAN

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Frank Dean who will be retiring from the National Park Service after nearly forty years of dedicated service. Since 1976 when he first joined the National Park Service as a Ranger at Alcatraz Island, Frank Dean has remained committed to preserving the natural beauty and strong cultural heritage of America's National Parks for this and future generations.

Over the past four decades, Mr. Dean has served the American public at parks across the United States, and he will retire in March 2015 as the General Superintendent of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). Since 2009, Frank Dean has taken on the monumental task of managing the GGNRA, which is the nation's largest urban park and is currently visited by an estimated twenty million people each year. As General Superintendent, Mr. Dean has been responsible for overseeing a staff of nearly three hundred federal employees and tens of thousands of volunteers, in partnership with over twenty-five affiliated nonprofit and commercial organizations. Frank Dean's ability to balance the diverse and competing interests of those who enjoy the park has allowed the GGNRA to continue to flourish and expand its appeal while keeping pace with America's changing demographics.

Under Mr. Dean's visionary leadership, world-class art has been incorporated to enhance the park through unique installations, such as Mark di Suvero at Crissy Field and @Large: Ai Weiwei on Alcatraz Island. Frank Dean has pursued the park service's proud tradition of providing youth engagement and educational opportunities through the Park Youth Collaborative. He has overseen critical improvements of park land, notably the restoration of natural ecosystems at Muir Beach to benefit endangered Coho salmon populations. Frank Dean also played a leading role in forging the Tamalpais Lands Collaborative, a groundbreaking five-way partnership to secure a better future for Mt. Tamalpais.

Frank Dean's effective leadership has benefited all who enjoy the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. While he may be retiring from the National Park Service, his outstanding commitment to our parks will continue as Mr. Dean works to preserve and protect Yosemite National Park as the new President and CEO at Yosemite Conservancy. Please join me in recognizing Frank Dean and expressing deep appreciation to him for his long and impressive career, and exceptional record of service to our great nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SUPER STATE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOLASTIC STATE CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of the Southwest High School Chess Club for their outstanding achievement in winning First Place at the 2015 Super States Southern California Scholastic State Chess Championship for the K–12 Under 1200 rating section. This championship offers students across the state an opportunity to showcase their chess skills through friendly competition.

I would like to recognize the Southwest High School Chess Club for providing instructors, equipment and curricula to after-school programs. These programs are designed to promote problem-solving, higher-level thinking

skills, and improved self-esteem, which are crucial to developing the young minds of our children.

Once again, I would like to congratulate the Southwest High School Chess team for a job well done!

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. DAWN HOBBY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 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 Emmy award-winning journalist, Ms. Dawn Hobby. Dawn has worked at WALB–TV in Albany, Georgia for more than 20 years and currently serves as the News Director. She will be retiring on March 20, 2015.

For many years, Dawn was a familiar face on the evening news in Albany, Georgia. Indeed, she has built quite an impressive career which began when she worked as a producer at WALB. She later became a reporter and then an anchor. She launched the news operation for Albany station WFXL, before returning to WALB five years later.

A prominent investigative reporter, Dawn has received numerous honors and awards for her work. In 2011, she won an Emmy Award from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences Southeast for her work on the ''Gulf Oil Crisis'' special report. In 2007 and 2009, Dawn was awarded the Gabby Award for ''Best TV On-Air Personality'' by the Georgia Association of Broadcasters. She also holds three prestigious Golden Viddy Awards from the National Academy of Television Journalists for ''Best Female Anchor'' and ''Best Investigative Reporting.'' She has been honored by the Associated Press Broadcasters Association, the Green Eyeshade Awards for Excellence in Journalism from the Society of Professional Journalists, Georgia Trend magazine, and numerous other organizations and publications.

Dawn is a 2011 graduate of the Raycom Media Leadership program and a 2012 graduate of the Poynter Leadership Academy at the Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, Florida. She serves on the Board of Directors for the Georgia Associated Press and was appointed to the Raycom Media News Directors Advisory Board in April 2014.

Dawn's work at WALB, the NBC- and ABC-affiliated television station for Southwest Georgia, has made her a household name in Albany and the surrounding areas. She anchored WALB News 10 alongside Ben Roberts for more than 20 years, covering many of Southwest Georgia's most memorable events. I have had the pleasure of working with her throughout the years and I know she will truly be missed on the air and at WALB.

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 Dawn has given her time and talents to keeping the residents of Southwest Georgia informed about current events taking place throughout the state of Georgia, our great nation, and the world. A woman of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise are unparalleled. Albany, Georgia shined a little brighter because of Dawn Hobby.

Dawn has accomplished much in her life but none of it would be possible without the love and support of husband, Russell, and her son.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Ms. Dawn Hobby upon the occasion of her retirement from an outstanding career in journalism.

HONORING STEVE BROWN

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Steve Brown, an extraordinary community leader, an accomplished businessman, and a friend, whose life was tragically taken when he was killed riding his bicycle last April.

Steve was a man who lived his life the right way every day. He grew up in Illinois and moved to Florida in 1978 to start his career. Steve was a master salesman, who built Brown's Furniture in Boca Raton and Jupiter, Florida into landmark furniture and design stores. Steve believed his business should be built on the hallmarks of honesty, integrity, hard work and devoted service. He would do anything for his customers, even loaning them furniture until they had chosen what they wanted, so that their homes wouldn't be empty in the interim. Steve was extraordinarily loyal to those who worked with him; the average employee of Brown's has been with the company for more than twenty years.

Steve was a dedicated member of his community. He was very active on the board of the Florence Fuller Child Development Center and helped to manage their thrift shop. He served on the board of Temple Beth El of Boca Raton for many years and chaired the membership committee. Steve was active in helping resettle Jewish refugees from the former Soviet Union when they came to South Florida, and he would regularly loan his company's trucks to needy or vulnerable families if they needed help with a move. He was active with the Jewish Federation of South Palm Beach County and an ardent supporter of America's bond with the State of Israel through Israel Bonds.

Most important to Steve was the love he shared for his family. He was a loyal son to his father and mother Carol and Murray Brown, a dedicated brother to David and Pam, and a loving and devoted husband to his wife Dana, the love of his life. Most important to Steve were his children: his daughter Susie and her husband Micha, his son Andrew, his wife Jennifer, and his youngest son Jordan. If only he could have lived to see the birth of his granddaughter Sara, born last August.

I am glad to take this opportunity to celebrate Steve's life and legacy, and I join with my friends at Spanish River Community High School in my district who will be honoring Steve's memory on March 28, 2015. For all of us who were privileged to know Steve or were touched by his vibrant life that was all too short, Steve's memory truly is a blessing.

HONORING JOHN THOMAS DODSON

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Thomas Dodson, Music Director of the Adrian Symphony Orchestra, and to thank him for his impact on the musical life of the Adrian community over the past 14 years.

Many years ago, I served on the Board of Directors which brought John Dodson to the symphony, which he has energetically overseen since 2001. During that time, he elevated the artistic level of the orchestra while collaborating with artists of the highest quality. His authority at the podium and willingness to engage new formats and audiences will certainly be missed when he steps down from his position next month.

His talents have been recognized beyond the walls of the Dawson Auditorium, as Mr. Dodson was awarded the 2008 Lenawee Arts Award from the Croswell Opera House. He also earned the Ross Newsom Award for Outstanding Teaching in 2009 by Adrian College where he taught from 2001–2013.

On April 19, 2015, he will direct Symphony No. 9 in D Minor, the final complete symphony of Ludwig van Beethoven, and fittingly, Mr. Dodson's final classical concert performance with the Adrian Symphony Orchestra. I know the Adrian community looks forward to one last inspiring performance and wishes Mr. Dodson the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING MS. CYNTHIA ORTIZ GUZMAN

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Cynthia Ortiz Guzman as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district, and I am proud to recognize Cynthia as one of them.

When meeting Ms. Guzman for the first time, you are immediately taken in by her personal warmth, keen sense of humor, friendly smile and her enthusiasm for life. In 2011, Ms. Guzman was diagnosed on her 63rd birthday with younger-onset Alzheimer's disease. Not one to accept her challenges without a fight, Ms. Guzman moved to Napa to be closer to her family, and began raising awareness and advocating for increased research funding for this terrible disease. She has been an active member of the Alzheimer's Association and has been spreading her personal story throughout the region.

Ms. Guzman's story has been published in multiple books, magazine, and newspapers. She has come to my office in Washington, D.C. as a part of the Alzheimer's Association Advocacy Forum and I'm proud to have participated multiple times in her Walk to End Alzheimer's.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Guzman not only

for her commitment to fighting this terrible disease, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. Guzman's unyielding dedication to raising funds and awareness and guiding our policymakers in Napa County is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her continued success.

HONORING MARGARET HARFIELD

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Margaret Harfield, who is celebrating her 105th birthday this month. Margaret is a remarkable woman who has made significant contributions to the film industry, where she established herself as one of the first female professionals in a field once dominated by men.

Margaret grew up in New Jersey, where she had the special privilege of working with the world-renowned escape-artist Harry Houdini as his projectionist and assistant film editor. At a time when few women were able to enter the film industry, Harfield's unprecedented work for Mr. Houdini and beyond demonstrated her extraordinary talent, hard work and dedication to her profession. Margaret continued to break barriers with her work on movie tone newsreels and national commercials, later joining the film technicians union where she continued to thrive as an editor. Later, she became one of the founders of the National Film Editors Guild. In 1944, Margaret became an assistant editor for Paramount News and was quickly promoted to be an editor for the Life Stories Divisions, where she worked on film biographies used in newscasts and movie theatre reels. Margaret married the love of her life and late husband Harry Hartfield in 1933, and lived together with him in Florida for more than 50 years.

Today, Harfield still lives in South Florida where she is a proud mother, grandmother and great grandmother. 105 years young, she is still an active member of her community and can be found at the local Bingo hall every Tuesday night and at many other functions across town.

It is a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to represent a district with citizens like Margaret Harfield. Harfield is a woman of great accomplishment, and I am incredibly pleased she is continuing to enrich the lives of those around her. On behalf of my entire district and the United States Congress, Happy Birthday, Margaret!

RECOGNIZING FREDRICK ''WILL'' WILLIAMS

HON. RALPH LEE ABRAHAM

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fredrick ''Will'' Williams on the occasion of his retirement from the SourceAmerica Board of Directors, through which he has helped identify and create work opportunities for individuals with significant disabilities in Louisiana and in communities across America.

Mr. Williams served in the U.S. Army from February 1983 to March 2006. He is an Iraq War Veteran and two time Purple Heart recipient. He was acting as a convoy escort managing a team of 14 soldiers escorting dignitaries through the war zone when there was a suicide bomb attack resulting in injuries leading to his retirement from the Army. He later became employed by Training, Rehabilitation and Development Institute (TRDI) where he worked as a security monitor. While at TRDI he became a knowledgeable and vocal advocate for people with disabilities and the AbilityOne Program and received recognition for his efforts through the SourceAmerica 2007 William M. Usdane Award.

Mr. Williams is also a mentor in the Boys and Girls Club of Monroe and works with young adults who have disabilities and are struggling to find their purpose. Mr. Williams is a deacon of True Vine Baptist Church and has served on the Finance Committee. He is also a member of the AbilityOne Speakers Bureau and has spoken to groups around the nation about the difference employment makes in an individual's life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Williams for his heartfelt commitment to improving the lives of those with disabilities, and wish him well as he departs from the SourceAmerica Board of Directors.

IN RECOGNITION OF RUTH HYMAN

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Ruth Hyman as she is honored by the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group at their Ruth Hyman Spiritual Support in the Jewish Tradition Hospice Program Tree of Life Donor Wall Dedication.

A lifelong resident of Long Branch, New Jersey, Ruth Hyman continues her philanthropic endeavors to improve the well-being of New Jersey's residents. As the recipient of a generous donation by Ms. Hyman, the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group has named its hospice program's special services for Judaic pastoral care in her honor. The Ruth Hyman Spiritual Support in the Jewish Tradition program will continue to provide important spiritual and pastoral care and comfort to individuals and their families. The Visiting Nurse Association Health Group's mission to make the community a better place reflects Ms. Hyman's passion for helping others.

The largest non-profit visiting nurse association in New Jersey, the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group provides an invaluable service to our communities through compassionate home health care and support services. Its skilled health aides continue to meet the needs of over 120,000 individuals in the comfort and security of their homes each year.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in thanking Ruth Hyman and the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group for their immeasurable contributions to our community.

VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Douglas Gorman of Katy, TX for being named the Katy Area Chamber of Commerce Volunteer of the Year. He selflessly donates his time to serve the people of TX–22.

Mr. Gorman has been a strong volunteer since he moved to Katy in 2008. He serves on the advisory board for the Fussell Senior Citizen Center and volunteers weekly at Katy Prairie Conservancy and St. Paul's Episcopal Church. He is also as a board member of the Katy Home Savers Association, and an advocate to preserve safe home environments for the elderly. We are lucky to have such a committed civil servant living in Katy. His selfless dedication to community service strengthens our community.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Douglas Gorman for being selected as the Katy Area Chamber of Commerce Volunteer of the Year. We appreciate your service and continued successes.

RECOGNIZING HILARIO ''LALO'' RODRIGUEZ

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hilario ''Lalo'' Rodriguez of Laredo, Texas on the occasion of his retirement. For the last 42 years, Mr. Rodriguez has become a renowned and respected member of both the Laredo and HEB communities.

Lalo Rodriguez began his career with HEB in 1972 as a carryout at the original Laredo 3 store. From there, he rose in the ranks, serving as a department manager in Carrizo Springs, Hondo, and Eagle Pass and then as top store leader in Crystal City in 1984. Most recently, Mr. Rodriguez served as a Unit Director in Laredo stores 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. As a result, he has emerged as a tenet of the HEB organization in Laredo.

Over the last 42 years, Mr. Rodriguez has developed a reputation as an exemplary leader and role model at HEB. His colleagues describe him as ''one of Laredo's most iconic top store leaders'' and credit him with helping to position HEB as ''the retailer of choice'' in Laredo. During his 42-year tenure, Mr. Rodriguez has been a ''positive role model,'' helping to empower the next generation of leaders in Southwest area stores.

Mr. Rodriguez is celebrated for his business acumen and love of the job. Many have attributed the rise of HEB in Laredo to his leadership and hard work. Overall, he will be remembered as being an effective business owner and merchant, as well as an exceptional developer of people.

In addition to his 42 years of exemplary service to HEB, Mr. Rodriguez is a devoted husband and father of four daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Hilario ''Lalo'' Rodriguez

for his 42 years of service to HEB and the people of Laredo.

TRIBUTE TO ABILITYONE AND BOSMA ENTERPRISES

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exemplary partnership between the AbilityOne Program and Indiana's own Bosma Enterprises.

AbilityOne is an extraordinary initiative that helps people with disabilities. It is the largest single provider of employment for people who are blind or face other significant disabilities. The Program puts more than 47,000 Americans to work by providing products and services to both federal government and commercial customers.

For twenty five of the past 100 years that Bosma Enterprises has been in business it has partnered with the AbilityOne Program to serve hundreds of Hoosiers each year through Community and Center-Based Services; services that have helped disabled Hoosiers achieve a greater level of independence and self-esteem. Their partnership has also enabled many people to gain employment in good paying Indiana jobs. Nearly 60 percent of all employees at Bosma Enterprises are blind or suffer some degree of visual impairment. But Bosma's partnership with AbilityOne is about more than just the number of people. It is about the individuals that are being assisted.

One such man was stay-at-home dad Don Green. Retinitis pigmentosa left Don totally blind making it very difficult for him to reenter the job market after taking time off to care for his twins. On more than one occasion he was asked why potential employers ''should have to make accommodations for someone who is blind.'' Almost 200 applications later, Don was disenchanted, dismayed and about to give up when a friend encouraged him to check into the opportunities provided by Bosma Enterprises. That application changed his life as Bosma hired Don as a material handler in its warehouse.

Bosma Enterprises was able to offer Don a job because of its contracts through the AbilityOne Program. Through this important program, Bosma provides exam and surgical gloves to VA hospitals across the country and has created nearly 100 jobs for people who are blind or visually impaired in Indiana. Today, just six years later, Don is the Production Supervisor managing 40 people working on the exam glove lines.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work Bosma Enterprises is doing in partnership with the AbilityOne Program and ask all Hoosiers to join me in recognizing the life altering work they do each and every day. They open doors of opportunity and help make the state of Indiana a better place to live. In the words of Don Green, ''It means everything to be able to have a job. I am so glad that I am able to take care of my family and give them a better life.''

STRONG COMMITMENT TO SERVICE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate two members of the Brazos Valley Community-Girl Scout Troop 28028—Sarah-Leanne Sherman and Katie Stone. These young women received the Silver Award, the second highest Girl Scout award and the highest award at the middle school level.

Sarah-Leanne and Katie have continually showed their commitment to changing society and helping their community. They were awarded the Silver Award after running a cheer and dance camp for the children staying at the Fort Bend Women's Shelter over the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. At the end of the camp, the children were able to perform their routine for their mothers.

I am proud to represent two young leaders who possess a strong commitment to service. On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Sarah-Leanne and Katie for earning this distinguished award. I look forward to seeing what Sarah-Leanne and Katie do in the future.

HONORING MS. KAREN TAYLOR, SOLANO COUNTY'S WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Karen Taylor as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district and I am proud to recognize Karen as one of them.

Ms. Taylor is a considerate woman with a loving and giving heart, and is always seeking to help the less fortunate in our community, especially youth, homeless, and elders. From block parties that she put on as a teenager to field trips to take kids to Lake Tahoe to see snow for the first time, she has been a fixture in her neighborhood and the Vallejo community. Forming activity groups, such as Karen's Tiny Tots and Karen's Girls Clubs for kids and teenagers, she has helped young people in Vallejo experience and see the best in themselves.

Ms. Taylor has strived to improve our community for more than thirty years. She has worked with kids to perform plays, has hosted meetings on pregnancy prevention for teenage girls, and has devoted countless hours of work to the Solano AIDS Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Taylor not only for her commitment to bettering the lives of the less fortunate around her, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. Taylor's unyielding dedication to the people that make region unique is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her continued success.

BRAIN AWARENESS WEEK

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in celebration of the 20th anniversary of Brain Awareness Week and the importance of educating students and the general public on brain science in the United States and around the world. I'd like to highlight an issue that's important to me and the people of California's 14th District. Traumatic brain injury, known as TBI, affects over 1.7 million people in the United States each year and costs Americans almost $77 billion annually in direct and indirect medical costs. The effects of TBI on the brain vary greatly. TBI includes concussions, which may not show brain damage on an MRI, but can lead to headaches, fatigue, behavioral changes, and long-term effects on cognition or personality. More severe TBIs may lead to loss of consciousness for over 30 minutes, and can result in severe headaches, seizures, loss of motor coordination, and agitation. TBI can result from falls, car accidents, or due to combat trauma or athletics.

TBI has been called the signature wound of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, and many of the TBI cases from these wars are due to injury from Improvised Explosive Devises (IEDs). The DoD states that since 2000, more than 287,000 U.S. service members have sustained a TBI. Research indicates that TBIs are related to development of PTSD or major depression in veterans, and being able to accurately diagnose and treat TBI is an important step in caring for the mental and physical health of our veterans.

TBI is also an issue in athletes of all levels, ranging from high school sports to professional sports. It is estimated that 300,000 sports-related concussions occur each year. In recent years, repeated concussions in athletes have been shown to be related to chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE) that leads to increased irritability, and eventually dementia. Many people with traumatic brain injury never get diagnosed, and there are not reliable treatments available for those who do get diagnosed. Being able to accurately identify and then treat TBI is important for the health and long-term well-being of high school athletes, professional athletes, service members, and veterans.

In an effort to improve diagnosis and treatment of TBI, the University of California, San Francisco is leading several federally-funded research initiatives. UCSF will be directing an $18.8 million award from NIH that will support research on how to improve diagnosis and treatment for TBIs, which are frequently undiagnosed, misdiagnosed, and undertreated. UCSF has also received a $17 million Department of Defense award that aims to improve clinical trials for TBI which may lead to better treatments. Researchers will use data from thousands of patients to identify effective measures of brain injury and recovery using brain imaging, biomarkers, and other tools. This may lead to the first successful treatment of TBI.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Brain Awareness Week and the contributions that thousands of dedicated scientists are making to unlock the mysteries behind the human brain.

HONORING MALCOLM JAMES ''JIMMY'' KEEP FOR HIS SERVICE AND BRAVERY AS A MARINE WITH THE FOURTH MARINE DIVISION DURING THE PACIFIC CAMPAIGNS OF WORLD WAR II

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Malcolm James ''Jimmy'' Keep, a lifelong Memphian and a veteran of World War II who fought bravely against Japanese forces on Guam, Saipan and Iwo Jima. Keep, now 88 years of age and one of two surviving veterans in the Memphis area who fought on Iwo Jima, served with the Fourth Marine Division after joining the Marines in 1943 at just 17 years old. On March 17, Mr. Keep and his son, Mickey, will travel to Iwo Jima with the help of Memphis-based nonprofit organization Forever Young Senior Veterans to join 70 other Marine veterans for a 70th anniversary gathering.

Assigned to reconnaissance duty early in his career along with his partner from training, Charlie Ciulla of Massachusetts, Keep experienced the brutality of war that many people can only imagine through Hollywood films. Keep remembers fighting on Saipan as the bloodiest thing he had ever seen as Japanese soldiers employed Banzai charges, or human wave assaults, on Marines who were firing 50-caliber machine guns—essentially guaranteeing their own deaths. Even though Keep was trained in fighting and all too familiar with death, he took no satisfaction from the number of Japanese lives lost to his gun fire. On Iwo Jima, Keep and Ciulla found themselves exposed to enemy fire from all sides when their amphibious tank was disabled near Mount Suribachi, causing them to evacuate on foot. The two Marines then ran across the island without injury, earning them both the nickname ''rain-walkers.'' It was believed that if they could survive that kind of heavy fire without being hit, then they could walk through rain without getting wet. Their mission was not in vain as they saw the American flag raised on Suribachi.

Also on Iwo Jima, the American Marines fell under fire from seemingly ghost bullets, which were claiming the lives of many. It was discovered that Japanese fighters were using huge tunnels from which they launch their attacks. As a recon man, Keep was responsible for clearing out the tunnel, and in doing so, he found himself fighting a squad of roughly 15. He performed this task every other day for two weeks. In addition to helping his fellow Marines depart the island safely; Keep was photographed helping a wounded Marine back to the beach. He recalled telling the Marine, ''You're getting off this rock. I'll trade places with you.'' Jimmy Keep is a true hero.

After returning to Memphis, Tennessee, Jimmy became an electrician and started a family. Today, he still resides in Memphis and is an ardent fan of the Memphis Grizzlies. When Jimmy and his son travel to Iwo Jima, Jimmy will no doubt be filled with emotions as he is united with other Marines who also fought valiantly during World War II. While there, Keep plans to visit Japanese Shinto shrines to ask Japanese gods for forgiveness for the lives that he took as a result of war. This show of sorrow and respect is to be commended. It is my hope, however, that he also remain mindful of the countless lives that were saved because of his selfless decision at such a young age to fight for his country against those forces that sought to do harm to America and the American way of life. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring Malcolm James ''Jimmy'' Keep for his service and bravery as a Marine with the Fourth Marine Division during the Pacific campaigns of World War II.

HONORING MS. PAMELA PHILLIPS, LAKE COUNTY WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pamela Phillips as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district, and I am proud to recognize Pamela as one of them.

Over her exemplary five decade career as a public servant, Ms. Phillips worked her way up from receptionist to Field Manager of the Lakeport Social Security Office. I've worked with Ms. Phillips for the past sixteen years and her work ethic and dedication to our mutual constituents was outstanding. She always did her upmost to alleviate the immediate personal need in every dire situation and to see that every question was answered and every beneficiary was well-served.

Employees such as Ms. Phillips are often underappreciated, overworked and their important work sometimes goes unrecognized, but she has always been patient, compassionate and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Phillips not only for her commitment to public service, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. Phillips' unyielding dedication to every recipient of Social Security benefits in Lake County is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her a most enjoyable retirement.

CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF GREATER WATERBURY

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the unveiling of the newly renovated Boys & Girls Club of Greater Waterbury.

On March 19, 2015, the Boys & Girls Club of Greater Waterbury opens its doors to our community, unveiling recently completed upgrades. I was proud to help secure the $750,000 in state bonding funds for improvements to enhance the overall structure and amenities of the facility.

For over 125 years, the Boys & Girls Club of Greater Waterbury has shaped successful members by fostering leadership skills, developing educational enrichment programs, and designing activities focused on health and wellbeing. The club continues to demonstrate its commitment to our children through a variety of invaluable programming from promoting a healthy lifestyle to achieving academic success.

Thank you to the Boys & Girls Club for the countless hours you serve as youth advocates for children from all backgrounds. Your sense of purpose and passion creates an environment where boys and girls are welcomed for their diversity and encouraged to build strong character and responsible citizenship.

The Boys & Girls Club of Greater Waterbury transforms lives by expanding opportunities and empowering youth. I offer my congratulations and sincere thanks to the Boys and Girls Club for all of these contributions to our community. I wish them many more years of continued success.

HONORING MS. MAUREEN TOMS, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Maureen Toms as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district, and I am proud to recognize Maureen as one of them.

Ms. Toms has been a strong supporter of the Special Olympics; as a parent of a child with Down Syndrome, she has been a tireless advocate for children with disabilities. She has also donated hundreds of hours as a volunteer on numerous planning committees that have led to improving the quality of life for the families and residents in the City of Pinole and West Contra Costa County.

Ms. Toms grew up in a family that believed in serving their community, and that philosophy became a lifelong passion. From helping children with intellectual disabilities overcome barriers through sports and shatter stereotypes with the Special Olympics to helping beautify her local neighborhood by obtaining grants to plant trees in a local park, she has been a tireless advocate for the people and places that make our community special.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Toms not only for her commitment to improving the lives of children with disabilities, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. Toms' unyielding dedication to the people that make our region unique is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her continued success.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1637–S1673.

Measures Introduced: Thirty-three bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 796–828, and S. Res. 105–106. **Pages S1659–61**

Measures Passed:

National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 106, designating March 22, 2015, as "National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day". **Page S1672**

Measures Considered:

Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act: Senate continued consideration of S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S1638–57, S1672**

Pending:

Portman Amendment No. 270, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking. **Pages S1638–57**

Portman Amendment No. 271, to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth. **Pages S1638–57**

Vitter Amendment No. 284 (to Amendment No. 271), to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth. **Pages S1638–57**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 56 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 75), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to the bill. **Page S1641**

Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the committee-reported substitute amendment to the bill. **Pages S1641–42**

By 56 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 76), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Pages S1641–42**

Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the bill. **Pages S1642–57**

Budget Committee Reporting—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, that on Friday, March 20, 2015, between 12 noon and 2 p.m., it be in order for the Budget Committee to report out a concurrent resolution and that it be in order for the Senate to begin consideration of that resolution on Monday, March 23, 2015. **Page S1672**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Francine Berman, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2020.

Richard Christman, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2017.

Shelly Colleen Lowe, of Arizona, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

Juan M. Garcia III, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Stephen P. Welby, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Andrew J. Read, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2016.

Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

LaVerne Horton Council, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Information and Technology).

David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

33 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Coast Guard nomination in the rank of admiral.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.
Routine lists in the Army. **Pages S1672–73**

Messages from the House: **Page S1659**

Measures Referred: **Page S1659**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S1659**

Executive Communications: **Page S1659**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S1661**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1661–69**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1658–59**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1669–71**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S1671–72**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—76) **Pages S1641–42**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 5:50 p.m., until 12 noon on Monday, March 23, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1672.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 for the Veterans Benefits Administration, after receiving testimony from Allison A. Hickey, Under Secretary for Benefits, James E. Manker, Jr., Chief Financial Officer, and Thomas Murphy, Director, Compensation Service, all of the Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

APPROPRIATIONS: UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the United States Secret Service, after receiving testimony from Joseph P. Clancy, Director, United States Secret Service, Department of Homeland Security.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine U.S. Strategic Command, U.S. Transportation Command, and U.S. Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Admiral Cecil D. Haney, USN, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, General Paul J. Selva, USAF, Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, and Admiral Michael S. Rogers, USN, Commander, U.S. Cyber Command, Director, National Security Agency, and Chief, Central Security Services, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine Air Force force structure and modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from William A. LaPlante, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Lieutenant General Tod D. Wolters, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force for Operations, and Lieutenant General James M. Holmes, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force for Strategic Plans and Requirements, all of the Department of Defense.

REGULATORY REGIME FOR REGIONAL BANKS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the regulatory regime for regional banks, after receiving testimony from Thomas J. Curry, Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury; Martin J. Gruenberg, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and Daniel K. Tarullo, Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

BUDGET: 2016

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2025.

CYBER INSURANCE MARKETPLACE

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security concluded a hearing to examine the evolving cyber insurance marketplace, after receiving testimony from Ben Beeson, Lockton Companies, Washington, D.C.; Catherine Mulligan, Zurich, New York, New York; Ola Sage, e-Management, Silver Spring, Maryland; and Michael Menapace, Wiggin and Dana, Hartford, Connecticut.

U.S. CRUDE OIL EXPORT POLICY

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine U.S. crude oil export policy, after receiving testimony from Carlos Pascual, IHS, Elizabeth Rosenberg, Center for a New American Security, Charles T. Drevna, American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers, and Jeffrey Warmann, Monroe Energy Inc., on behalf of the CRUDE Coalition, all of Washington, D.C.; and Ryan Lance, ConocoPhillips, Houston, Texas.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AT FIVE YEARS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Affordable Care Act at five years, after receiving testimony from Douglas Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum, Holly Wade, National Federation of Independent Business, and David Blumenthal, The Commonwealth Fund, all of Washington, D.C.

UNITED STATES–AFRICA LEADERS SUMMIT

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy concluded a hearing to examine the United States-Africa leaders summit seven months later, focusing on progress and setbacks, after receiving testimony from Ben Leo, Center for Global Development, Del Renigar, General Electric, Susan C. Tuttle, IBM Government and Regulatory Affairs, and Thomas J. Bollyky, Council on Foreign Relations, all of Washington, D.C.

FEDERAL RULEMAKING CHALLENGES

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management concluded a hearing to examine Federal rulemaking challenges and areas of improvement within the existing regulatory process, after receiving testimony from John D. Graham, former Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Bloomington; Neil Eisner, former Acting Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations and Enforcement, Federal Aviation Administration, American University Washington College of Law, and Pamela Gilbert, former Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Cuneo Gilbert and LaDuca, both of Washington, D.C.; and Drew Greenblatt, Marlin Steel Wire Products, LLC, Baltimore, Maryland, on behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers.

TEXAS V. UNITED STATES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts concluded a hearing to examine reining in amnesty, focusing on *Texas v. United States* and its implications, after receiving testimony from Kris W. Kobach, Kansas Secretary of State, Topeka; David B. Rivkin, Jr., BakerHostetler, LLP, Washington, D.C.; and Jill E. Family, Widener University School of Law Law and Government Institute, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

PATENT REFORM

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine patent reform, focusing on protecting innovation and entrepreneurship, including H.R. 9, to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and S. 632, to strengthen the position of the United States as the world's leading innovator by amending title 35, United States Code, to protect the property rights of the inventors that grow the country's economy, after receiving testimony from David Winwood, Louisiana State University Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, on behalf of the Association of University Technology Managers; Robert N. Schmidt, Small Business Technology Council, Fort Meyers, Florida; Rachel King, GlycoMimetics, Inc., Gaithersburg, Maryland; Craig Bandes, Pixelligent Technologies, Baltimore, Maryland; and Timothy A. Molino, BSA The Software Alliance, Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 66 public bills, H.R. 12, 1457–1522; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 25–26; and H. Res. 160–161, were introduced. **Pages H1800–04**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1806–07**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Tipton to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1773**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 159 noes with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 129. **Pages H1773, H1788–89**

Member Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Schock, wherein he resigned as Representative for the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois, effective on March 31, 2015. **Page H1773**

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures: The House passed S.J. Res. 8, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures, by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 128, after the previous question was ordered. **Pages H1782–88**

H. Res. 152, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) and the resolution (H. Res. 132), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 127, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 126. **Pages H1775–82**

Providing for a recess of the House for a joint meeting to receive His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan: Agreed by unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Tuesday, March 25, 2015 for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, the President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. **Page H1789**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, March 24, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 25. **Page H1789**

Providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress: The House agreed to H. Res. 152, amended, providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, by voice vote after the previous question was ordered. **Pages H1789–92**

Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the amendment printed in House Report 114–45 was agreed to. **Pages H1789–92**

H. Res. 152, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) and the resolution (H. Res. 132), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 127, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 126. **Pages H1775–82**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, March 23rd for Morning Hour debate. **Page H1800**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1781, H1781–82, H1788, and H1789. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:59 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 897, the ''Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2015''. H.R. 897 was ordered reported, without amendment.

APPROPRIATIONS—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Bureau of Land Management budget. Testimony was heard from Neil Kornze, Director, Bureau of Land Management.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Veterans Affairs, Office of the Inspector General oversight.

Testimony was heard from Richard J. Griffin, Deputy Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs; and John D. Daigh, Jr., Assistant Inspector General for Healthcare Inspection, Department of Veterans Affairs.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Agriculture Farm and Foreign Agricultural Service budget. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Agriculture officials: Michael T. Scuse, Under Secretary, Farm and Foreign Agriculture Service; Brandon Willis, Administrator, Risk Management Agency; Val Dolcini, Administrator, Farm Service Agency; Phil Karsting, Administrator, Foreign Agriculture Service; and Michael Young, Budget Officer.

APPROPRIATIONS—UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on United States European Command budget. Testimony was heard from General Philip M. Breedlove, United States Air Force, Supreme Allied Commander Europe (NATO), Commander, United States European Command. This hearing was closed.

APPROPRIATIONS—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Transportation Security Administration budget. Testimony was heard from Melvin Carraway, Acting Administrator, Transportation Security Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on Consumer Product Safety Commission budget. Testimony was heard from Elliot F. Kaye, Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission; and Ann Marie Buerkle, Commissioner, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Surface Transportation Programs budget. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Transportation officials: Gregory G. Nadeau, Acting Administrator, Federal Highway Administration; Therese W. McMillan, Acting Administrator, Federal Transit Administration; Mark R. Rosekind, Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; and Paul N. Jaenichen Sr., Administrator, Maritime Administration.

FISCAL YEAR 2016 MISSILE DEFENSE HEARING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2016 Missile Defense Hearing''. Testimony was heard from Brian P. McKeon, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; Admiral Bill Gortney, USN, Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command, U.S. Northern Command; Vice Admiral James Syring, USN, Director, Missile Defense Agency; and Lieutenant General David L. Mann, USA, Commander, Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense.

FISCAL YEAR 2016 GROUND FORCE MODERNIZATION AND ROTORCRAFT MODERNIZATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2016 Ground Force Modernization and Rotorcraft Modernization Programs''. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Michael E. Williamson, USA, Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology); Major General Michael D. Lundy, USA, Commander, U.S. Army Aviation Center of Excellence; Vice Admiral Paul A. Grosklags, USN, Principal Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition); Lieutenant General Anthony R. Ierardi, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8; Brigadier General Joe Shrader, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Systems Command; and Bill Taylor, Program Executive Officer Land Systems, U.S. Marine Corps.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee concluded a markup on the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016. The concurrent resolution was ordered reported, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on H.R. 906, to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FCC REAUTHORIZATION: OVERSIGHT OF THE COMMISSION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''FCC Reauthorization: Oversight of the Commission''. Testimony was heard from the following Federal Communications Commission officials: Tom Wheeler, Chairman; Mignon Clyburn, Commissioner; Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner; Ajit Pai, Commissioner; and Michael O'Rielly, Commissioner.

OVERSIGHT OF THE SEC'S DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the SEC's Division of Enforcement''. Testimony was heard from Andrew J. Ceresney, Director, Division of Enforcement, Securities and Exchange Commission.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN: BLOCKING OR PAVING TEHRAN'S PATH TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS?

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Negotiations with Iran: Blocking or Paving Tehran's Path to Nuclear Weapons?''. Testimony was heard from Antony J. Blinken, Deputy Secretary of State, Department of State; Adam J. Szubin, Acting Under Secretary, Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, Department of the Treasury.

AGENTS OF OPPORTUNITY: RESPONDING TO THE THREAT OF CHEMICAL TERRORISM

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held a hearing entitled ''Agents of Opportunity: Responding to the Threat of Chemical Terrorism''. Testimony was heard from Mark Kirk, Director, Chemical Defense Program, Office of Health Affairs, Department of Homeland Security; Armando B. Fontoura, Sheriff, Essex County, New Jersey; and public witnesses.

CHILD EXPLOITATION RESTITUTION FOLLOWING THE *PAROLINE* V. *UNITED STATES* DECISION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Child Exploitation Restitution Following the *Paroline* v. *United States* Decision''. Testimony was heard from Jill E. Steinberg, National Coordinator for Child Exploitation Prevention and Interdiction, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE SPENDING PRIORITIES AND MISSIONS OF THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE AND THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2016 BUDGET PROPOSAL

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands; and Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans, held a joint hearing entitled ''Examining the Spending Priorities and Missions of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in the President's FY 2016 Budget Proposal''. Testimony was heard from Daniel M. Ashe, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service; and Kathryn D. Sullivan, Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

A REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY'S POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE APPREHENSION, DETENTION, AND RELEASE OF NON-CITIZENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES—PART II

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''A Review of the Department of Homeland Security's Policies and Procedures for the Apprehension, Detention, and Release of Non-Citizens Unlawfully Present in the United States—Part II''. Testimony was heard from Sarah R. Saldaña, Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

CONTRACTING AND THE INDUSTRIAL BASE III: REVERSE AUCTIONS, VERIFICATION AND THE SBA'S ROLE IN RULE MAKING

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce held a hearing entitled ''Contracting and the Industrial Base III: Reverse Auctions, Verification and the SBA's Role in Rule Making''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on H.R. 571, the ''Veterans Affairs Retaliation Prevention Act of 2015''; H.R. 593, the ''Aurora VA Hospital Financing and Construction Reform Act of 2015''; H.R. 1015, the ''Protecting Business Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2015''; H.R. 1016, the ''Biological Implant Tracking and Veteran Safety Act of 2015''; H.R. 1017, the ''Veterans Information Security Improvement Act''; H.R. 1128, the ''Department of Veterans Affairs Cyber Security Protection Act''; and H.R. 1129, the ''Veterans' Whistleblower and Patient Protection Act of 2015''. Testimony was heard

from Meghan Flanz, Director, Office of Accountability Review, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

THE GROWING CYBER THREAT AND ITS IMPACT ON AMERICAN BUSINESS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Growing Cyber Threat and Its Impact on American Business''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Monday, March 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will begin consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016. Senators should expect at least one vote on or in relation to an amendment to the concurrent resolution at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, March 23

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Abraham, Ralph Lee, La., E370
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E369
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E368, E372
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E367
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E370
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E369, E370
Esty, Elizabeth H., Conn., E372
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E365, E368
Kato, John, N.Y., E365
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E366
Massie, Thomas, Ky., E365
Nolan, Richard M., Minn. E365, E367
Olson, Pete, Tex., E366, E367, E370, E371
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E366, E370
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E371
Smith, Adam, Wash., E367
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E371
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E366, E369, E371, E372, E372
Vargas, Juan, Calif., E366, E368
Walberg, Tim, Mich., E369

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.