United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2015 No. 55

# House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

## PRAYER

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

Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We thank You that You give us a share in Your creative work, having endowed each with unique and important talents.

On this day, we ask Your blessing on the men and women of the people's House, who have been entrusted with the care of this great Nation's people. Because of the great blessings You have bestowed on our Nation, may we embrace this opportunity to build a better world beyond our borders as well.

As they return to their home districts, may they bring discerning ears to hear not only what they are inclined to hear, but those words that might be unwelcome but important to hear. May all citizens help to make their Representatives better as legislators and as people as well.

May all that they do this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

## REMEMBERING JIM MCNEAL

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, with great sadness, I rise to mourn the passing of Jim McNeal, a California business and civic leader, who for decades guided one of the largest and oldest independent ambulance companies in California, Schaefer Ambulance.

His work ethic was legendary. At the age of 83, he was still running the family business. For all those years, he struggled with the challenges of competing against his own tax dollars in a highly regulated environment, facing and fighting government double standards at every turn. I know all about that. I would get an earful from him every month or so.

Jim McNeal was a patriot who served in the Korean war and believed in freedom as a gospel that he would preach to everyone that he met.

During his marriage of 53 years, he and his wife, Louella, raised three children and had six grandchildren. Their family's grief today is shared by all who knew him. Our country has lost an exemplary citizen and, his family, a devoted patriarch.

## WARRIOR BEACH RETREAT

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Warrior Beach Retreat, a north Florida charity dedicated to supporting our combat wounded warriors, their families, and caregivers.

The organization was established by Linda Cope after her son, Sergeant Joshua Cope, was severely injured by an IED blast in Baghdad, Iraq, on November 12, 2006.

The Cope family turned tragedy into triumph, and twice a year, Warrior Beach Retreat welcomes 50 wounded warriors and their caregivers to Panama City with a parade and a weeklong retreat dedicated to honoring their service and sacrifice.

I wish I could be with them today in Panama City to welcome these brave wounded warriors, but unable to do that, I would like to officially recognize Warrior Beach Retreat in the RECORD and thank them on behalf of our north Florida community for all the hard work they do for our veterans.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH ACT

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I am introducing the Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act. This bill is a bipartisan effort to make communities safer by improving access to mental health services for people in the criminal justice system.

U.S. jails have effectively replaced in-patient mental health facilities as the largest institutional treatment providers for adults with mental illnesses. Each year, more than 2 million people with serious mental illnesses are booked into jails, as well as millions more coping with less serious mental illnesses that jails are nonetheless required to address.



Printed on recycled paper.

This is not right. Our jails are not mental health facilities. We can do better with the way we treat the mentally ill in the justice system, and we can do it while reducing costs and increasing public safety.

At a recent TED Talks, comedian and mental health activist Ruby White asked: How come every other organ in your body can get sick and you get sympathy, except the brain?

My bill will by no means solve the problem, but it is a step we can take to show some compassion, improve lives, and reduce recidivism by more appropriately responding to the mental health needs of those in the criminal justice system.

I encourage each of my colleagues to cosponsor and join me in this effort.

## ONCOLOGY NURSING SOCIETY 40TH ANNIVERSARY

(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 want to take a moment today to highlight the contributions of the Oncology Nursing Society to cancer care in our Nation. Oncology nurses care for cancer patients during some of the most critical and challenging times of their lives.

As cancer treatments have become more complex, oncology nurses have been called upon to acquire new knowledge and skills while continuing to provide compassionate care and emotional support to their patients.

This is where the Oncology Nursing Society comes in. Since 1975, the Oncology Nursing Society has worked tirelessly to lead the transformation of cancer care and ensure that our Nation's oncology nurses are well equipped to tackle the healthcare challenges of the future. Next week, the Oncology Nursing Society will hold its 40th Annual Congress.

I want to commend the Oncology Nursing Society for its commitment to the highest quality care possible for cancer patients, and I want to offer my congratulations on its 40th anniversary.

## DEATH TAX AND FARMERS

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, before my time in Congress, I owned and operated a small independent insurance agency for about 20 years. I was also fortunate to spend a number of years working with my grandfather on a small cattle farm that we owned and operated.

Through both of these experiences, I have experienced firsthand how the Tax Code can make or break a small business or family farm and how the death tax, in particular, is very harmful to farms and businesses and the families who own them.

Often, the death tax would force families to pay their tax bill by selling vital equipment, laying off loyal employees, or selling the farm or business entirely.

These are hard-working Americans who work from generation to generation to build these farms and businesses that are the backbone of our communities and our country.

Instead of incentivizing pursuit of the American Dream, this tax shuts down our local tractor dealers, peanut farms, and grocery stores, which is why I applaud my colleagues for joining me in repealing the death tax for family businesses, farmers, and American citizens not just in Georgia, but across this great country.

## SUPPORTING THE DREAMERS AND L.B. 623

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my unwavering support for the plight and uncertainty that DREAMers face in Nebraska and across the Nation.

Let me start by stating that I unequivocally support the DREAM Act. In Nebraska, the notion of immigration is as bipartisan as the legislative body itself.

As evidence, Republicans and Democrats in the State capitol are backing L.B. 623, introduced by State Senator Jeremy Nordquist. It allows driver's licenses for thousands of Nebraska DREAMers. I wholeheartedly support and endorse this bill. My good friend from across the aisle, State Senator John S. McCollister, is making these licenses his top priority.

By the way, if the name McCollister sounds familiar, it should be. In the early 1970s, John's father, Congressman John Y. McCollister, served the people of Nebraska's Second Congressional District with distinction. His son continues that tradition as he reaches across the aisle in Lincoln, Nebraska, to give our DREAMers a better life than their parents have had.

Again, I pledge today, as I have in the Nebraska legislature, to support the DREAMers. I ask my colleagues in this body and in the Senate to work towards a comprehensive reform package which includes a permanent and certain path for our DREAMer youth.

## TRIBUTE TO ED WAY

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend—in fact, a friend to all of northeast Arkansas—Ed Way.

In February, Ed passed away after a short battle with brain cancer. He is survived by his wife of 42 years, Dianna; his son-in-law, Phillip; daughters, Lindsey and Mary Catherine; and two granddaughters, Bailey and Weslea. Ed is also survived by his legacy, an incredible footprint of good works that won't soon wear away.

Ed was a banker by education and practice, but he was also an ambassador for northeast Arkansas. Whether it was the annual D.C. fly-in by the Chamber of Commerce in Jonesboro or road games supporting the Arkansas State Red Wolves, Ed was a willing and eager promoter of all that northeast Arkansas has to offer.

Ed's influence extends far beyond my own experiences. Countless others working with Ed recognized his leadership and good humor, but even beyond his job, his service with various Jonesboro civic clubs reflected Ed's desire to give back. He also served as a deacon at his church and was active with the Arkansas State Red Wolves athletic foundation.

We often search for the best way to remember and celebrate the lives of our most inspiring leaders and our truest friends. Because Ed's life was a long road of community service, the best way for us to honor his memory is through the continuation of that work.

His joyful devotion to our region set the gold standard for others to follow. By consistently striving towards that standard, we not only preserve Ed's legacy, but we honor the community he loved so much.

## EARTH DAY 2015 RAPIDLY APPROACHING

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, Earth Day 2015 is rapidly approaching.

I would like to draw the attention of the House and the American citizens to the reality of climate change. Global warming is real.

Take a look at California. We are in the midst of the fourth year of a very severe drought. You can debate whether the drought is or is not the result of climate change; but you cannot debate the fact that $CO_2$ in our atmosphere is approaching 400 parts per million, the highest it has ever been in over 800,000 years.

You cannot debate the fact that it is a heck of a lot warmer in California in the last decade than it has ever been in recorded time, and you cannot debate the fact that the snow level in California is rapidly rising up the Sierra Nevada and the Siskiyou Mountains, leaving us with an ever smaller snow reservoir.

This is a real problem. We need to address it with very strong, powerful legislation here in Congress, most of which has not been done. We have a challenge out ahead of us. I hope and pray that we meet that challenge.

## HONORING FLORIDA SOUTHERN COLLEGE

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, Florida Southern College is a liberal arts college nestled in my hometown of Lakeland, Florida. It is known not only as a great academic institution, but also contains the largest collection of Frank Lloyd Wright architecture in the world and was recently selected by the Princeton Review as the most beautiful campus in the country.

However, today, I rise to recognize another important distinction for Florida Southern College. The Moccasins Men's Basketball Team recently captured the 2015 NCAA Division II National Championship.

On Saturday, March 28, 2015, the Mocs defeated Indiana University of Pennsylvania, capping off a remarkable season with a 36–1 record. Led by senior guard and two-time Sunshine State Conference Player of the Year Kevin Capers of Winter Haven, Florida, the Mocs closed out the year by winning a school record 25 consecutive games.

Growing up in Lakeland, I have watched Florida Southern College flourish before my eyes. President Anne Kerr has done a wonderful job with this college. It is a tremendous educational institution, and this win is a terrific achievement not only for the school, but also the community.

Go Mocs.

□ 0915

## PUT INLAND EMPIRE RESIDENTS BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we marked 100 days in the 114th Congress. Since taking office in January, I have traveled across my home district in southern California, in San Bernardino County, on a jobs tour to meet with small businesses, community leaders, labor representatives, and job seekers about what we can do in Congress to put the Inland Empire back to work.

After having many conversations with residents and businessowners, today, I am releasing a jobs plan—a strategy—for how we can get the Inland Empire economy back on the road to recovery.

My plan calls for giving small businesses the tools they need to grow and thrive to create 21st century jobs in emerging sectors like renewable energy and biotechnology, connecting employers with job seekers and supporting job training programs and investing in our infrastructure to spur economic development.

We have a lot of work to do, but if we focus on these areas, we can strengthen the Inland Empire and the California economy and put our residents back to work.

## PERMISSION TO POSTPONE ADOPTION OF MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 1105, DEATH TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 1105 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

## DEATH TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 200, I call up the bill (H.R. 1105) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 200, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114–74, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1105

*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 ''Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015''.

**SEC. 2. REPEAL OF ESTATE AND GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAXES.**

(a) ESTATE TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**''SEC. 2210. TERMINATION.**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this chapter shall not apply to the estates of decedents dying on or after the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015.

''(b) CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS FROM QUALIFIED DOMESTIC TRUSTS.—In applying section 2056A with respect to the surviving spouse of a decedent dying before the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015—

''(1) section 2056A(b)(1)(A) shall not apply to distributions made after the 10-year period beginning on such date, and

''(2) section 2056A(b)(1)(B) shall not apply on or after such date.''.

(b) GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter G of chapter 13 of subtitle B of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**''SEC. 2664. TERMINATION.**

''This chapter shall not apply to generation-skipping transfers on or after the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2210. Termination.''.

(2) The table of sections for subchapter G of chapter 13 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2664. Termination.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to the estates of decedents dying, and generation-skipping transfers, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 3. MODIFICATIONS OF GIFT TAX.**

(a) COMPUTATION OF GIFT TAX.—Subsection (a) of section 2502 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 2501 for each calendar year shall be an amount equal to the excess of—

''(A) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for such calendar year and for each of the preceding calendar periods, over

''(B) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for each of the preceding calendar periods.

''(2) RATE SCHEDULE.—

| ''If the amount with respect to which the tentative tax to be computed is:. | The tentative tax is: |
|---|---|
| Not over $10,000 | 18% of such amount. |
| Over $10,000 but not over $20,000 | $1,800, plus 20% of the excess over $10,000. |
| Over $20,000 but not over $40,000 | $3,800, plus 22% of the excess over $20,000. |
| Over $40,000 but not over $60,000 | $8,200, plus 24% of the excess over $40,000. |
| Over $60,000 but not over $80,000 | $13,000, plus 26% of the excess over $60,000. |
| Over $80,000 but not over $100,000 | $18,200, plus 28% of the excess over $80,000. |
| Over $100,000 but not over $150,000 | $23,800, plus 30% of the excess over $100,000. |
| Over $150,000 but not over $250,000 | $38,800, plus 32% of the excess of $150,000. |
| Over $250,000 but not over $500,000 | $70,800, plus 34% of the excess over $250,000. |
| Over $500,000 | $155,800, plus 35% of the excess of $500,000.''. |

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Section 2511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and except as provided in regulations, a transfer in trust shall be treated as a taxable gift under section 2503, unless the trust is treated as wholly owned by the donor or the donor's spouse under subpart E of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1.''.

(c) LIFETIME GIFT EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 2505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) the amount of the tentative tax which would be determined under the rate schedule set forth in section 2502(a)(2) if the amount with respect to which such tentative tax is to be computed were $5,000,000, reduced by''.

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 2505 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any calendar year after 2011, the dollar amount in subsection (a)(1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year by substituting 'calendar year 2010' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading for section 2505 of such Code is amended by striking ''**UNIFIED**''.

(2) The item in the table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 12 of such Code relating to section 2505 is amended to read as follows:

''Sec. 2505. Credit against gift tax.''.

(3) Section 2801(a)(1) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 2001(c) as in effect on the date of such receipt'' and inserting ''section 2502(a)(2)''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to gifts made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying sections 1015(d), 2502, and 2505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as 2 separate calendar years one of which ends on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act and the other of which begins on such date of enactment.

(2) APPLICATION OF SECTION 2504(b).—For purposes of applying section 2504(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as one preceding calendar period.

**SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of repealing the estate tax. Repealing this death tax is a top priority for Nebraska's farmers, ranchers, and small businessowners—in fact, not just for Nebraska's farmers, ranchers, and small businessowners but for these folks all around the country.

Agriculture, particularly raising cattle and crops such as corn, is a land- and capital-intensive process. These Nebraskans aren't sitting on piles of cash. In fact, their assets are the land and the equipment they use to help feed our Nation and to help feed the world. They pay income taxes on what they earn, and they pay high property taxes on the land on an annual basis. They take great pride in this work and want their children and grandchildren to continue in their livelihoods. They shouldn't have to jump through hoops to ensure their descendants can continue their work when they have passed on.

The death tax doesn't penalize the wealthiest Americans. In fact, they probably don't even feel that penalty. They can plan their estates and give away their wealth as they see fit. It penalizes those who have worked all of their lives and who have reinvested in their family businesses to ensure their families and neighbors have every opportunity to be hard-working taxpayers.

I certainly urge a ''yea'' vote to grow opportunity in the U.S. and to support that growing opportunity.

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

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

It appears that the bipartisan, good feelings of the last few weeks are gone. After reaching across the aisle to pass important legislation like the doc fix, my Republican colleagues are back to their old tricks of handing out tax breaks to the few at the expense of the many.

Today's vote to repeal the estate tax is just the Republicans' last attempt to tilt the U.S. Tax Code in favor of their ultrawealthy campaign donors. This week's target is the estate tax—a tax, I would mention, that was dreamed up by and championed by Teddy Roosevelt, who is the same guy the Republicans like to hold up as one of the greatest the party ever produced.

Their crusade to help the rich has gone too far. This proposed repeal of the estate tax is nothing more than a massive, unfunded tax break for a small sliver of America's wealthiest families, and, as is usually the case with Republican tax policies, this repeal would do nothing to help hard-working, middle class families.

In Nebraska, 52 households would benefit while there are 202,000 people living in poverty. The fact of the matter is that the estate tax is only paid by about 5,400 families, or the top 0.2 percent of estates in the country. Estates worth less than $5.4 million pay nothing. What is the cost of providing a tax break to the top 5,000 families? It is a quarter of a trillion dollars—$269 billion.

Now, these are the deficit hawks who were talking last week about ''we have got to worry about the deficit, the deficit, the deficit.'' Yet they are standing here with a straight face, putting $269 billion more on the deficit. Instead, we should be using the money to extend the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit, which are tax credits that would actually help Main Street America—the real drivers of the American economy. Or we could fund universal pre-K or build new bridges and roads or provide free community college to 9 million people.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will try and tell you that the estate tax hurts family farmers. My colleague who began this debate was talking about that, Mr. Speaker. They will tell you the estate tax forces farmers to liquidate in order to pay the estate tax. When pressed to provide examples, as we did, of family farms being forced to liquidate, my Republican colleagues pointed to a 15,000-acre farm they say had to be broken up for the estate tax.

Let me put that into context, as most people who live in the cities don't know how big that is: 15,000 acres is the equivalent of 23.5 square miles. That is a 5-by-5 square mile farm. That is more than the island of Manhattan. Manhattan isn't that big, and it is home to a million people. I think most people who work hard would be hard pressed to believe that 23 square miles is a family farm.

As families at the very top of the income scale experience unprecedented wealth and prosperity—some may call it the second Gilded Age—Republicans are helping the rich get richer. They want to talk about ''We are going to help the middle class,'' but what are they doing? They are shoveling a quarter of a trillion dollars out the door to the richest. Repealing the estate tax will surely sow the seeds of a permanent aristocracy in this country. We learned from Britain what a permanent aristocracy gets you.

As we prepare to take this vote, I would ask my colleagues: Whose side are you on? Are you on the side of working families and communities across this country who are struggling to pay the bills, or are you on the side of the ultrawealthy heirs who don't feel they need to pay taxes on the millions and billions that they were handed by their ancestors?

Wealth has never been taxed. That land and the accumulation of the wealth in it has never been taxed. I vote for the working middle class, and I hope that you will all vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) to manage the time for the Ways and Means Committee.

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

There was no objection.

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

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his leadership on ending this terrible tax.

Can you imagine working your whole life to build up a family-owned business or a farm, and then, upon your death, Uncle Sam swoops in and takes nearly half of what you have spent a lifetime building up for your children and grandchildren?

Can you imagine this case, as my friend from Washington talked about? This was a farm that had been in his family since the 1880s—five generations. It didn't start that size—it started small—and they built up over years and years and generations and generations. When the young woman went back to Texas—she actually worked up here and went back to Texas to settle her aunt's estate—she and her brother were forced to sell off two-thirds of the farm that they had had for five generations. They had to sell off two-thirds of it just to pay Uncle Sam, just to try to keep some small portion of what their family had worked so hard to build.

These are real life examples of how the death tax is the wrong tax at the wrong time, and it hurts the wrong people. It is the number one reason family-owned businesses and farms aren't passed down to the next generations. It is at its heart an immoral tax, and it is an attack on the American Dream, especially more so for our newest startups in America—women- and minority-owned businesses that are building wealth for the first time, hoping that they can create a nest egg, that they can create a business for their children and grandchildren so that they have greater opportunities in this great country.

I really want to thank my Democrat lead sponsor, Congressman SANFORD BISHOP of Georgia, for his leadership to repeal the death tax and for his belief that you shouldn't punish success.

I want to thank my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Representative KRISTI NOEM; longtime champion, Congressman MAC THORNBERRY; and a former colleague of mine on the Ways and Means Committee, former Representative Kenny Hulshof, who carried this legislation for so long.

The superrich don't pay this tax. They have a legion of lawyers and tax planners, and they have charitable trusts and foundations. They never pay this tax. These are family-owned, hard-working, risk-taking, determined Americans who are building their businesses, their farms, their ranches. These are not, as we will hear today, the Paris Hiltons and robber barons of the Teddy Roosevelt days. These are Americans who are often forced back to the bank for a loan or who are cruelly forced to sell their land and businesses just to satisfy the IRS.

Death tax supporters will tell you this is all about income inequality, but it turns out, according to a former Federal Reserve Vice Chairman, with regard to income inequality only 2 percent is related to what people inherit. In America, it turns out we do build our prosperity. We pull ourselves up to prosperity. Some people say, Look, this thing generates $200-plus billion.

Let me put this in perspective. For all of the damage it does to our family-owned businesses and farms, the damage it will do to our women-owned businesses and minority-owned businesses that are building wealth, it will generate less than 2 days of Federal spending a year, and it is declining.

At the end of the day, there is a basic question: Is this your money and your hard work, or is this the government's money? Who has the claim over all of the years you have spent working? Why, at the end of the day, are we punishing success?

Let's give children and let's give our families their shot at the American Dream and a better nation than the one, frankly, we inherited. That is why, today, we rise to bury the death tax once and for all.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Texas that 292 households in Texas will do nothing for the 4.4 million people who are living in poverty in Texas.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of estate tax reform and in strong opposition to this wrongfully and inaccurately titled Death Tax Repeal Act.

Whenever you hear people say ''death tax,'' know right away that they are not talking about public policy and that they are not talking about tax reform—they are talking about politics. There is no such thing as a death tax. You won't find those words anywhere at all in the Tax Code. It is partisan jargon. After you die, you don't have to pay taxes. You don't have to take out the garbage. You don't get called for jury duty anymore. When you are dead, you are dead. So there is no such thing as a death tax.

Today, my Republican colleagues are pursuing a full repeal of the estate tax under the guise of helping family farms and small businesses. I wish this were the case, but the rhetoric is simply disingenuous when you look at the policy.

I agree that the estate tax is a real issue for family farmers and for ranchers. The first bill I introduced when I came to Congress was a bill to reform the estate tax. Folks in my district, where farmland values have reached as high as $300,000 an acre, are often land rich and cash poor.

□ 0930

There are middle class people who work their land every day and pay taxes on the income they earn from that work. They are not people who the majority's bill is designed to help. Their full repeal is not the answer. It costs too much money. It is not paid for—$269 billion not paid for—and it helps people who don't need the government's help.

A more commonsense and targeted approach would be to pass the bill that I referenced earlier. My bill exempts farmlands and related assets from estate tax as long as the family that inherits the farm continues to farm the land. If they stop farming the land, then the tax kicks back in. This is a fair and equitable response to the issues many farmers are facing today: a shortage of young farmers because the barriers to entry are too high and the high volume of farmland we are losing. More than an acre of farmland is lost every minute of every day.

It is important that we help farmers preserve farmland for future generations, which will benefit our food supply and our environment, but it needs to be done the right way. So once this political exercise is over, I hope we can get down to business and work together on a proposal that is actually aimed at protecting our family farms and our family-owned small businesses.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I know the gentleman from California is sincere, but his approach was tried before. It failed so miserably to protect farms, it was repealed, I think, 3 years later. No more gimmicks. Let's actually help these family-owned farm businesses.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), a gentleman who understands the importance of family-owned farms and businesses and rewarding success.

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I come from America's dairy land, the central and northwestern part of Wisconsin, and we have a lot of small dairy farms—300, 500, maybe a thousand acres of small family farms. This death tax, when Dad dies, isn't paid by Dad because he is gone, but the kids who inherit the farm are the ones who pay that tax, and they end up not being able to pay it. So what do they do? They sell to the corporate farm. Repealing the death tax is the ability to keep the American family farm and not transfer these farms to the big corporate conglomerates. If you want to stand with the little guy, let's repeal this thing.

But it is not just farms. I have a family in my community in Wisconsin that employs hundreds of families. They are a manufacturer. A family-owned business. They asked me not to use their name, but they understand that this tax, if two or more of them die at the same time, they can't pay it, and so what they would be forced to do is sell the business, which would more than likely mean that they are going to lose these jobs to some other part of the country or some other part of the world. So now this family, because they love their community, they love the people that work in their company, many for 20 and 30 years, what they won't do is they won't travel together, they won't fly together, they won't drive together, because God forbid, if there were an accident and two of them die, they have to sell a major employer

in our community. They don't travel together, family members, because of this tax.

I hear my friends across the aisle talk about this helping the big, wealthy guy. I agree with the gentleman from Texas who has done such great work on this bill. They don't pay this tax. They don't pay. They have great lawyers, great estate planners. It is the guys in the middle that are employing folks in their community that pay this tax; and when they have to pay it, that means jobs for middle class Americans.

I think we should all stand up in this House, and we should stand with the middle class Americans, the middle-income Americans, and let's work to repeal this bill to make sure that we have a vibrant, prosperous, middle class in America.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that 63 households will benefit in his State. There are 618,000 people living under the poverty level. That is $18,000 for a family of four.

Now, one of the things about these kinds of debates is the political rhetoric gets a little overheated. If you die and you have this great big business, you have 5 years to pay that tax. You don't have to pay it the day that they bury the body of your grandfather or your mother, your father, whoever. You have 5 years to pay it or to decide on it, and 10 years deferred. So you have got 15 years before that tax has to be paid. It isn't like somebody shows up at the house when you are having the reception after the funeral and says, ''Here, give us the money, or we are taking your property.'' That is not what happens in this country. We have laid it out to give people time to figure out how to do it financially. Anybody who has that much money probably has enough money to actually hire a financial consultant, it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I have heard better stories in the Bada Bing Club in New Jersey. I am listening to the accounts of all of these poor people. Let me tell you what we are talking about here.

Do you see this big chart? That is 99.85 percent that get nothing out of this legislation in the United States of America. Here is 0.15 percent that get a $270 billion tax cut. Here, let me use the magnifying glass and get a better picture of how much we are talking about. You can all see that orange slash right there.

You are telling me that this helps the common good? My friends on the other side of the aisle—and when I use the word ''friends,'' I mean it—recently have taken to talking about the lack of wage growth in this country, yet here we are today considering legislation that will add, Mr. Speaker, $294.8 billion to the deficit for people who don't work at all.

This whole idea that the estate tax hurts middle class Americans in income that has already been taxed is simply not true. Much of this income has never been taxed. Repealing the estate tax in full would result in a massive tax cut for the wealthiest of the wealthy. It hits 5,500 households in this whole country—never mind Texas, the whole country—with estates worth more than $5 million. I mean, that is the law. I am not making this stuff up as I go along.

This bill only further exacerbates our already upside-down Tax Code. Our Tax Code is already stacked against hard-working labor income, and this bill would make it even worse.

I sit on the House Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. After sitting through 13 hours of our budget markup, I could tell you that this $294.8 billion goes a long way in making up for the devastating cuts that the other side of the aisle has inflicted on the middle class.

It is also important to note that the budget does not assume, Mr. Ranking Member, the repeal of the estate tax. Where the heck are they going to get the $294.8 billion? It assumes a revenue-neutral—I like it when they say it—a revenue-neutral reform. It assumes that revenues will be exactly what CBO projects under current law for the next 10 years.

We really have only two conclusions: either this bill is directly contrary to the budget, or it is not paid for today. Congress will, at some point, have to sit down and go down the road, pass a tax hike to pay for this massive deficit-financed tax cut. You have no choice. You can't have it both ways.

I would like to hear from my good friend, the chairman, what his path will be to make up for this $294.8 billion. That is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. Where the heck is it coming from?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I would point out studies show we would generate more money by repealing this tax than keeping it because people wouldn't put their money into tax shelters and other things and instead would put it back in their business into job creation.

I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a leading member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a gentleman whose father started their business by the sweat of his brow.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to sit and listen to the rhetoric. I think sometimes if you drink the purple Kool-Aid long enough, you start to believe it.

That chart is a great chart that was just up there because what we are doing again is we are starting to separate America. We are saying that because it only applies to this very little sliver that we have to go after these people.

I want you to think about something. The entire produce of a woman's or man's life after they have paid their local taxes, their State taxes, their Federal taxes, all the sales taxes over their life and the way they have contributed to build their communities, at the time of their death—now, I know we don't want to call it a death tax, but it is triggered at the time of their death. God forbid these hard-working American taxpayers are allowed to pass on to the next generation that which they were able to accumulate.

Now, the chairman made a reference to my parents, and it is not just about my parents. My dad was a parts picker in a Chevrolet warehouse. He married the girl who ran the switchboard at that warehouse. That was my mother. He went off to World War II. He came back home, started with a little car dealership in Verona, Pennsylvania, one-car showroom, four service bays. He built it into something he was very proud of and was able to pass on to my brothers and me.

Now we want to go after these folks not because they were successful, but because they died and because the government cannot live within its means. So when we go to the viewing, we go to the funeral home and we go to pay our respects, we are also telling them: Thanks for all your hard work. You did a great job. You contributed so much, and now the government wants to take some of that produce of your entire life because they can't live within their means. You lived within your means. You tightened your belt when you had to. You made more with less.

But no, that is not good enough because we can't rein in spending, so we can't stop taxing. That is egregious in the United States of America to sit back and look at all those who have done so much and paid so many taxes in their lifetime, and yet to say upon their death they are not allowed to pass this on to the next generation.

I love the chart because you really specify exactly what has been going on here for too long. You are separating the country. You are dividing the country, rich versus poor. This is America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I hope you would remind the gentleman that the country is already divided into rich and poor. There is no question about that. In Pennsylvania, 144 households will get the benefit, and 1.57 million people in Pennsylvania live in poverty. So there is already a bit of a division here.

It might be more acceptable if this bill recouped all the money that we spent in farm subsidies over time.

Maybe when people die, they ought to give their farm subsidy back to the government. When my grandfather died, the State of Illinois came back to get the public assistance money that had been given to him during his life, his last years.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, and perhaps for no better reason than it is a $270 billion cost that the Congressional Budget Office showed with no pay-fors, no offsets in the Federal budget. If my Republican colleagues want to move forward on this policy proposal, at least they should show courage to the American people and tell them how they are going to pay for this $270 billion bill or to admit that it is just going to be added to the annual structural budget deficits, a completely fiscally irresponsible approach to trying to reform our Tax Code. Lord knows we need to get to work on that.

But there is a larger point—and to speak to the last speaker's point that he just made on the floor—what is somewhat problematic and troublesome for me, it seems many of our Republican colleagues seem very comfortable with the idea of income inequality in this Nation, which is only growing worse. But here is the main point: this income inequality in our society, absent opportunity, absent hope, absent mobility, is just a caste system. It is just a caste system where birth determines outcome.

That is why one of the richest people in the world, Warren Buffett, who opposes repealing the estate tax, says that our fate in life should not depend on whether we win the birth lottery or not. It is no longer good enough for the other side to continue to deliver tax relief to the wealthiest 1 percent; now it has got to be the wealthiest two-tenths of 1 percent, because that is what this legislation affects is two-tenths of 1 percent of the wealthiest households in America.

But they keep saying: Don't worry. We will address the deficit later. They say we have a spending problem in Washington. But what we have seen from their budgets, where they go for offsets in spending: it is in Pell grants; it is in workstudy; it is in GEAR UP and TRIO programs; it is the broadband expansion that we need in this Nation; it is the basic research funding that has to take place; it is the infrastructure modernization that we need.

□ 0945

It is those things that we need to be investing in to keep America competitive, and those are the type of programs that help with mobility, that help with opportunity for many Americans.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend.

That is what is so onerous behind this legislation. They have become very clever at piling up debt, convincing the American people we have a spending problem; yet the very programs they decide to target in their budget resolutions are those programs that provide upward income mobility for all Americans.

I am a product of that. I am a kid who went on to school with Pell grants, with student loans, with the workstudy program. There is no way I want to be a Member of Congress that is going to pull up the ladder behind me and say ''tough luck'' to the lower income classes of this country.

That is what this bill leads to, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would say let's have the courage to stop hiding behind Warren Buffett, George Soros, the superrich. They don't pay this tax. They have lawyers and tax accountants and tax finders. They have charitable trusts. This is family-owned farms and businesses.

I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), a second-generation small-businessowner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in 1939, a man started a car dealership to realize the American Dream. When he died, the ownership of the business was passed along to his son and so was a death tax liability equal to a significant value of the business' worth.

The IRS was there 3 days later after the father's death, wanting the money, 50 percent of the value of the business. His son nearly declared bankruptcy. Fortunately, he was able to pull resources together to keep his family's profitable dealership afloat and save jobs. He still runs the dealership to this day and has more than 100 employees. That son is me.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House will vote to repeal the death tax, the most unfair double taxation on job creators we have ever seen. The death tax is a tax on savings that have already been taxed on before, but the tax provides less than 1 percent of Federal revenue.

According to the Tax Foundation, repeal of the death tax would boost GDP, create 139,000 jobs, and eventually increase Federal revenue. That is right. Ironically, by killing the death tax, the U.S. Government would earn more money and more opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, many second-generation businessowners do not have the means to hire teams of accountants and lawyers to navigate the costly obstacles to save the family farm and save the family business.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As a small-businessowner of 44 years, I have seen friends and colleagues lose gains earned from a lifetime of hard work because of Washington's greed and failed policies, like the death tax.

We must repeal this unfair policy that does no good to the Federal Government and does life-changing harm to American job creators and families. We must make sure this law goes away.

In God we trust.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Brady ''Borrow to Benefit Billionaires Act.''

I don't believe that it is in the interest of our country to borrow another $269 billion from the Chinese, the Saudis, or whomever we can get it from in order to benefit about 5,000 or so of the wealthiest families in this country, and that is precisely what this legislation does.

> ''If ever our people become so sordid as to feel that all that counts is moneyed prosperity, ignoble well-being, effortless ease and comfort, then this Nation shall perish.''
>
> ''No advantage comes either to the country as a whole or to the individuals inheriting the money by permitting the transmission in their entirety of the enormous fortunes which would be affected by such a tax.''

Those are bold words of a different kind of Republican than we have today. They are the bold words in 1907 of President Teddy Roosevelt when he originally proposed the tax that has been mislabeled today as the ''death tax.''

President Roosevelt thought that it would be the death of our country if we had a permanent leisure class elite of the type that dominated so many European countries. He thought that a reasonable tax on inheritance of the wealthiest, most prosperous members of our country would be in the national interest—indeed essential to the future of the country.

I think his approach was right at the beginning of the 19th century, and it remains true in this century because this is really a billionaire protection act.

When he introduced this legislation, Mr. BRADY said: What kind of government swoops in upon your death and takes nearly half of the nest egg that you've spent your life building?

Well, the answer is not the American Government. Our government does not do that and does not touch the estates of any but the smallest, smallest fraction of the wealthiest—about 5,000-plus households in the country.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. I am concerned about the anticompetitive effects of this bill because, while this money could be used to address the size of our national debt—and that might be an appropriate place for it. Think about the size of $269 billion and what it could do. We know that our infrastructure is crumbling. That would be more than enough

to cover, over the next 10 years, the shortfall that has been estimated in dealing with our transportation infrastructure.

Think what dollars of that size would do for strengthening of the competitiveness of our workforce from pre-K to postgrad.

It is a bad investment to help those who have already got what they have got.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE), a fifth-generation proud resident of his State.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring awareness to a pervasive tax that threatens the very livelihood of the future of generations of Montanans, the death tax.

April 15 was tax day; and, while some Americans look forward to a refund, many families in my home State and across the Nation are reminded of the looming debt their children and grandchildren will face.

The death tax jeopardizes the future of 28,000 Montana farms and thousands more small, family-run businesses. This is not a leisure class. These are hard-working Americans that spent their whole life—generations—building their future, only to see it threatened.

This tax punishes Americans that have worked hard, played by the rules, and want to pass that legacy on to their children. The death tax is a tax on the American Dream.

I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure in order to preserve the American Dream for farmers and small ranchers.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will remind the gentleman from Montana that he is talking about 19 families in Montana, when you have got 145,000 people who are living below the poverty line.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it could be very confusing trying to understand what is going on. I see in today's gallery a lot of young Americans—our future leaders—and they are probably wondering: Is this something that might affect me in the future?

Because I think everyone in America has this dream, this hope that our country makes available of making it in America, we all aspire to do well.

I know my parents—my father didn't get more than a sixth grade education—aspired to see their kids do more. I know they are very proud of what their children have been able to accomplish.

Make no doubt, we all want to make sure that we make it in America. We all want to make sure that we have what we need to buy that first home, to send our kids to college, to save up enough for retirement.

Most Americans would say: I have made it. That is the American Dream. If I can guarantee those things and know my kids are going to have an opportunity to be better than me, that is great. Can I do more? I would love to do more.

I don't think that most Americans say that we have to give a tax break not to the wealthy, not to the megawealthy, not to the ultra-megawealthy, but to the uber-mega-ultra-superwealthy, a tax break that would cost all us taxpayers $270 billion because this bill is not paid for when, at the same time, that $270 billion would pay for the same amount of coverage for the entire National Institutes of Health to do all the research that we expect it to do to help us cure Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, diabetes, lung cancer, and heart disease.

All that research that the National Institutes of Health is doing with all those great scientists and all those universities today in America costs for 10 years the same amount that this bill would cost to give not 1 percent of the wealthiest—one-tenth of 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans—a tax break that costs $270 billion.

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

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

Mr. BECERRA. Every time a proponent of this measure gets up and says, We want to protect the family farmer, they have to say, Well, we mean the one-tenth of 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans who may be a family farmer.

I guarantee you that guy is not going to have callouses on his hands if he is a family farmer, and he is one-tenth of 1 percent of the richest Americans.

Let's be real. We have priorities. We want to make it in America. We want to buy that house; we want to send our kids to college, and we want to be able to retire securely.

You don't have to be the one-tenth of 1 percent richest Americans, at the cost of $270 billion to all the other Americans, especially every one of those folks sitting in this gallery today, to say we have got to give a tax break to the uberwealthy.

Let's not vote for this bill.

I see in the gallery of this Chamber tomorrow's leaders. They have dreams and they have priorities for their future.

The American people are pretty straightforward about what their priorities are.

Having the opportunity to buy our own homes, send our kids to college, and having a secure retirement are parts of the American dream that we all aspire to.

Thanks to the decisive actions taken by Congressional Democrats and President Obama during the Great Recession, our economy is on the rebound: Over the last 61 straight months our economy has created over 12 million jobs, the longest consecutive period of job growth on record. Wages have grown by over 5% over the last year. The high school graduation rate is at an all time high.

Despite these gains, for too many families the American dream is still out of reach.

Congress's number one priority should be to build on this foundation to boost wages and economic growth. It should be to strengthen investments in the middle class. It should be to ensure our tax code and economic policy rewards hard work, not just wealth.

The legislation we are considering today does none of these things.

It won't benefit any middle class Americans. It won't make investments in our education or our infrastructure, it won't create ladders of opportunity into the middle class, and it won't put the American dream within reach for working class families.

Instead, this legislation is a special giveaway to the wealthiest estates.

At a time when the wealthiest 1% of Americans hold more than 40% of the nation's wealth, it would widen the wealth gap even further.

And we're not even talking about "the 1%" today—the group that benefits from this legislation is even more exclusive.

This bill would only benefit uber-mega-ultra-super wealthy estates.

This bill would give a mere fraction of the richest 1% estates a special tax break of over $3 million each, and leave working class families to pick up the tab.

This bill only benefits fewer than 2 of every 1000 estates and costs $270 billion. What other investments could be made with this money?

100% of school nutrition programs, which provide nutritious meals to 31 million children every day; 100% of Social Security survivor benefits, 3/4 the cost of providing Pell grants to more than 9 million students a year over the next 10 years; 31 times the funding for Head Start for FY 2015; 39 times the funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for FY 2015; 104 times the funding for the Food and Drug Administration for FY 2015.

Health Care: You could fund NIH's budget for 2015 9 times over. FY 2015 estimates: 461 times NIH Alzheimer's funding, 394 times NIH breast cancer funding, 50 times NIH general cancer funding, 894 times NIH stroke funding, 265 times NIH diabetes funding, 1929 times NIH Parkinson's funding, 221 times NIH heart disease funding.

The bottom line is that this bill fails to help the middle class get back on their feet.

It doesn't make it easier for the hardworking small business owner and it doesn't make it more affordable for a hardworking family to send their kids to college.

It's time for Congress to get to work and ensure that we put the American Dream within reach for every American, not just the wealthiest few.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to avoid references to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

For those listening today, young people included, ask yourself a question: Do you want a government that guarantees you food stamps and welfare checks or an opportunity to build your American Dream?

At the end of your life, all the years of hard work, all the sweat, all the sacrifice, do you want to pass that down to your kids and grandchildren? Or should Uncle Sam swoop in and take

nearly half of everything you have worked a lifetime to earn?

I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, we all love hearing about American success stories. It might be that startup that begins with an idea, a couple of dollars, and a lot of hard work that grows into a business that can support a family, that serves a community, and provides for the future.

Many family-businessowners, ranchers, and farmers do hope to keep that success going by passing it on to the next generation.

However, for too many, the dream of taking over the family business can quickly turn into a nightmare. While having to cope with the loss of a loved one, relatives are often forced to make tough decisions in order just to meet the estate tax obligations under law.

It can mean taking on large amounts of debt. It can mean selling off critical assets. It can mean even closing down the business and being forced to sell the entire family farm or business just to pay the taxes alone.

The truth is that average Americans can be negatively affected by this tax. Not only are businesses not being passed down to the next generation, but they are also being forced to lay off other employees that are currently employed. When a small business shuts its doors and then lets those employees go, it can have a very profound affect on the community.

Farmers can be impacted by the Federal estate tax simply based on the value of the farmland alone. That doesn't even take into account, Mr. Speaker, the buildings, the equipment, the livestock, and other nonliquid assets that are present.

I spoke to a Minnesota family business who was forced to be spending 20 percent of their net income on an expensive life insurance just to fund their future death tax obligations. That is money that is not being used to expand and grow the current business.

We have to ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, for a country that prides itself on the American Dream that we all agree on and the idea that our children will be better off than we were: Does it make sense to penalize success?

I ask for support for this legislation, and I commend the gentleman, Mr. BRADY, for his leadership.

□ 1000

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I know the time that is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 9¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 15¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill that would add hundreds of billions of dollars to our deficit to deliver a windfall to the heirs of the wealthiest estates in the country.

Although the Republican budget holds that we must make draconian cuts to domestic programs in the name of fiscal prudence, cuts that harm the elderly, the working poor, the infirm, the middle class, the Republican leadership lauds a bill that would provide inequality in our Nation and give an average tax break of $3 million to the most secure.

In my congressional district, the median income is $48,841. The unemployment rate for African Americans is 24.5 percent. The poverty level for children is 38.3 percent, the poverty rate for the elderly is 21.4 percent, and over 63,000 households receive food stamps.

In the State of Illinois, over 13,000 children are homeless. At the end of last year, Chicago had the fifth-highest foreclosure rate in the Nation.

This bill is fiscally irresponsible and reflects misplaced priorities for our Nation. We can make improvements to the bill to address the concerns of small businesses and family farms if current law is inadequate, but wholesale repeal reflects poor leadership.

The fiscal recklessness of the Republican approach that balloons our deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars via dozens of tax cuts reminds me of the adage that says ''death by a thousand cuts,'' only this time it is debt by a thousand tax cuts. Debt by a thousand tax cuts is bad for our economy, it is bad for our citizens, and it is bad for our Nation. I will vote ''no.''

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. NOEM. On March 10 of 1994, my dad was killed in an accident on our family farm. I was taking college classes at the time. I was 21 years old, and I ended up coming home with my family and trying to figure out how we were going to get by without him after this tragedy hit our family.

All I could hear during that point in time were the words that my dad had said to me for many years. It wasn't very long after he was killed that we got a bill in the mail from the IRS that said we owed them money because we had a tragedy happen to our family.

One of the things my dad had always said to me is, ''Kristi, don't ever sell land, because God isn't making any more land.''

But that was really our only option. We could either sell land that had been in our family for generations, or we could take out a loan. So I chose to take out a loan, but it took us 10 years to pay off that loan to pay the Federal Government those death taxes.

That is one of the main reasons why I got involved in government and politics, because I didn't understand how bureaucrats and politicians in Washington, D.C., could make a law that says that when a tragedy hits a family they somehow are owed something from that family business. And it doesn't work for normal, everyday people.

That is why this death tax is so unfair because, at one of the most vulnerable times of people's lives, the Federal Government says, We need to take what you have and what your family has worked for.

A lot of the conversation today has been about that the rich need to pay more. Well, the rich will avoid this tax. They have the resources to do that. But it hits families like mine harder than ever. The rich certainly are not going to pay the burden of this tax.

I will also say that some of the discussion has been about the deficit. The government does not earn money. The government takes other people's money, is what it does. It certainly is not going to earn more money by this policy.

This previous administration and the members of the other party here on the House floor today talk about the people who have struggled. We have more people living in poverty today under your policies than we had before you were in charge of this country.

One in 15 children are on food stamps because of the policies of this administration. Fifty percent of our college students can't find work or are underemployed because of the policies of this administration. We talk about income inequality, and we are seeing it because of those previous policies.

This tax is a very unfair tax. It is double taxation. Please don't put any more families in the situation where they lose their family operation or are threatened by it because of a tragedy that happens to their family.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), another new member of the Ways and Means Committee who understands just how fragile these family-owned farms and businesses are.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, growing up and working on my great-grandfather's farm, I learned many values. One that I was taught is a comparison and, basically, when you are out there working with the hogs, you learn that there is little value in hogwash.

I would compare a lot of the facts that we have been hearing today, that are opposing this legislation, as equivalent to hogwash. And I say that under the stipulation that I have heard numerous facts stated of farms the size of 15,000 acres.

Well, the average family farm in this country is less than 500 acres. If you look at the Bootheel of Missouri, which I represent, every farm in that area, if you would just consider a 500-acre farm and the price of a 500-acre farm, times that by how many acres they have—say, 500 acres times $10,000. That's $5 million—$5 million.

Then you have to put the price of a combine and a tractor to harvest the rice and the cotton. Guess what? They are part of that top 2 percent that the other side says is the wealthiest of the wealthy. Well, guess what?

Less than 2 percent of Americans are farmers. Less than 2 percent of Americans are farmers. This legislation, this tax is directly after farmers.

Our Tax Code, what is wrong with it, it is disadvantaging rural America, and the death tax is part of that disadvantage. You are seeing people leave rural America because of the Tax Code, and this is a way to fix the Tax Code.

When you look at family farmers, 85 percent of their investment is in the land and in the equipment. It is not in liquid assets. And when they get a tax bill, like the Congresswoman from South Dakota who spoke mentioned, they have to either sell their land or they have to take out a loan so they can keep their family business. This is a tax on the American Dream, and this is awful.

The folks on the other side of the aisle have never found a tax that they disliked. Folks, we have to stop this.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield one 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the leader of the Select Revenue Subcommittee on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for bringing this bill to the floor and for his hard work on this bill. I appreciate the opportunity to speak today in support of this bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The story is the same across this country in all of our districts, whether you have heard that today from every Member or not.

Businessowners and farmers work hard for their entire lives with the goal of passing on the first fruits of their labor but face the sometimes insurmountable hurdle of the death tax. And, in addition to the actual tax liability the death tax imposes, merely planning for it, regardless of whether these businesspeople and farmers end up owing it, it is yet another challenge.

Last month, when I chaired the hearing in the Select Revenue Subcommittee on this bill, we heard from three witnesses: a rancher, a farmer, and a product distributor. Their stories were the same. This is an onerous tax, creating hours and hours and months of work by attorneys and by their own employees trying to figure out how they are going to keep their business in their family.

One businessowner said, for the first 26 years working in his family business—26 years he spent trying to figure out how to meet the death tax. When one relative was about to pass away, they had another death tax issue they had to address. Another relative was about to pass away and did pass away, and again they had to address the death tax.

This is an issue that the other side wants to make between the rich and the poor. This is about average American men and women, businessowners across this country trying to keep their family-owned business and protect their hard work.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), the lead sponsor of the Repeal the Death Tax Act, an Eagle Scout, Army veteran, key member.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join Representative BRADY on this important bipartisan legislation to repeal the death tax once and for all. I have always believed that the death tax is politically misguided, morally unjustified, and downright un-American. It is really a tax on success.

The assets that people want to pass on to their progeny have already been taxed. If it is a business or if it is a farm, the individuals who earned it, who started the business, they paid income taxes. If it was a corporation, the corporation paid taxes also.

Why should it be taxed a third time just to be passed on and just to keep the business together?

It undermines the life work and life savings of farmers, small- to medium-sized businesses in Georgia and all across the Nation.

We have all heard the statistics. The United States has the fourth-highest estate tax in the industrialized world at 40 percent. Only Japan, South Korea, and France have higher death taxes. Thirteen countries have repealed their taxes since 2000.

It has a disproportionate impact on African Americans. A study by the Boston College professors John Havens and Paul Schervish several years ago estimated that between 2001 and 2055, the death tax will erase between 11 percent and 13 percent of all African American wealth. This one tax alone will cost African American households between $192 billion and $257 billion.

Some people have argued that the estate tax is no longer a serious problem since we have permanently raised the exemption to $5 million for individuals and $10 million for couples to index it to inflation. Nothing can be further from the truth.

According to the Georgia Farm Bureau, the exemption is barely keeping pace with increasing farmland values. In fact, the number of farms in Georgia with building and land values of over $5 million rose from 664 to 677 between 2007 and 2012.

I just can't stand by and allow this estate tax to continue to punish family-owned businesses in Georgia and throughout the country. It is not just farmers.

We have heard a lot about farms, but look at funeral homes, funeral directors who have multiple locations with rolling stock, caskets, limousines, hearses. That amounts to a pretty good amount of money.

I have got constituents who own radio stations; finally, worked hard enough to have a family-owned business that would be able to be in communications. They started out with one radio station. Now they have got five stations in three different States.

It is a family business. The husband, the wife, and now the three kids went to college, law school, and they are running the business. It is a shame that they would have to sell that business and, ultimately, have to lay off employees to pay the 40 percent estate tax.

It is clear that the estate tax really hurts the economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. A study by the Tax Foundation found that repealing the death tax would increase U.S. capital stock by 2.2 percent, it would boost GDP, and it would create 139,000 jobs, which eventually increases Federal revenue.

This is a tax on success. It is not a big contributor to the revenue of this country. It is a very, very—a drop in the ocean really, and so, it is time to repeal it.

I urge my colleagues to really think realistically, not ideologically, and just do the right thing. I urge you to join my colleagues and repeal the death tax once and for all.

□ 1015

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the gentleman for this opportunity.

Madam Speaker, having served on the Ways and Means Committee for decades, it is a little bit embarrassing to see us debating a bill that goes nowhere. This is a political action that is taken by the majority to select provisions that are in the Tax Code and to have those of us that advocate tax reform to just select those parts that appear to be very popular with some parts of our constituencies.

There is nobody in this House that truly believes that this legislation, if passed, ever would become law, but it is something to be used in political campaigns as to what you voted for and why you voted against it.

The truth of the matter is that, to listen to the other side talk, we have some very, very rich farmers; and just because they are in a family doesn't mean that they are not wealthy.

First of all, let's go to the video, let's go to the facts, and let's find out how many people are going to be affected. And the statistics show that 99.8 percent of the population, those people who die, don't pay any taxes. So what

the heck are we talking about? We are talking about a few rich people that are 0.2 percent of those people that will be eligible for a tax, and that is only after we estimate that the value of their estate is $5 million for one person and $10 million for two.

So I am not saying that for these people it is not going to be inconvenient. But when you think about the number of people that pay taxes, that are working hard every day, that are trying to save money for their kids' education, then this really means that hundreds of billions of dollars are being set aside for those people that already have.

If we really want equity, if we really want fair play, why don't we take a look at the entire Tax Code? Why are we just looking at the estate tax or the local and State tax? Because equity is how much money are you raising and how much money do you need.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, to clarify, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a fourth-generation farmer.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act.

I want to thank Chairman BRADY and Chairman RYAN for their leadership in addressing this issue that is so important for my district in Indiana and for many folks all across the Hoosier State.

In Indiana, under the leadership of Governor Mike Pence, we officially repealed our State's death tax in 2013, and with this bill we can do the same thing on the Federal level.

As a fourth-generation farmer, I can see how family-owned businesses already struggle each year with a destructive mess that is our Federal Tax Code. The death tax, which is a double tax on Americans' hard work, only adds to the problem. It stifles prosperity, and it prevents individuals and families from making the personal decisions they want to make with their savings and their property for generations to follow them.

Madam Speaker, it is time to repeal the death tax. Only accounting for a fraction of a percent worth of annual revenue for the Federal Government, let's call it what it really is: it is a distorted attempt to redistribute the earnings of Americans' hard work.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, would you tell us the time left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 5¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

Madam Speaker, it is ironic. This week, we have had hundreds and hundreds of businesspeople, folks from organized labor, contractors coming to town, pleading with Congress to get its act together and enact a 6-year comprehensive transportation bill. We have been frozen in place for years, with 23 short-term extensions because this Congress can't figure out how to provide the resources necessary to deal with a critical situation.

America is falling apart and falling behind, yet we are caught here in an inability to provide resources to help rebuild and revitalize America. That is part of the issue.

Today my Republican friends have discovered that there is $270 billion of revenue that somehow the Federal Government no longer needs. They have decided to give an additional tax cut to people who need the help the least. And, ironically, for all the talk about this being a death tax and double taxation, the vast majority of the wealth that will be untaxed has never been taxed in the first place. You don't get to be a billionaire on W–2 income. It is appreciated capital. But we are going to, in their judgment, give a windfall.

We have had this tax for over a century from Republican administrations, but we are going to turn our back on it because we no longer need $270 billion while we continue to shortchange America. We are having construction projects stopped this summer because the short-term fix for the transportation bill is going to expire.

This is lunacy. It is not fair.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from east Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, several years ago, there was an author who wrote a book about millionaires in America; and it was amazing, most of the millionaires built a business, built a farm, and the number one most commonly driven vehicle by millionaires in America was a Ford F–150 truck. They were workers.

There was a time in America when we looked around and we saw somebody work 16 hours a day, like my aunt and uncle did, and build together a farm and we were proud of them. Well, my Aunt Lilly died, and the FDIC dumped land out by her place before the land could be sold. So the IRS came in and eventually sold every acre of her land.

The family was called in. Let's try to at least buy some of her assets from her home, her little modest home. I bought this music box from Aunt Lilly. It plays ''Amazing Grace.'' But she didn't get amazing grace. Her heirs didn't get amazing grace. They ran into the amazing greed of the United States Congress.

Let's take the green-eyed monster and put it where it belongs and begin to feel good for people that have worked for what they own.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman from Texas is ready to close.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have one further request for time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to share a story of Bobby McKnight, a seventh-generation cattleman from my district in Fort Davis, Texas.

Bobby says many farm and ranch farmers like his may be asset rich but they are cash poor. Most of the value of their estate is attributed to the value of the land they use to raise cattle and grow food for consumers around the world. In fact, a lot of that food, my colleagues are going to enjoy today.

Bobby shares that when times have been lean, he has had to make sacrifices to keep his family business above water. But as any small-businessowner can tell you, sometimes you run out of places to cut. That is what happened to his family during hard times brought on by the death tax. He had to let go of seasoned employees that had families of their own, losing the skilled labor he needed to run their operation. And now, as land values continue to increase, many farm and ranch families are concerned that this may trigger the estate tax.

As Bobby and others can attest to, the death tax is devastating to the family farms, ranches, and small businesses in my district and throughout the Nation.

Come on, y'all. Let's stop punishing families for achieving the American Dream. I support this bill to repeal the death tax and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

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

For the past hour, my Republican colleagues have stood up and tried to scare you. They have tried to turn the estate tax into a boogeyman that kills family farms and hurts family business. They have called the estate tax all kinds of bad names, like ''immoral,'' and they have tried to claim it is a calculated attack on the American Dream. They have also claimed that the estate tax disproportionately affects poor small businesses and startups. These wild and inaccurate claims could not be farther from the truth.

Here are the facts that Republicans have forgotten to mention:

The estate tax would only affect 5,400 estates out of an estimated 2.6 million this year. That means repealing the estate tax would amount to a tax break for the top 0.2 percent—the Hiltons, the Adelsons, the Kochs, those folks.

According to the Tax Policy Center, only 20—I emphasize 20—small businesses and small farm estates nationwide owed an estate tax in 2013—20. Furthermore, those estates owed just 4 percent of their value in tax.

Now, the real question here is this: America is a wonderful country. We all have a chance to make it. Some make it better than others. That is because luck and whatever hard work—and it isn't that everybody who doesn't have money isn't working hard. We are all working hard, but some have a little more luck than others. The fact is that, if you have had a little luck, don't you owe a little something back to the country?

Here you have got people who have gotten $10 million that we have given them as an estate exemption, and then they owe 4 percent of the value on money that has never been taxed before. It is all on capital appreciation.

Now, my Republican friends conveniently forget to mention how much this handout to the rich would cost—$280 billion. That is as though every American today was giving a $1 billion tax cut to the wealthy in this country. There are about 300-and-some-odd million of us. And if we all gave, there we would be. And we are doing this to a group that has no problems whatsoever. Their problem is how to keep their money. That is their only problem.

So I want people to understand: this is a quarter of $1 trillion. And as the gentleman from Oregon pointed out, we have a tremendous problem in infrastructure in this country, but there is no money for that.

We have a tremendous problem in investment in the National Institutes of Health. It used to be the National Institutes of Health funded 20 percent of the grant applications that were given to them. Today they are only funding 6 percent of the grant applications that are given to them.

We are not investing either in the physical infrastructure or the human infrastructure of this country. What has made us strong, all of us immigrants who came here—about 99.99 percent of them, as immigrants, came here with nothing, and this country gave us an opportunity to be rich or to be successful. The only way it will work is if we pay something back into the process, not sitting there using money that you never have been taxed on.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this and to think about the 99.8 percent of Americans who will get no benefit whatsoever.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1030

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

Madam Speaker, feel free to dismiss the woman in my district, a widow, who now has been forced back to the bank for the third time to take out a loan just to be able to keep the family farm they worked generations—worked generations—to keep and hand down. Dismiss her as the Paris Hiltons of the world, as the superrich.

Dismiss the 114 organizations who back the repeal. Most of them are Main Street businesses who support this Death Tax Repeal Act. They are storeowners; they are loggers—loggers in the field—and they are plumbers. There is a glamorous life. That is the superrich.

That is who, after these people worked years and years and weekends and nights to build up their business, these are the ones who, when they pass away, Uncle Sam swoops in and confiscates—takes—nearly half of what they have built a lifetime earning. Dismiss them if you will, but this is the American Dream.

The American Dream is not a government that promises you welfare checks and food stamps. The American Dream is the thought that you can build yourself up and pull yourself up through hard work, skills, and dedication and that you can build a better life for your family and then give it to your children and grandchildren so maybe, just maybe, they have a better chance at the American Dream, that they have opportunities maybe you didn't have that they can pass on to their children.

You will hear today, Oh, this only affects a few. Those are the people who pay the tax. One out of three businesses, more than that, are farmers. They are already paying money into tax planning. They are putting money aside; they are spending hours that they would rather put into their farm and their business. They would rather hire young people and new people looking for jobs, but instead, they are trying to avoid this horrible tax.

All for what? For a measly 2 days of Federal spending—actually less than that—this government wastes so much money. It just pours it out of here. Instead of tightening our belt, we attack the American Dream of hard-working families and businesses.

Many of them, by the way, are women and minority-owned businesses building wealth for the first time, believing the American Dream is right for them. They are not Paris Hilton. They are not robber barons. They are not the people who are dismissed on the floor today.

At the end of the day, this is the simple question: Whose money is it? Whose hard work and years is it? Is it government's? Is it the Washington politicians' who will take your money in time, force you to sell your business or family-owned farm and waste it on who knows what? Or is it your money, your hard work, and your American Dream? Are you allowed to keep that dream and help your family going forward? Or is it the government's dream, whatever that could be?

At the end of the day, what I love the most about America is we don't resent success. We strive for it. Whatever success is for each of us, we strive for it. We are absolutely convinced that we can achieve it for us and that we can maybe give our kids a chance going forward.

This is a simple question. If you stand with those who believe it is the government's money and hard work, vote ''no,'' but if you stand with our family-owned farms, businesses, young people, and those chasing the American dream, vote ''yes'' to end the death tax once and for all.

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

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, as a CPA, I understand that the only certainties in life are death and taxes. Unfortunately, Washington has decided that a third certainty can be created when we combine those two separate terms.

The death tax is an issue that, as long as it exists, will be seen as a provision by which politicians can pocket more of families' hard-earned legacies.

I recently heard from one Kansan whose father-in-law, a farmer, passed away in 2005. Because these folks wanted to keep the farm in the family, they had to set up an installment plan with the IRS to pay the death tax. Even then, they have been forced to dip into retirement funds and sell other assets in order to make the payments and keep the land.

Stories like this are the reason why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1105, which would permanently repeal the death tax. We need to stop treating death as a taxable event. The only solution to this problem, which faces family farmers and business owners in Kansas, is to eliminate the death tax, once and for all.

Mr. BLUM. Madam Speaker, to paraphrase Benjamin Franklin, there are only two sure things in life: death and taxes. Unfortunately for Americans, the federal government has managed to combine the two into greater tragedy with the federal estate tax, more commonly known as the ''death'' tax.

The death tax is a tax levied against property transferred at death to a person's heirs. This property is neither new income or newly acquired real estate or assets, but rather a simple transfer of ownership. Confusingly to most commonsense folks, this the federal government has already taxed this income. While there is an exemption of up to $5.43M, the death tax remains a growing issue with farmers and small businesses in the First District of Iowa as the values of farmland real estate and industrial equipment continue to rise.

While supporters of the death tax say only a small percentage of businesses and farms actually end up paying the tax, I believe this is a question of fairness. I oppose any means that grants the federal government the ability to tax you twice on your income.

This, along with the compliance costs for estate planning, is why I advocate for abolishing the death tax altogether.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 1105, the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015, I commend my colleagues in the House of Representatives in joining me in passing this legislation by a bipartisan vote of 240 to 179.

Americans, already taxed to death, should not also be taxed in death. Let the heirs, no

matter the value of the estate, determine what is best for the family fortunes, large or small. It would be far better for our children and grandchildren to invest, spend, or utilize our estates rather than the federal government any more.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to continue to advance this important legislation that will finally permit farms and small businesses to pass from generation to generation without the specter of the death tax looming.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 200, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. NOLAN. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nolan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1105 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

**SEC. 4. BENEFITS DISALLOWED IN CASES OF GIFT AND ESTATE TAX EVASION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any disqualified individual—

(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if the amendments made by this Act had never been enacted,

(2) no credit shall be allowed under section 2505 of such Code (relating to unified credit against gift tax) with respect to any gifts made after such conviction, and

(3) the applicable exclusion amount with respect to such individual under section 2010 of such Code (relating to unified credit against estate tax) shall be zero.

(b) DISQUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ''disqualified individual'' means any individual who—

(1) is convicted of attempting to evade or defeat the tax imposed under chapter 12 of such Code (relating to gift tax), or

(2) prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, engaged in a transaction (or series of transactions) with the intent to evade or defeat the tax imposed under chapter 11 of such Code (relating to estate tax).

Mr. BRADY of Texas (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

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

Madam Speaker, years ago, when I first went into public life, my father,—as fathers could be expected—gave me a little fatherly advice.

He said: Son, I will always be proud of you if you just do a couple of things.

I said: What is it, Dad?

He said: Number one, be honest. I don't want my kids getting in trouble. Tell the truth.

Secondly, he said: If you're going to go in public life, commit yourself to working for the common good. Don't worry too much about the rich. They have got a way of taking care of themselves.

Well, my father never had any money to speak of, but, boy, he sure understood that. If you look at this chart here, this is what this bill is really all about. This bill is about giving $270 billion in tax benefits to the richest of the rich. That's right.

This is America, and here is that less than 1 percent of the 1 percent, $270 billion tax break, 5,500 individuals over the next 10 years. That means the rest of the country is going to have to pay for it.

Have these people benefited from the greatness of America where people can work hard, prosper, and become successful? Yes, of course, they have. They are the richest of the rich.

Here, we want to give them another tax break? Talk about greed. Talk about carrying the water for the richest of the rich. What are we talking about here? Do you know what, it gets even more egregious, and that is what my amendment is about here today.

Under my amendment, this little percent, this little 1 percent of the 1 percent, if they have engaged and been found guilty of tax fraud as it relates to inheritance and gift taxes, they are going to benefit from this. They amass fortunes through illegal activities as it relates just to this very specific tax; and we want to give them a tax break on the fortunes that they amassed illegally?

The least we can do—and that is what my amendment does—my amendment says that, if you have been found guilty of tax fraud trying to get more than you already have illegally and criminally, then you are not going to get the benefit of this tax exemption.

I am confident that if my good friends and good colleagues here on the floor of the House on both the Republican and Democratic sides look at this thing honestly, they will say: I have got to support that amendment. I can't go back home and tell my folks how people who are found criminally guilty of trying to cheat the taxpayers of this country out of taxes that were due should be entitled to benefit from that. We can't do that.

I want to remind everybody that here we are looking at this country at a time when the disparity and inequality of income in this country is the worst of any developed nation in the world.

People like Pope Francis are concerned about it. Leading economists like Al Greenspan are talking about it. By God, when Hillary Clinton and TED CRUZ announce their candidacies for the Presidency because they are concerned about the growing disparity and inequality in income, we have a problem in this country.

Mind you, this gift tax, we are here talking about farmers and businessmen. Well, I am a businessman. I spent 32 years of my life in business. Let's tell the truth. Let's tell the truth. Ninety-nine percent of the people in this country are not required to pay any estate or gift tax because the value of their farm, their business, their accumulation in life does not exceed the limits that are allowable under the law—which, by the way, are $5.5 million per individual, $10 million, $11 million for a family.

That is a pretty nice gift at the end of the day for something that, quite frankly, you were not the hard-working, creative, innovative person who made all that money. You are just the beneficiary by wealth the old-fashioned way: you inherited it.

Do we all aspire to wealth and success? Yeah. That is something we want to applaud. It is something we want to celebrate. This is about celebrating the gift of inheritance, and there is plenty of it here in this legislation.

At the end of the day, this bill is really about the other 99 percent because they are the ones who are going to have to make up the $270 billion in gifts that we gave already to the richest of the rich. That is not how you fix this problem of growing disparity that is threatening our economy and threatening our well-being.

Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, all this is a red herring. The desperation you hear is for a government in Washington that desperately wants to keep spending your money on $800 toilets and on research projects that make no sense and who feel free to waste your money at will because they are not the ones who worked a lifetime to earn it.

Madam Speaker, today, we heard Congresswoman KRISTI NOEM talk about the tragedy of her dad and how, 3 days after his death, they were notified by Uncle Sam that they owed or they would have to sell their ranch.

We heard from a gentleman from Texas whose dad built up from one car and four stalls a family-owned car dealership with 400 workers. It was a profitable company that nearly went

bankrupt because they had to pay Uncle Sam or sell the business. They worked 20 years to pay off that loan.

My constituent, a woman who is widowed, was forced back to the bank for the third time, paying death tax for her grandfather, her father, and now her and her husband, just to keep the family farm they have worked generations on. These are the people who are punished by this tax.

It is not the government's money and work. It is yours. This is all about that issue. At the end of the day, unless we want to keep attacking the American Dream and insisting that Uncle Sam swoop in and take your nest egg, it is time to restore the American Dream and to end the death tax once and for all.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

## STATE AND LOCAL SALES TAX DEDUCTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 200, I call up the bill (H.R. 622) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 200, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114–74 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 622

*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 ''State and Local Sales Tax Deduction Fairness Act of 2015''.

**SEC. 2. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF DEDUCTION OF STATE AND LOCAL GENERAL SALES TAXES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 164(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (I).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

**SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scoreboard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1045

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 622, the State and Local Sales Tax Deduction Fairness Act of 2015.

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to thank my colleagues, JIM MCDERMOTT and MARSHA BLACKBURN, for joining me in leading the fight to make this middle class tax provision permanent.

This provision is about tax fairness and equal treatment. If taxpayers in income tax States can deduct their State and local income taxes, so should residents of sales tax States. That, in America, is just fair.

This provision helps hard-working taxpayers keep a little more of what they earn, which is even more important to families, given their stagnant paychecks over the past number of years. More than 10 million American taxpayers in nine States depend on this commonsense deduction, and the dollars that stay in the local community help grow their community rather than grow Washington's economy.

A permanent State and local sales tax deduction provides certainty to American families, makes Federal budget scorekeeping more honest, and removes the asterisk from this temporary provision so the progrowth tax reform can advance.

It is certainly important to Texas. Since it has been restored, my neighbors have saved more than $10 billion, which buys a lot of school clothes, gas for your car, and helps with rising college costs.

To be sure, this provision isn't reserved just for sales tax States. It allows all American taxpayers to choose whether they deduct their State and local income taxes or their State and local sales taxes, whichever is greater. That is fair. That is equal treatment.

Let's be honest. Extending this provision temporarily year after year, which is exactly what has been done since 2004, that won't cost any more than making it permanent today and creating that certainty and fairness for taxpayers.

I want to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting middle class families by making this provision permanent.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The State and local sales tax deduction is an important tax provision for Americans living in States without a State income tax who cannot take advantage of the State and local income tax deduction.

Although I support this deduction as an important alternative for taxpayers in States without income taxes, H.R. 622 is fiscally irresponsible, given that it permanently extends this deduction without any offsets.

Frankly, I am quite surprised that the Republican leadership is advancing this bill that would add $42 billion to the deficit. Just last year, then-Chairman Dave Camp proposed eliminating the State and local sales tax deduction in the Republican tax reform draft. At that time, current Chairman RYAN said he approved of eliminating the sales tax provision before us.

Further, just last month, the Republican leadership presented a budget that requires offsetting the cost of any tax extenders that are made permanent with other revenue measures. Indeed, the GOP budget principle is in line with the Republican tax reform draft last year, which adopted a fiscally responsible approach.

I am at a loss to understand why the Republican leadership is adding $42 billion to our deficit to permanently extend a provision it thinks should be repealed. This bill coupled with the next bill under consideration would add over $300 billion to our deficit, almost half of the amount the Republican budget said we must cut from domestic discretionary spending.

The Republican budget said that we had to cut $759 billion over the next 10 years in domestic discretionary spending in the name of fiscal prudence but can throw $300 billion to the wind for a provision that they have proposed eliminating in tax reform.

We need to provide certainty to taxpayers in affected States that the sales tax deduction will be available to them this year, and then we need to focus on comprehensive reform. This bill moves us farther away from tax reform, not closer.

In addition to being fiscally irresponsible, this bill coupled with the next one under consideration reflect misplaced priorities for this House; rather than pushing a piecemeal, deficit-inflating agenda, we should be helping hard-working American families by raising the minimum wage, ensuring equal pay for equal work, making college more affordable by increasing the Pell grants and improving student loans, helping low-income families afford quality child care, encouraging

work via effective tax programs, improving investment in low-income communities, and strengthening the research innovation and competitiveness of our Nation, just to name a few critical efforts on which we should focus.

I am ready to work with the majority on tax reform. However, I cannot support this piecemeal, fiscally irresponsible approach, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the leader of our tax reform subcommittee and a champion in restoring the State and local sales tax deduction.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for allowing me time to speak, recognizing that Texas is also affected—one of the States affected by this bill, as well as Washington State, which is the State where I come from, and several other States.

I rise to support H.R. 622, the State and Local Sales Tax Deduction Fairness Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, this bill is really about two things. It is about fairness, and it is about certainty. Fairness because Washington is one of, as I said, several States without an income tax—and by allowing this deduction of State and local taxes, this legislation will put Washingtonians on the same level as those people who live in States that have an income tax. That is all. It is plain and simple. It is fairness. That is all we are asking for in this bill.

Certainty because people work hard, they pay their sales taxes, and at the end of the year, they want to know for sure that they can deduct their sales taxes.

That is all it is, fairness and certainty. Fairness puts us on parity with the rest of the States across the country and certainty in allowing those people in the State of Washington, Texas, and others to know that, when they spend and pay their sales taxes, they can deduct those from their Federal income taxes at the end of the year. That is it.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor and yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), one of the key leaders of the Ways and Means Committee who has been in this fight to successfully restore and extend the sales tax deduction for many years.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and Texan, Mr. BRADY, for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, today, we are voting on a bill that is long overdue, a bill that would permanently allow taxpayers, including most especially my constituents, to permanently deduct the State and local sales taxes that they pay.

Back in 2004, I was part of the effort that brought back this important tax deduction. Unfortunately, as many of my constituents know too well, this deduction is not permanent. Because it is not permanent, Congress has had to renew it almost every year. This creates uncertainty for taxpayers.

That is why this bill is so important. By making this deduction permanent, we can provide taxpayers with the certainty that they deserve, but this bill isn't just about providing certainty; it is about providing fairness.

Right now, taxpayers in States with income taxes can permanently deduct their State and local income taxes; but, in States without an income tax, like Texas, taxpayers can't permanently deduct their State and local sales taxes. That is wrong, and that is unfair.

It shouldn't matter what type of State and local taxes we are talking about. If the IRS allows folks to permanently deduct their income taxes, it ought to also allow so for sales taxes. The IRS shouldn't discriminate against hard-working taxpayers in other States like Texas.

With many hard-working Americans, taxpayers are trying to make ends meet. Every dollar in the pocketbook makes a difference.

In closing, I would like to thank my good friend, Mr. BRADY, for his work on this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I emphasize my surprise at Republican priorities before us. This week, the Joint Economic Committee issued a report on the economic challenges facing the African American community. The findings are stark and detail the significant racial inequities in employment, earnings, wealth, and poverty.

The report shows that the median income of African American households is $34,600, nearly $24,000 less than the median income of White households. Black Americans are nearly three times more likely to live in poverty than White Americans.

At 10.1 percent, the current unemployment rate for Black Americans is more than double that for White Americans. In my congressional district, the rate of Black unemployment is 24.5 percent compared to only 5.1 percent for White unemployment.

These facts exemplify the extraordinary growth of inequality in recent years. Massive inequality and the injustices which flow from the great imbalance grips so many of our neighborhoods, so many of our towns and villages, so many of our people who need and deserve the opportunity to share in all of our Nation's potential and all that it has to offer.

These are the topics on which policymakers should focus, not hundreds of billions of dollars in piecemeal tax cuts for the wealthiest corporations and heirs to estates over $10 million. The Republican budget proposes to raise taxes on 26 million working families and students by discontinuing important improvements to the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, and education tax credits.

The Republican budget proposes making college more costly by freezing the maximum Pell grant award, eliminating mandatory Pell funding, reducing eligibility for Pell grants, eliminating the in-school interest subsidy, and cutting the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program.

The Republican budget would end Medicare as we know it and proposes undermining the retirement and employee benefits of Federal workers and postal workers. It cuts funding for the Internal Revenue Service, which results in less revenue for our government, undermines taxpayer assistance, and encourages fraud.

We should focus on repairing our Tax Code and enacting policies to help hard-working Americans share in the economic opportunity enjoyed by the wealthiest Americans and most profitable companies.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), a distinguished Member of the House who has been fighting for the State and local sales tax deduction and, as a new mom, understands just how expensive it is to raise families these days.

□ 1100

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, Mr. Speaker, which is so important to the residents in my State, the people whom I serve. I encourage folks to support permanently extending the State and local sales tax deduction.

I was listening to the previous speaker, and I don't think he was really focused on this bill. This bill is about ensuring that residents of Washington and of seven other States are treated equally, that their income taxes are treated equally by the Federal Tax Code. It is a fairness issue. It is also about eliminating the uncertainty that comes at the eleventh hour every year when Congress reauthorizes this as a 1-year deal.

Residents from 40 other States get to deduct their State income taxes from their Federal taxes, but residents of Washington State don't have that option. We pay one of the highest sales taxes in the country, and without the option to deduct our State sales tax, we are forced to carry a higher amount of the Federal burden. Mr. Speaker, that is not right.

Since it is my job to fight for the residents of Washington State, let me also mention that folks in the Evergreen State have been the highest

beneficiaries of the State and local sales tax deduction. More Washingtonians use it than any other State. My predecessor, who was a Democrat, was a big proponent of this bill as well.

At a time when several counties in southwest Washington are still in economic recovery, we need to make sure that families who have already dutifully paid their fair share of taxes get to keep a little bit more of their money. $602 is the average claim from a State sales tax deduction. A mom in Chehalis, Washington, can make $602 go a long way. When she spends it on groceries, on gas, or on new soccer cleats for the kids, that money is going back into the local economy, and it is generating more economic activity.

We often hear about ''fairness'' when it comes to the Tax Code, and I believe in fairness for hard-working taxpayers and for job-creating businesses. What better way to provide fairness than to seize this opportunity before us today to permanently etch this provision into our Tax Code. This bill helps families, and it helps local economies. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), one of our key members of the Ways and Means Committee who has been fighting for this as a Representative from Tennessee, and as a small business owner, she knows how expensive it is for families who work and live along Main Street.

Mrs. BLACK. I want to thank my good friend and colleague for leading this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the State and Local Sales Tax Deduction Fairness Act.

My home State of Tennessee is proud to be one of the eight States without a State income tax. In fact, such a tax is, actually, explicitly banned in our constitution. We do, however, have a State and local sales tax, which could be as high as 9.75 percent in parts of my district.

Taxpayers in other States are able to deduct their State income taxes on their Federal returns, and it only makes sense that Tennesseans should be able to do the same when it comes to their State and local sales tax. In 2012, more than 18 percent of Tennesseans did exactly that, getting an average deduction of $404; but too often, my constituents haven't been able to count on this tax credit being available to them from one year to the next. So, today, let's do something different.

Let's ensure that this tax provision for families, which they rely upon, is not subject to a political tug of war here in Washington. Let's help our small businesses plan for tomorrow by giving them peace of mind that this credit will be there for them now and in the future, and let's make the State and local sales tax deduction permanent by passing this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is, after all, a matter of fairness. I urge a ''yes'' vote on H.R. 622.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I rise today to thank the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. PAUL RYAN, for bringing this measure to the floor and for offering hope to taxpayers in States across the country that they will be treated fairly.

Mr. RYAN is making tax reform—fixing this broken Tax Code and reining in the IRS—a top priority. This measure actually helps take us a step toward that by creating certainty for taxpayers in sales tax States by creating more honest scorekeeping in budgeting. Because we are going to extend this temporarily, it makes no difference in our doing it permanently, but it helps create that honest scorekeeping, and it removes the asterisk from this provision so we can do tax reform, which creates a much healthier economy.

If you support fairness for taxpayers in sales tax States as well as those that have income taxes, if you believe we ought not to discriminate depending on where you live, and that we ought not force States into income taxes that believe a sales tax is the right way to go, this measure is for you.

I acknowledge the President has threatened a veto on this bill. I guess my question is: Why turn your back on hard-working taxpayers? Middle class economics means helping families keep more of what they earn, especially those who are living paycheck to paycheck.

Today, we will stand for families and fairness in making sure they can keep a little bit more of what they earn. I urge support for a permanent extension of the important State and local sales tax deduction.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 200, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. NEAL. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

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

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 622 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

**SEC. 2. NO INCREASE IN DEFICIT OR DELAY OF COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.**

Nothing in this Act shall result in—

(1) an increase in the deficit, or

(2) a delay or weakening of efforts to adopt a permanent extension of the election to deduct State and local sales taxes, so long as such extension is accomplished in a fiscally responsible manner.

**SEC. 3. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF DEDUCTION STATE AND LOCAL GENERAL SALES TAX.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 164(b)(5)(I) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''January 1, 2015'' and inserting ''January 1, 2016''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

Mr. NEAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, my friend Mr. BRADY spoke eloquently, as always, about the notion of fundamental tax reform. I mean, a reasonable mind in this Chamber might ask: When? The chairman is not even here this morning. He sends out as the starting pitcher his ace reliever, Mr. BRADY, to defend what we all know in the end is going to be a 1-year extension of this tax provision.

Friends, this is a messaging amendment. By the way, after they get done today with repealing the estate tax, perhaps we could move in this Chamber to call this now the ''House of Lords,'' where it might be peerage and peer review that brings us here.

Mr. Speaker, it is April. The birds are chirping; the flowers are blooming; the days are getting longer; and the nights are getting warmer. Spring has sprung. The onset of spring brings with it a new baseball season—that time of year when hope springs eternal and every fan thinks his team has a fair shot of claiming baseball glory and immortality.

However, for the fans of bipartisan tax reform, the Republicans are saying here in April: wait until next year.

Yesterday was the 100th day of the 114th Congress. It is 100 days up, 100 days down, and we are no closer to making tax reform a reality. Our Republican friends have wasted 4 months of valuable time and have nothing to show for it. They have whiffed on the 10 permanent tax extender bills that they have passed this year. Not one of these bills has become law nor will any

become law. The President has made that clear, and he has issued a veto threat on every one of these bills.

Contrast this with the Senate Finance Committee. Rather than pursuing a minor league strategy of passing one partisan, unpaid-for, permanent tax extender bill after another on party-line votes, adding to the deficits, they are working together to move forward on bipartisan tax reform.

Democrats have no quarrel with the bill that is before us today but for one exception: State and local sales tax deduction promotes tax fairness for the States that do not impose a State income tax. It only makes sense that, if taxpayers in income tax States can deduct their State and local taxes, so should the residents of sales tax States. We support making State and local sales tax deductions eventually permanent but not at the cost of $42 billion a year being added to the deficit. This is how they have done all of these tax extenders—the party, by the way, that frequently will have us believe that they are champions of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to step up to the plate as Democrats and pass a bipartisan tax reform bill that really hits it out of the park for middle class people, that creates jobs, that gives special interests a little chin music—or, as we call it, the ''brushback''—and that ushers in lasting economic growth, much the same as we experienced during the Clinton years here in America: surpluses for years, growth unprecedented. There were 23 million new jobs created during those years. That is the experience that we should be talking about today.

The chairman of our committee, my friend, Mr. RYAN, is always saying that this committee can walk and chew gum at the same time. Guess what? I believe him.

So, Mr. Chairman, do we prefer Wrigley's, Hubba Bubba, or, maybe, the classic Big League Chew?

Let's get on to the third inning and get tax reform done, and let's stop procrastinating in front of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this motion is what people sort of hate about Washington.

We say we stand for fairness for taxpayers in sales tax States but only for a few more months. We say we don't want to discriminate between you and people who are in income tax States but only for a few more months. Up here, Washington says, Look, we think you ought to keep more of what you have earned because it is expensive to raise a family but only for a few more months because we in Washington, they say, have the power to yank this any time we want.

The truth of the matter is it is so expensive to raise families these days, and our Tax Code picks winners and losers all the time. What this provision does is make permanent the fairness to ensure taxpayers across America are treated equally, that this Tax Code doesn't discriminate, that you can keep a little more of the money it takes to raise your family, to buy that gas, to buy the school clothes, to pay the utilities. That is all that this law does.

□ 1115

It is a step toward tax reform and reining in the IRS because it removes the asterisks from this temporary provision we extend year after year at the same cost. It is really about honest budgeting, because those who claim there is a huge cost of this, they are going to vote and have voted to extend this. So there is no difference there. It is just a talking point. At the end of the day, this creates a certainty for our taxpayers, removes that asterisk from a temporary provision, and moves us forward to progrowth tax reform that creates a much healthier economy and creates a Tax Code that is fair, flatter, and simpler.

I urge support for permanently helping families with their costs and lowering the cost of their taxes. I urge support for this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 622, if ordered; the motion to recommit on H.R. 1105; and passage of H.R. 1105, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 243, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—179

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
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
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, 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
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
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
Cohen
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 (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)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry

McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Duncan (SC)
Gosar
Perry
Ruiz
Schrader
Smith (WA)
Welch

□ 1145

Messrs. PALMER, WALKER, Mrs. LOVE, Messrs. STUTZMAN, BRIDENSTINE and THOMPSON of California changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ASHFORD, DESAULNIER, FATTAH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 152, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—272

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

NAYS—152

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Blackburn
Duncan (SC)
Gosar
Perry
Ruiz
Smith (WA)
Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1154

Mr. CUMMINGS and Mrs. LAWRENCE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 159 on H.R. 622, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "no" when I should have voted "yes."

## DEATH TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 1105) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 232, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—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
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, 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
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
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
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
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
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
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
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—13

Blackburn
Dold
Duncan (SC)
Fincher
Gosar
Kinzinger (IL)
Meehan
Perry
Rogers (KY)
Ruiz
Smith (WA)
Welch
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1201

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 160 I was unavoidably detained with constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
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
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
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)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
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
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
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
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)

Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
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
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
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
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Blackburn
Duncan (SC)
Eshoo
Frankel (FL)
Gosar
McClintock
Perry
Ruiz
Smith (WA)
Tipton
Welch
Whitfield

□ 1210

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 161, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded on the following votes because I was absent due to a family emergency. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 158 on the Motion to Recommit on H.R. 622, "nay", rollcall No. 159 on Passage of H.R. 622, "aye", rollcall No. 160 on the Motion to Recommit on H.R. 1105, "nay", rollcall No. 161 on Passage of H.R. 1105, "aye".

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the resolution of the Senate (S. Con. Res. 11) ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025,'' agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints the following Members be the conferees on the part of the Senate, with instructions: Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. KING.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, April 13, 2015.*

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702, I hereby reappoint as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress the following person: Dr. Sharon Leon, Fairfax, Virginia.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1215

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE JOHN DINGELL

Mr. HOYER. Before I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for the purpose of informing us of the schedule, I would like to note the presence of the longest-serving Member of this House in history, one of the best legislators in the history of this House, and one of the most decent human beings I know. We are so proud to have him on the floor with us once again. His successor, whom he knows very well, DEBBIE DINGELL, is here with him as well.

John Dingell, Mr. Chairman, we welcome you, Mr. Speaker Pro Tem, back to the House of Representatives. We are so glad to see you.

Mr. Chairman, the beautiful DEBORAH is doing a wonderful job representing your district.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, for the purpose of informing us of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1195, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection Advisory Boards Act, authored by Representative ROBERT PITTENGER. This bipartisan bill, which enjoys significant support from the Financial Services Committee, including the ranking member, will ensure that there is appropriate input given on actions being taken by the CFPB.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider two critical cybersecurity measures: H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act, authored by Chairman DEVIN NUNES, and H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act, authored by Chairman MIKE MCCAUL. These bipartisan bills will improve cyber threat information sharing between the private sector and the government and ensure that America can meet cyber challenges now and into the future.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information. Initially, I would like to just bring up a question with reference to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection Advisory Boards Act. The gentleman talked about bipartisan legislation. This, as the gentleman may know, was a very bipartisan bill, with one of your Members and one of my Members, Mr. HECK, on my side, joining together in committee overwhelmingly in favor of setting up an advisory board so that there would be input from small business. Unfortunately, as the gentleman knows, there has subsequently been added a funding source which undermines, from our perspective, at the same time that we are trying to add an advisory board, the operations of the Consumer Financial Protection advisory board.

Mr. Leader, it is somewhat ironic that we just passed $300 billion in reduced revenues without paying for them and are now worried about $9 million. The Bible has something to say about the mote in one's eye being the object of attention. But it seems somewhat ironic, and I would hope that we could return this bill, which is a very admirable bill, to a bipartisan condition and not undermine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau at the same time that we are trying to give it some additional advice and counsel.

I would be glad to yield to my friend with, hopefully, perhaps a suggestion where we might return this bill to its bipartisan and overwhelmingly supported-on-both-sides-of-the-aisle condition.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the only change in this bill is to make sure that the taxpayers are protected and not increase the debt. It is just a simple pay-for as we move forward. It has got bipartisan support coming out of the committee, and we hope that we could be able to move forward on the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I think the gentleman knows that I am one of the biggest proponents of

paying for things, which is why I voted against your two tax bills on the floor today. They are not paid for, and $300 billion of revenue will be reduced. That will exacerbate the deficit. That is why we have PAYGO. So I am supportive of PAYGO, but I would like to see if we can reach a bipartisan agreement on a pay-for which does not undermine the operations of the consumer financial protection board. I know your side, with all due respect, Mr. Leader, does not like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and would like to repeal it and reduce its funding greatly. We disagree with that. We have a great disagreement on that proposition.

So all I am saying is we have a bill on which there is bipartisan support. I see my friend, Mr. LUCAS, on the floor on the ag bill. We had that on his bill, and he gave one of the most eloquent statements on the floor that I have heard about, Look, we have a bipartisan agreement; don't look bipartisanship in the eye and say ''no.''

So we are turning a bipartisan bill into a partisan bill not because we are against paying for it—we are for paying for it. But we are against undermining the ability of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect consumers, as it was designed to, and we need to adequately fund it without adding responsibilities and reducing its resources to protect the public.

If the gentleman wants to say anything further, I will yield to him. If not, I will go on to another subject.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his comments. But as the gentleman knows, most every American has had to, in the last few years, cut back based upon the economy. I do not believe it is too difficult to find $9 million out of a $600-million-per-year budget, and I would think the consumers would expect that of the organization as well. We can all tighten our belts to make sure that the taxpayer is protected, and I look forward to continuing to work with you. I do believe, knowing you think things should be paid for as well, that there is an opportunity here that we can find 9 out of 600.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I think what I hear is we are not going to reach bipartisan agreement on that, and that is unfortunate.

The cybersecurity bill, as the gentleman mentioned, will we consider the two cybersecurity-related bills together or separately? We have heard some information over here about whether they may be joined together or whether we are to consider them discretely, each one of them. I think they are relatively noncontroversial in some respects. But would the gentleman tell us how they might be considered?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I usually don't like to get ahead of the Rules Committee, but we will consider these bills separate but then joined together and sent to the Senate.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

The gentleman also has brought up the issue of—well, I don't think you brought it up, but let me talk about it. As we know, April 15 occurred yesterday. The budget was supposed to be adopted as of yesterday. As the gentleman and I both know, when my party was in charge, as when your party is in charge, we haven't met that April 15 deadline. But I know the gentleman has talked about reconciliation instructions.

The Senate bill, of course, does have reconciliation instructions to the Finance Committee and to the HELP Committee, the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, but none others. The House apparently has left itself room to have instructions to every committee.

Can the gentleman tell us, A, when he expects the budget conference to report back and when we might consider that conference on the floor? Then, secondly, whether or not he believes that there will be reconciliation instructions beyond the Affordable Care Act. We understand that that is contemplated. But beyond the Affordable Care Act, does the gentleman expect reconciliation instructions on other matters?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, since my side of the aisle has taken the majority, we have done a budget every single year. We have passed the budget on this floor. We have voted this week to go to conference, we have appointed conferees, and we were actually excited about the change in the Senate and their moving a budget, so we are very hopeful that we will get this done very quickly. I do not want to get ahead of the conferees working, but I am hopeful that they will get back soon. Seeing how far they go, I am hopeful that they will be able to give as much flexibility as possible when it comes to reconciliation.

Mr. HOYER. So the gentleman contemplates going beyond reconciliation instructions on the Affordable Care Act to other matters? For instance, in the House budget, we replace seniors' Medicare guarantee with a premium support voucher. Would the majority leader expect a reconciliation instruction on replacing seniors' Medicare guarantee with such a premium support voucher?

Mr. MCCARTHY. As the gentleman knows, I do not like to get ahead of the conferees. I will let them work forward and see what comes back. As soon as their work is done, we will notify everyone and have it back on to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I know that you don't want to anticipate, but, obviously, our Members are concerned about what they ought to be considering and planning for and making themselves aware of the facts about. Does the gentleman expect a reconciliation instruction on the part of the budget that was passed by the House that turns Medicare into a capped block grant reducing the funding by approximately one-third?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I appreciate the gentleman's going line by line, but if I can be very clear, I do not want to get in front of the conference. As soon as they get their work done, there will be plenty of time to notify all Members of what comes before the House, and we will notify them at that time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I hope that is the case. And I would hope that we did not have that. We talked about—I have talked about and you have talked about—just now, bipartisanship. I would hope that we would pass a budget that then the Appropriations Committee and other committees would be able to work on so that we could have a bipartisan product, as opposed to another confrontation that would go way past October 1 of this year, and we would be back in the position of having to have a continuing resolution on which there would be a confrontation and the threat of shutting down government.

□ 1230

Obviously, to the extent that we can, as I suggested with respect to the Consumer Financial Protection Board, to the extent that we can have bipartisan agreement—the gentleman that was just with me was Senator MCCONNELL.

Noting the passage of the sustainable growth rate bill which dealt with community health centers and dealt with the children's health insurance program, Senator MCCONNELL said: The American people expect us to do work.

He used the SGR example as a way that we did work in a constructive, bipartisan fashion, making compromises on both sides of the aisle, with Speaker BOEHNER and Leader PELOSI representing the two parties, came together and worked, and my staff and I think your staff participated as well, and we came to an agreement.

I would hope that we would be able to do that with respect to the budget and appropriation process. Obviously, the budget was not that way. All Democrats voted against the budget. We don't like the sequester. We think the sequester undermines the national security and undermines the investments that America needs to make in its infrastructure and its education, its health care, its environment, its basic research, and other items that are of critical importance if we are going to grow the economy and create jobs.

I would hope that we could on these issues—while I understand the gentleman is saying that we will be noticed of it, but I would hope we could have some discussions about it so that we could come to, frankly, as we did with SGR, an agreement.

That agreement, as you know, passed with 392 votes. You worked hard on it;

I worked hard on it; the Speaker worked hard on it; Leader PELOSI worked hard on it—392 votes in this House. That was one of the best days we had this year. As a matter of fact, it might have been the best day we had this year.

The items that I raised are of, obviously, great concern. Hopefully, we could have discussions about that before being simply informed that those would be in reconciliation instructions.

Let me go, if I can now, the gentleman made a very eloquent statement yesterday. That statement was on the 150th anniversary of the assassination of one of the greatest Americans in history; that, of course, was Abraham Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln helped cure one of the blackest blots on America's reputation and America's moral commitment by issuing the Emancipation Proclamation. However, Mr. Leader, as you know, subsequent to the adoption of the 13th Amendment, which the gentleman also referenced, we had vicious segregation. We had policies put in place that prevented African Americans from registering, much less voting.

The gentlemen and I have had the opportunity to walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge together where Alabama State troopers were sent by Governor Wallace to stop people from simply going to register to vote.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CONYERS and our friend JOHN LEWIS, one of the great heroes of the American civil rights movement, have cosponsored a bill—JIM SENSENBRENNER being the former Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS being the ranking Democrat—have sponsored a bipartisan bill which would return the protections that were undermined by the Supreme Court decision in the Shelby County v. Holder case.

I believe it is important—and I think the gentlemen share this view—that we absolutely protect the rights of every American to register and to vote and to ensure that the policies adopted by any State or any county or any municipality are not such that it undermines the ability of citizens to register and to vote. This is bipartisan legislation.

I would ask the majority leader respectfully, and one of the great attributes to Abraham Lincoln who talked about a nation divided against itself, talked about a nation who did not give equality to all of its citizens, talked about a nation that needed to respect the inclusion of all people irrespective of their race, I would ask respectfully that the legislation cosponsored by Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CONYERS and JOHN LEWIS be brought to this floor so that we can, in fact, ensure that every American—every American—has the right to register, to vote, and is protected by their Federal Government from the discrimination and exclusion that we know historically has happened too often.

I urge my friend, the majority leader, to bring that bill, that bipartisan bill, to the floor for debate, open to amendment and discussion and a vote.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank him for his comments regarding Abraham Lincoln as well.

Yesterday was the 150th anniversary of his passing. It was also a significant day yesterday, as well, of the Jackie Robinson anniversary of breaking the color barrier in baseball.

As the gentleman knows, as we have walked across that bridge many times with our good friend JOHN LEWIS, the difference that it has made in those last years from when he first was beaten across that bridge and how far this country has come, and this country can go much further.

The bill is before the committee. It is not scheduled for the floor next week. We will watch as the committee continues to work. The gentleman and I can continue to work on the issue to make sure we get this done.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

## WELCOMING DR. JULIO FRENK AS THE SIXTH PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Julio Frenk on being named as the sixth president of the University of Miami and the first Hispanic to be selected for this job. Dr. Frenk joins my hometown Hurricanes after a 6-year tenure as dean of Harvard's School of Public Health.

The son of German and Spanish immigrants who settled in Mexico, Dr. Frenk's remarkable career as an academic and a public servant also includes his service as the Mexican Minister of Health under President Vicente Fox.

I would like to welcome Dr. Frenk and his wife, Dr. Felicia Knaul, to south Florida and to the Miami Hurricanes family. I look forward to working with him as he leads the university's continued transformation into a global research hub in a world class international city.

Go Canes.

## TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Trade Adjustment Assistance was designed as a lifeline for hundreds of thousands of America's workers, their last line of defense when they lose their jobs through no fault of their own thanks to NAFTA and other bad trade deals that outsourced their jobs to foreign countries. Many workers never qualified even when they were eligible.

The American people need much more than just adjustment assistance for thousands more workers whose jobs will be outsourced by the Trans-Pacific Partnership. America needs trade deals, themselves, to be adjusted, so they, again, create jobs in America rather than suck them away to foreign shores.

This hasn't happened for nearly four decades. Since 1976, our Nation has lost 47.5 million jobs due to lopsided trade agreements. Last year, our economy lost 16 percent of its growth due to the overhang of the growing trade deficit.

Thousands of steel workers in Lorain, Ohio, have just been pink-slipped and laid off due to imported steel. With every lost U.S. job, our Nation's economy gets weakened. Our working families become less financially secure. Rising into the middle class becomes impossible.

What we need and must learn is the history of bad trade deals. Congress can't repeat the mistakes of the past. Our Nation needs a new trade model that creates more jobs in America, instead of outsourcing our jobs to foreign shores.

## HONORING LIEUTENANT JOHN LEAHR

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, another outstanding member of America's Greatest Generation departed from this world.

Lieutenant John Leahr—Johnny, as he was known—a lifelong Cincinnatian, is an example of an American we should all strive to emulate. Lieutenant John Leahr was a member of the Tuskegee Airmen, a group of African American fighter pilots that flew missions protecting Allied bombers over the skies of Europe during World War II.

On March 27, 2009, 6 years before Mr. Leahr's death, the Tuskegee Airmen were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal. Lieutenant Leahr had hoped that the successes of the Red Tails, as they were known, would shift the racial prejudices that African Americans faced before the war; but, after fighting fascism overseas, he had to continue fighting discrimination back home.

Over the years, times changed, and the people of Cincinnati and our entire Nation began to recognize the heroism of Lieutenant John Leahr. I had the honor to get to meet John in recent years, and his story is remarkable, a story that needs to be told for unending generations.

Today, I, with all of you, honor his courage and thank him for his unparalleled service.

## NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the National Day of Silence.

Tomorrow is the 18th year we have recognized the National Day of Silence, a day when young people come together to raise awareness for the discrimination that LGBT students face.

I am proud of students who stand up against bullying, students like Karen Jimenez of Aptos, California, who said: ''Identity extends further than our physical selves, so when expression of identity becomes restricted, it's similar to having chains placed on your home.''

I am a proud sponsor of the Student Non-Discrimination Act and will continue to fight for acceptance and tolerance for LGBT youth. California is a leader in promoting and protecting the rights of our LGBT community.

This year, we celebrate the 15th anniversary of the passage of the Safety and Violence Prevention Act and recent passage of a bill to ensure that trans students are afforded necessary gender neutral facilities in their schools.

We, in Congress, have a responsibility not to be silent. It is our job to speak for those who cannot. We must work harder towards becoming a wholly gender-inclusive society that welcomes and protects all our Members.

## HONORING MANO A MANO

(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 to honor Mano a Mano on its 15-year anniversary in Round Lake Park and to recognize the staff and volunteers who support this incredible organization.

In 2000, community leaders saw a rise in the Latino immigrant population, as well as the struggles they face due to language barriers and a lack of higher education.

Mr. Speaker, these leaders took it upon themselves to help the growing community through support and education. They opened the doors of Mano a Mano and began providing services such as community school for parents, kindergarten readiness, citizenship preparation, employment connection, and health education.

It is because of organizations like Mano a Mano that families can break down the barriers they face and succeed. Through these services, Mr. Speaker, Mano a Mano has empowered immigrants and underserved families to become proud contributing members of our community.

I congratulate them on their 15-year anniversary.

□ 1245

## PAYDAY LENDING REGULATIONS

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to talk about the critical need for the stronger oversight of payday lenders.

In March, I welcomed President Obama to the city of Birmingham, in my district, where he highlighted our Nation's economic recovery and put a spotlight on the areas that needed the most improvement. The President highlighted the urgent need for better regulations of the payday lending industry—the very same day that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau unveiled proposals to rein in this loosely regulated industry.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the CFPB's efforts to ensure that these products help—not harm—consumers. The payday lending and title loan industry must take steps to ensure that borrowers understand the loan terms and have the resources to pay them back.

In my district, the proliferation of payday lending is, really, unacceptable. On every corner, you will find a payday lender. In fact, the President quoted that there were more payday lending institutions in my district than there were McDonald's. These borrowers are disproportionately African American and Latino—two communities that were severely impacted by the predatory lending practices, and far too many of these borrowers find themselves trapped in a cycle of debt.

In the coming weeks, I plan to introduce a bill and to spearhead efforts, led by consumer industry groups, to protect consumers from predatory lending. I ask my colleagues to join me. These good people are my constituents and are not this industry's prey.

## IN MEMORY OF MARY LARAE RICHTER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in memory of Mary LaRae Richter.

Everybody knew her as ''Rae'' in the Chico, California, and northern California area. She was a truly inspiring woman who left a deep, lasting impact on her family, on the community of Chico, and on all who knew her. I knew her very well for quite a few years. She was a very, very sweet lady, indeed.

Born in 1932, at the height of the Great Depression, Rae was an exceptional student and a joyful daughter who was no stranger to hard work. Her first job was behind a soda fountain in a drug store in order to help support her family.

She married her husband, Bernie, in 1953 after they met in high school. Their marriage lasted for 46 years until Bernie passed away. Of course, with Bernie's having been a political figure, including in the State legislature, she played a very supportive role in that endeavor, which was sometimes an arduous one, but she always had the right thing to say, including, ''Oh, Bernard,'' when, maybe, things were getting a little out of control.

Bernie and Rae moved with their three children up to Chico in the 1960s. Rae poured her heart into her town and into her community and into her family-owned businesses while always making time to volunteer for the students just across the street at the Rosedale Elementary School. Rae fought valiantly with Parkinson's disease since 1998, and she displayed courage and joy even in that battle.

Being that supportive wife, a loving mom and grandmother, a joyful business manager, and a good friend to many, she will be greatly missed by all who knew her in northern California.

## THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy, my father used to point out to me that there were certain moments, certain events, that not only defined, perhaps, a community or a generation but that left an indelible mark on a person. He referenced me to go speak to my grandparents about where they were when the news came that Pearl Harbor had been bombed. I can remember my Grandfather Lucas describing the exact field, the exact row that he was picking cotton in in December of 1941 when one of the neighbors stopped and asked, ''Have you heard?''

My father could tell you exactly the moment, while walking down the street in Elk City, Oklahoma, when he walked up on a crowd that was staring in the window of a store that was selling televisions. Everyone's mouth was down. Everyone was aghast at the news from Dallas.

In many ways, the experience of 2 minutes after 9 a.m. on April 19, 1995, has had the same mark and the same effect on not only me and on my colleagues in this delegation but on our communities in the country. Like my grandfather in his remembering the moment that he found out about Pearl Harbor and like my father in the moment he understood that President Kennedy had been assassinated, I will never forget sitting with the Oklahoma delegation, waiting to give testimony in a BRAC hearing in Dallas, when a reporter tapped me on the shoulder, a reporter I had known for some time.

He said: ''We have a report that there has been an explosion at the Federal building in Oklahoma City. They say the building is gone. Your district office is in one of those Federal buildings

in downtown Oklahoma City. Which building are your people in?''

It is a moment that I will never forget.

The delegation got up, and, en masse, we rushed out into the lobby. There on the television monitors was the building that we recognized as the shell of the Murrah building. It, literally, was gone.

My folks were spared, but, on that day, 168 of our good fellow citizens in Oklahoma City were not. This Sunday morning, we will gather to remember that event of 20 years ago, an event that has changed us all forever.

I am proud of my fellow Oklahoma delegation here today because we still work just now as we did 20 years ago to address those issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to one of my colleagues from Oklahoma, who was at that time the secretary of state for the State of Oklahoma, one of the folks in the inner circle in Governor Keating's administration as State government responded to something that no one could have expected.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend for yielding, and I thank my friend for leading us in this genuinely somber and extraordinarily important moment not only for our State and, certainly, for what was then his district but, I think, for Americans everywhere.

Twenty years ago on April 19 of 1995, we saw a domestic tragedy of historic proportions. It is still the largest single act of domestic terrorism in American history. It was totally unexpected, totally unanticipated, and extraordinarily devastating to the people involved and, I think, to the country as a whole. But sometimes out of a tragedy of that proportion a triumph emerges, and that is certainly what occurred in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995, and on the days that followed.

Our first thoughts on the 20th anniversary is always of the victims—of the 168 lives who were lost, 19 of them children, unknowing that disaster was about to overtake them—and of the many dozens who were wounded severely and who still, to this day, carry those injuries with them.

Next, we think always of the first responders, particularly of the Oklahoma City fire and police officers who immediately rushed to the scene; of the surrounding fire and police departments that were rapidly mobilized to assist them; of the Oklahoma National Guard, which was there within a matter of hours; and, frankly, of the rescue teams from all across the United States of America that immediately moved in our direction to help our people.

I think of the people of Oklahoma next, who, stunned, rallied with enormous speed and with great courage to try and support, in each and every way that they could, the folks whose lives had been lost and the people who were still in danger.

I still remember that day at the Governor's office—at the end of the day, at 2 o'clock in the morning—and driving from the capitol toward my home in Moore, Oklahoma, and seeing a line of people outside the blood center. At 2 in the morning, they were still there, wanting to help and be supportive in whatever way that they could. We were really blessed at that particular moment in the history of our State and in the history of our country with extraordinary leadership. I think, first, always—because I worked for Governor Keating as his secretary of state—of the manner in which he responded.

Like my friend Mr. LUCAS, I heard about this totally unexpectedly. I was, literally, walking into the capitol at 9:02, in the tunnel, and I felt a little shudder. When I walked into my office, my secretary immediately walked in and said, ''Your wife is on the phone.'' She was working two blocks away from the site of the bombing, and she was on the 18th floor of a building.

She said, ''I don't know what has happened, but I am looking down, and I can see enormous smoke—an explosion occurred—rolling out, and there are hundreds of people on the street, fleeing from this disaster.''

My office was below the Governor's office on the first floor of the capitol, and I went up. This was maybe 8 minutes into the event. I walked in because I knew the Governor would be focused on this, obviously. He was standing in the press room immediately to the right as you walked in, and at that time, there were already helicopters in the air, and, on the scene, we were seeing the horrific sights.

The speculation immediately was that it was some sort of natural gas explosion. Well, Frank Keating, who was our Governor, was also a former FBI agent who had been trained in investigating terrorism in the 1960s. He was a former Tulsa prosecutor, a former U.S. attorney, a former Associate Attorney General of the United States, and he knew what he was looking at. He immediately looked at that television set, and I will never forget what he said.

He said: ''That is not a natural gas explosion. That is a car bomb of some sort.'' He knew instantly what he was dealing with.

On that day and on the subsequent days, he led with extraordinary distinction in mobilizing resources, leading from the front, being on the front line. It was an exceptional act of public leadership from an official who was less than 100 days into his first term as Governor of the State.

Equally impressive was the leadership of his wife, our first lady, Cathy Keating. Most of America knows of the memorial service that took place on the Sunday after the disaster. I remember the night after the disaster my being at the Governor's Mansion. We still didn't know how many people had been lost, and we didn't know if there were survivors still in the building. There were search teams. We were dealing with a disaster of national and of, really, international proportions.

Cathy Keating came to the meeting and said: ''We need to have some sort of service to memorialize the people who have been lost. People are grieving, and they want to participate.''

I remember thinking at the time, my goodness, how in the world can we ever pull this off? We are dealing with more than we can deal with, let alone organizing something like that, and I made that point. She said, ''Don't worry. I will take over,'' and she did.

America, not just Oklahoma City and Oklahoma, was given a moment to mourn, a moment that attracted the President of the United States, Billy Graham, a national audience, and thousands of Oklahomans who simply wanted to get together and pay tribute to those who had lost their lives. It was an exceptional act of public leadership on her part. The two of them set up a foundation to take care of the educational needs of anyone who had lost a parent, let alone two parents, in the course of that, and that institution still functions to this day. Again, exceptional leadership.

We have had other moments of tragedy in our country, like 9/11, and just as Rudy Giuliani was quoted as being ''America's mayor'' on that day, Ron Norick in Oklahoma City was ''America's mayor'' that day. It was an amazing performance as he got together his police and his fire firefighters and was immediately on the scene. He is one of the greatest public servants who I have ever seen.

I would be remiss not to mention my friend behind me, Mr. LUCAS. As he alluded to in his remarks, that was his district office one building over. That was a place where he was in and out of a lot in the Federal building. My task as secretary of state, assigned by the Governor, was to work in Washington to try and coordinate with the Federal Government long-term rebuilding efforts.

□ 1300

Nobody did more to rebuild Oklahoma City than FRANK LUCAS. Nobody did more to help secure the funds, get the national support, work with us to get out of the requirements. We had to match this with 25 percent because this was not a natural disaster. This was literally an attack on a Federal facility in Oklahoma City with a unique Federal responsibility. Those were all things that FRANK LUCAS got done for not just the people of his district, but the people of our State; and, frankly, in that, he set some precedents that served the people of New York on 9/11 awfully well in addition.

The last person I want to mention is the President of the United States at the time. I am a pretty good Republican, and I can't say I ever voted for Bill Clinton, but I was very glad he was President of the United States at that moment. Nobody helped us more.

I will never forget 1 p.m. the day of the disaster. We had moved the Governor to a civil defense facility below

ground at the Capitol—he was directing affairs there—and we got a call from the President of the United States. I did not know it at the time, but they—Frank Keating and Bill Clinton—had actually gone to school together. They were both at Georgetown together. Frank Keating was president of the student body when Bill Clinton was president of the sophomore class, so they knew one another.

The first thing that the President asked was: Governor, do you have any idea who is responsible for this?

There were, of course, all sorts of wild reports on television, wild speculation.

The Governor, being a law enforcement professional, immediately responded: Mr. President, we have no idea. We do not know who would do this. I know you are hearing foreign terrorists or all sorts of things. We just don't know yet. It is too chaotic for us to know.

President Clinton at that point said something that really struck me, and struck me more later. He said: Well, I hope it wasn't a foreign national.

And I remember being almost shocked that you would hope that, you know, an American had done something this awful, but then he added, prophetically, as it turned out several years later: Because if it was, we will be at war someplace in the world within 6 months.

He was absolutely right. He, too, understood the dimensions of the tragedy. And in the days ahead, everything we asked for and all the resources and compassion that a great people like the United States of America and its citizens can muster was immediately at our disposal.

I remember President Clinton, when we announced we were doing the ceremony, we were discreetly approached by a member in his administration, who said: You know, the President would like to be here, but we certainly don't want to be here if it is inappropriate.

I said: Look, I have to go clear that with the Governor, but I can tell you, I know what Frank Keating's response is going to be. Of course, we would welcome the President of the United States.

He did, indeed, come. He not only helped us through it, he helped us emotionally through it, as did the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, at the time also made that journey and was there to help and comfort people.

So we may have our political differences from time to time as Americans, but in times of tragedy, we stick together. We come together; we pull together; and we work to help one another, and certainly President Clinton did that.

Finally, let me just make this observation and this expression of gratitude. I want to use this occasion to thank the millions and millions of Americans who responded with their prayers, with their help, the rescue workers that came, the donations that flowed in from all across the country to help the victims and the families of the victims, that came, frankly, from around the world, because we had international help as well.

I want to remind people that whenever they lose faith in the United States of America or just the sheer decency of people, think of the Oklahoma City bombing; think of the magnificent performance of this country, not just of the people on the scene, but of the support this country directed toward its fellow citizens in a time of difficulty, and of the many prayers and expressions of goodwill and condolence from around the world as people rallied in the face of what was an unspeakable act of terror.

So we had our moment of tragedy, but we have had 20 years of triumph since then; and that triumph is not just the triumph of the people of Oklahoma City or the people of Oklahoma, it is an American triumph, and it is a human triumph of enormous dimensions and of great consequence.

Mr. LUCAS. Thank you, Congressman COLE.

I certainly want to acknowledge Congressman MULLIN and Congressman BRIDENSTINE. We work as a family delegation, so to speak, in the Oklahoma delegation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to Congressman RUSSELL, who has the responsibility of representing that site in the Fifth District of Oklahoma, to conclude with a few comments.

Congressman RUSSELL.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank Congressman LUCAS and my friends and colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1995, I was defending my country as an officer in the United States Army. We were preparing warriors to defend our country, never imagining that an attack would occur in our hometown.

Among the 168 people that were killed and the 680 nonfatal injuries, the 324 buildings that were destroyed or damaged in a 16-block radius, and the $652 million worth of damage that was caused in my hometown, there were a number of brother warriors and sister warriors that were defending their country at their duty stations at the recruiting depots that were contained in the Federal building—Victoria Sohn, a master sergeant in the United States Army; Benjamin Davis, a sergeant in the United States Marine Corps; Lakesha Levy, an airman first class in the United States Air Force; Randolph Guzman, a captain in the United States Marine Corps; Cartney McRaven, an airman first class in the United States Air Force; and Lola Bolden, a sergeant first class in the United States Army—never imagining that in their recruiting duties in Oklahoma City that they would give their lives in defense of their country.

To my colleagues and to Congressman LUCAS, I would ask that we could observe a moment of silence in memory to all the 168 Americans, Oklahomans, friends that were killed in this despicable act of terror on our domestic shores, and to all of those that carry the scars and injuries to this day, if we could observe a brief moment of silence.

I thank my colleague and friend, Congressman LUCAS, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the Oklahoma delegation can express our thanks to the country for the help over the last 20 years, but with this moment of silence just now, we ask that everyone, 2 minutes after 9, central time, this Sunday morning think about those 168 souls, those killed and those who survived, and those who were changed forever.

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

## HONORING ALEX MILLS WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, after the Japanese attacks on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Americans from across the Nation were driven by a sudden sense of patriotism, and they sought ways that they could serve their country. One such patriotic American was young Alex Mills of Concord, North Carolina. Although Alex desperately wanted to serve his nation, at only 13 years old, he was too young to join the ranks of thousands of young men and women who were shipping off overseas.

Determined to not allow his youth to stand between him and doing something significant, young Alex searched for a way that he could help his country. Now, learning of a newly organized outfit created to patrol the coastline and borders of our homeland, Alex quickly enlisted in the Civil Air Patrol.

Throughout World War II, the Civil Air Patrol pilots flew hundreds of patrol missions searching for enemy submarines operating along our coastline. Throughout the war, the Civil Air Patrol spotted numerous German U-boats, and after the planes were fitted with bombs, the Civil Air Patrol crews were credited with sinking at least two enemy submarines. Recognizing the value of this volunteer force of civilians, Congress acted to make the Civil Air Patrol the official auxiliary of the United States Air Force.

Forty-one years after first joining the Civil Air Patrol, Alex Mills was appointed as the chaplain of Civil Air Patrol's Rome Composite Squadron at the Richard B. Russell Airfield in Rome, Georgia.

Since taking on the role of chaplain, Alex Mills has continued his exemplary service and has risen to the rank of

lieutenant colonel. He also has been recognized as the Georgia Wing Chaplain of the Year and the Southeast Region Chaplain of the Year.

Having had the honor to serve side by side with Lieutenant Colonel Alex Mills during my tenure at the Rome Squadron, I can attest firsthand to his dedication to duty, God, and country. I have witnessed the positive impact he has had on many young Americans who, as he did 74 years ago, joined the Civil Air Patrol as a way to serve their nation.

On Sunday, April 26, I will have the honor of presenting the Congressional Gold Medal to Lieutenant Colonel Alex Mills for his lifetime of service and as one of the few remaining charter members of the Civil Air Patrol.

Of all those that I have served with during my time in the military and serving in Civil Air Patrol, there are only a few that have had such a positive influence on my life and the life of my family. Without any reservation, I can attest that Lieutenant Colonel Alex Mills is one of those individuals.

On behalf of the State of Georgia and Georgia's 11th Congressional District, I recognize and commend Lieutenant Colonel Alex Mills for his 74 years of service to God, community, and country.

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

## HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 2015, TO MONDAY, APRIL 20, 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 6, 2015, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

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

There was no objection.

## THE WAR ON COAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you making time to be down here with me today.

Mr. Speaker, I am down here to talk about the war on coal. And when I say ''the war on coal,'' people think of that as if we can actually go and attack a natural resource. I am not worried about attacking natural resources. I am worried about the impact it has on American families. In particular, I am worried about the impact it has on families in my district in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, you can't see this chart, but it is a chart that represents section 111(d). It is the language that the President used to create his new carbon emission targets. I am not saying that Congress passed a law to do this, because Congress didn't pass a law. The President just decided he was going to do it. I am not saying that the House and the Senate got together and debated it, because we didn't get together and debate it. The President just decided this was the way it was going to be.

It is 292 words that were already in statute. The President has turned it into a 130-page regulation that he is implementing on the country—hundreds more pages of technical support documents going behind that. This is what President Obama's constitutional law professor had to say.

Again, this is a regulation that the President, Mr. Speaker, is implementing without any action of Congress whatsoever.

□ 1315

Laurence Tribe, the Harvard law professor who was President Obama's constitutional law professor, said this in December of last year: ''To justify the Clean Power Plan''—the President's energy plan—''the EPA has brazenly rewritten the history of on obscure section of the 1970 Clean Air Act''—that is these 292 words I talked about—''passed by Congress in 1970.''

Professor Tribe goes on to say: ''Frustration with congressional inaction cannot justify throwing the Constitution overboard to rescue this lawless EPA proposal.''

Mr. Speaker, a Clean Air Act passed in 1970—and I will get into some charts that show the successes we have had of previous Clean Air Acts in 1970, 1990. The President wants to do things differently than the law of the land allows, and he is frustrated, as described by Professor Tribe, that Congress refuses to do what the President wants us to do.

I am going to talk about why it is we don't want to do what the President wants us to do. We don't want to do it because it is destructive to the American economy and it is destructive to American families. We don't want to do what the President wants to do. The President hasn't come up here to lobby Congress to try to get Congress to do what the President wants us to do.

The President, to quote Professor Tribe, is ''throwing the Constitution overboard to rescue this lawless EPA proposal.''

We will come back to Professor Tribe. I want to talk about it in terms of my constituency, Mr. Speaker. I am right there in kind of the northeastern Atlanta suburbs there. It is only two counties, Mr. Speaker, but they are two of the fastest growing counties in the State of Georgia. They have also just been named two of the healthiest counties in the State of Georgia.

This is what we are talking about in Georgia. This is our Georgia Public Service Commission, that group of elected officials in charge of keeping energy prices affordable for Georgia families, that group that is tasked with keeping energy supplies reliable in Georgia, that group that is tasked with regulating energy in the State of Georgia.

It is not the EPA; it is not President Obama. It is the Georgia Public Service Commission. They say this about the President's rule:

> This rule will be unduly burdensome on Georgians, placing upward pressure on electricity rates, an outcome that is not acceptable to our organization or the citizens that we serve.

These are not Republicans and Democrats, Mr. Speaker. These are folks who are concerned, literally, about how families are able to keep the lights on. How do you keep the lights on? We talk about getting the mortgage paid. We talk about getting the car note paid. How do you keep the lights on? The Georgia Public Service Commission is concerned about the burden of this new rule.

The Clean Power Plan—that is what the President calls his plan—has nothing to do with clean power. It has to do with a war on America's energy security.

He says this:

> The Clean Power Plan is illegal, unfair, and unwise.

That is Georgia's attorney general. That is the one elected official in Georgia that is tasked with enforcing the laws of the land as they exist in Georgia, a statewide elected office. He calls this plan illegal, unfair, and unwise.

It is not just President Obama's constitutional law professor, Laurence Tribe, calling it unconstitutional. We hear it from our Georgia State attorney general as well.

This is from one of our power suppliers in Georgia. You may think of power suppliers, Well, of course, they want to pollute. That is what those big energy companies do—nonsense.

Oglethorpe Power is the group that supplies power to all of the electric co-ops in the State. Mr. Speaker, I know you have electric co-ops in your State, as I do in mine. These are citizen-owned utilities. These are citizen-owned companies that make sure the lights stay on.

Oglethorpe Power provides the power to those citizen-owned groups. This is not some big investor-owned utility. This isn't some dirty power producer. This is the group of citizens that represents every single one of us in the State of Georgia who receive our power in this way.

This is what Oglethorpe Power says:

> Consequently, there is substantial probability bordering on certainty that Oglethorpe Power will suffer economic injury if the EPA finalizes the proposal in its current form or in any substantially similar form.

Mr. Speaker, it is a bad idea to do it because Congress wasn't involved in it. It is a bad idea, as Professor Tribe suggests, to do it because the Constitution

doesn't allow. It is a bad idea, as Georgia's attorney general says, because it is unfair and it is unwise and it is unlawful.

It is a bad idea to do it, as Oglethorpe Power says, because it is going to burden every single American family, particularly these Georgia families that Oglethorpe Power serves, if that goes into effect.

Mr. Speaker, who is going to get hit the hardest? I will just use my State of Georgia because I get so tired on this House floor of pitting one group of folks against another.

There is that part of me, Mr. Speaker, that remembers when President Obama was first running for office, and he promised to be the President that had the most transparent administration in American history, and he promised to be a uniter, bringing America together, as we have not heretofore been together in recent times.

That is not what I see, Mr. Speaker. What I see is division. What I see are politics of division each and every day, so often along economic lines.

I would argue what is the right metric is not how much money you make in a day. It is how much money you are able to make tomorrow. The opportunity is the metric on which we ought to measure. Do you have opportunity for tomorrow? Do you have choices that you can make to make your life better?

Quoting an energy economist who testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee just this week, Mr. Speaker, he said this:

> Lower-income groups will bear the burden of higher energy costs imposed by the EPA's plan but will be among the least likely to invest in or benefit from the energy efficiency programs that the proposed rule envisions.

I want you to think about that. The President has big plans in this unlawful rule, this unconstitutional rule, this undebated rule; but he has big plans.

It is twofold. Number one, he is going to get American families to invest in energy-efficient products in their home which, in theory, Mr. Speaker, if I am using less electricity in my home, I am going to be spending less money on that electricity.

The President's plan is if I can get families to have more efficient products in their home, I can drive up the cost of electricity to the home, but families are still going to be out about the same amount of money. That is not the way the economists see it, Mr. Speaker.

Look at families with their aftertax income of less than $10,000 a year. Now, that is not altogether uncommon in the great State of Georgia, and certainly, those are the folks who already have a tough time keeping the lights on.

Thirty percent or more of their income, on average, is dedicated to energy costs. Thirty percent or more of everything that family has is dedicated to paying their energy costs. This rule proposes to run those costs up dramatically.

Now, you move up to folks who are making aftertax incomes higher than $50,000, Mr. Speaker, and you are down below 5 percent of their income that they are spending on energy costs.

The folks who can handle an increased rise in energy prices are also going to be those folks who invest in the more energy-efficient system. It is those folks who are trapped at the bottom of the income ladder, who don't have those opportunities to invest in more energy-efficient products, who are going to be hit the hardest by rising energy prices.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman in my District—700,000 strong—who doesn't want to see clean air, but the President's rule isn't about clean air. It is about picking winners and losers in energy production. The President doesn't like coal. He doesn't like coal miners. He doesn't like coal processors. He don't like coal power plant operators.

This isn't about clean air. It is about coal. Is going to have an economic impact on constituents in my District.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back to the words that folks use. This is the Georgia Chamber of Commerce. They obviously have an obligation to grow the economy in Georgia.

Let me just tell you that you can't pay taxes if you don't have a job, right? It is an essential point of basic government economics. You need people to work. You need people to be successful because, if they are not successful, they cannot pay their taxes.

The Georgia Chamber of Commerce is dedicated to success in our part of the world. They say:

> EPA's regulations will impose billions of dollars in costs on the United States—and Georgia's—economy but fail to meaningfully reduce $CO_2$ emissions on a global scale.
>
> If EPA adopts policies that substantially increase the cost of energy, thereby decreasing the competitiveness of the United States, investments and emissions will be sent to other, less efficient countries with higher $CO_2$ emission intensities.
>
> As a result, overly restrictive and costly United States policies to reduce emissions will not only be offset around the globe, but could actually result in a net increase.

I want you to think about that, Mr. Speaker. I want you to think about that. We just had this conversation in respect to the Keystone pipeline. The President vetoed bipartisan language passed in this House, passed in the Senate, to build the Keystone pipeline.

This pipeline has been in the approval process for longer than it took to build the entire Hoover Dam. The entire Hoover Dam, start to finish, was built faster than we can even get an approval. This law wasn't to mandate the building of the pipeline. This law was to mandate that the approval process come to conclusion.

The process still hasn't come to a conclusion—the President won't do it—as if, if America decides not to build the Keystone pipeline, oil will not be harvested in the independent nation of Canada—nonsense.

Canada didn't ask us whether or not they should bring the oil out of the ground. They asked us to help them get the oil to market. They are America's largest trading partner.

They said: America, will you help us with this pipeline?

The answer should have been: Absolutely, yes.

If not yes, perhaps the answer could be no; but, instead of a yes or no, we had 7 years of delay.

Well, that oil is going to come out of the ground. It is going to be shipped to a port in Canada. It is going to be shipped overseas to China. I promise you it is not going to reduce emissions. It is going to increase emissions because they are not going to process it in China as responsibly as we process it here.

What is the President asking of us? We are talking about how this is going to raise the cost of producing goods.

Again, just in Georgia, between 2005 and 2012—the last 7 years, Mr. Speaker—we have reduced carbon emissions in Georgia by 33 percent. The President's targets have Georgia needing another 44 percent in reductions by 2030—44 percent.

According to the Georgia Environmental Protection Division—again, these aren't the folks who are in charge of polluting the air; these are the folks who are in charge of protecting the air, our Georgia EPD, which is our equivalent of the EPA. They are tough on polluters; they are tough on folks who don't want to be good corporate citizens.

They say, ''The CPP''—this is the President's proposal—''does not provide flexibility to Georgia. In fact, the CPP is inflexible and punitive to States that have taken early action.''

I want you to think about that. If you were sitting around doing nothing; if you didn't come from two of the healthiest counties in the country, as I do, Mr. Speaker; if you weren't worried about protecting the planet, about our stewardship responsibilities to the Earth; if you weren't worried about any of those things, the President is going to set some targets for you.

Again, these are the unlawful, unwise, constitutional targets, but he is going to set some targets for you that you need to achieve. If you have been working, as we have in Georgia, to do the right thing ahead of time, he is still setting those targets for you, giving you no credit for the good things you have done in the past, asking you to do even more in the future.

It is not going to be economically feasible. Georgia, number six in the Nation, is being asked to do the most by the White House in this unwise, unlawful, unconstitutional rulemaking.

Let's talk about the dollars and cents that are required here. For the Nation, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about between $360 billion and $480 billion to implement the President's proposal—

again, the unlawful, unwise, unconstitutional proposal—but the President's proposal, $360 billion to $480 billion.

According to the economic projections, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be about a 12 or 13 percent increase in electricity prices across the country—a 12 or 13 percent increase in utility prices, electricity prices, across the country.

Now, in Georgia, that translates into about $400 a year. We have a pretty mild climate in the great State of Georgia, but it is about $400 a year per family. In my District, Mr. Speaker, it is about $94 million a year.

You put all of my constituents together, all those folks who are the boss of the Seventh District of Georgia together, we are talking about almost $100 million lost to implement the President's plan, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1330

Now, my question is, for what?

My folks are responsible folks, Mr. Speaker. They are dedicated to their stewardship responsibilities. They are dedicated to doing the right thing for the right reasons.

We are not a district where we try to figure out who is to blame. We are a district where we try to figure out how to fix it. How do you fix it?

But the current worldwide carbon emissions—again, this isn't about clean air. This is about carbon dioxide in the air. Carbon dioxide is in the air. It is a natural part of the air. It is a required part of the air.

Carbon dioxide emissions across the country, Mr. Speaker, across the world, rather, if we talk about developed nations, we generally talk about the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the OECD.

Carbon emissions of those developed nations, Mr. Speaker, are projected to be relatively flat for the two-generational future. Two generations from now, still flat. You are not seeing those increase.

You look at non-OECD nations, Mr. Speaker, those emissions are projected to double, and then triple.

From 1990, when we passed the Clean Air Act, you see level emissions coming from both OECD and non-OECD nations. About 2000, Mr. Speaker, you begin to see those lines diverge, and there is no expectation that non-OECD nations are going to change their carbon dioxide emissions.

There is a funny thing about the Earth, Mr. Speaker: we are all in this together. I don't know if you have reflected on that. There is no escaping this big ball of rock that we are all floating through space on. We are in this together. We will succeed or we will fail together.

For the price tag of $400 per American family, for the price tag of $100 million a year, just in my one congressional district, Mr. Speaker, for the price tag of more than $400 billion a year—that is about 10 percent of everything we spend in this country, about 10 percent of the Federal budget—is the cost of implementing the President's unwise and unlawful regulation.

And what we get for that, Mr. Speaker, what we get for that investment of American treasure, what we get for disadvantaging American businesses relative to foreign businesses, what we get for raising the costs of American products so that other products around the globe can be cheaper, what we get for that—golly, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you can even see it—is this little bitty red line in terms of carbon reductions.

What I have charted here, Mr. Speaker, are metric tons of carbon being produced, carbon dioxide being produced around the globe. This is the entire globe here.

I have 1990, I have 2010, I have 2020, I have 2030.

The benefit of disadvantaging American workers, the benefit of disadvantaging American manufacturers, the benefit of raising prices for every single American family is that the amount of carbon produced on the entire planet will drop the distance of this little bitty red line.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think you can see it. Now that is 2020. 2030, perhaps the line gets visible enough to see. It is virtually nothing. Virtually nothing.

The President talks about this unwise, unlawful, unconstitutional proposal as if it is designed to save the world. It is not. It is not designed to save the world. It is not designed to reduce carbon emissions around the globe. It is designed to put coal out of business in America.

We are the Saudi Arabia of coal, Mr. Speaker. We have coal. We have clean coal. We have coal.

Now, if we pulled up the charts of the Energy Information Administration, they are not going to tell you that coal production in America is going to go to zero. It is not. It is falling off dramatically. We are putting coal mining families out of business in record numbers.

If you go into coal mining country, Mr. Speaker, it used to be all Democrats, all the time. You know, there is not one Member of this Chamber from the Democratic Party that represents coal country today because coal miners threw every one of them out, not because they, as individuals, were bad Members, Mr. Speaker, but because the President was driving those individual families out of business.

Those families said, We are doing honorable work. We are doing lawful work. We work hard for a living, and we are providing a national service.

They are absolutely right.

$500 billion annually in American treasure for virtually no reduction in carbon around the globe.

Now, if we were actually going to talk about clean air, Mr. Speaker, and I wish we would. I wish we would get out of the business of picking winners and losers and talk about clean air. I wish we would get out of the business of having an ax to grind about energy producers and get to talking about clean air.

If we were going to talk about clean air we would talk about things like $NO_X$ and $SO_X$. That is nitrogen oxide, sulfur oxide, Mr. Speaker, $NO_X$ and $SO_X$.

We passed the Clean Air Act of 1990—and I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, that was a Republican President and a Democratic Congress—that bipartisan legislation where the President just didn't decide what he wanted to do; he came to Congress and worked with Congress to craft the law. It went after what at that time was so frequently referred to as acid rain, Mr. Speaker.

You would get this nitrogen oxide, this sulfur oxide in the air. It would come out of the air when it rained. It had an impact around the country. $NO_X$ and $SO_X$ we went after in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

The dark green line represents the sulfur, the yellow line represents the nitrogen. 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010, 2011, and 2012.

We came together as a nation, Mr. Speaker. We targeted these pollutants in the air, and we changed the way we produced power in this country. We didn't abolish coal; we made it cleaner coal. We didn't abolish electric power coming from these big power plants; we changed the way the scrubbers and the smokestacks worked, and we positively impacted air quality in this country.

We didn't pass the Clean Air Act of 1990 because we had an ax to grind; we passed the Clean Air Act of 1990 because we had a problem to solve. And as you can see by this chart, we solved it. We didn't just spend money to feel better about it; we solved it. We weren't just trying to pick winners and losers; we were trying to solve a problem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the Associated Press. They are talking about coal in this country, talking about the President's rule, talking about carbon production. They say this—they say it is leaving this Nation's shores, but not the planet. The fossil fuel trade which has soared under President Obama soared because we have had record exploration going on on private land.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the President has completely eliminated exploration on public lands. Those permits are not going out the door. Private exploration has soared under President Obama's administration.

They said this fossil fuel trade threatens to undermine his strategy, the President's strategy to reduce the gases blamed for global warming.

It also reveals a little-discussed side effect of countries acting alone on a global issues. As the U.S. tries to set a global example by reducing demand for fossil fuels at home, American energy companies are sending more dirty fuel than ever to other parts of the world, exports worth billions of dollars each year.

Let me go back, Mr. Speaker. When we were working together, when we

were working together in Congress, working together with the administration, we changed the way we produced energy. We changed the way we burned this coal to drastically reduce the pollutants coming from that coal.

In a classic example of Federal overreach, Mr. Speaker, again, acting alone, unlawful, unwise, and unconstitutional, the President has said, I want to do more. And in doing more, according to the AP, which is no conservative defender, in doing more, what the President is doing is telling these energy companies, Don't try to do better; don't try to be cleaner. We are going to put you out of business in America, so bring these products out of the ground and ship them overseas.

Mr. Speaker, where do you think our overseas competitors rank in terms of reducing these pollutants? Where do you think? Where do you think India ranks? Where do you think China ranks? Where do you think these nations competing with American workers rank?

Do you think they are producing it as cleanly as we were in 2012? Maybe you think they are a little worse like they were in 2000. Maybe you think they are as bad as when we started way back in 1990.

Nonsense. They are way back here off the chart altogether.

If you believe in a stewardship responsibility to the planet, if you believe we have a multigenerational obligation to care for our environment, then you know that only nations with a robust economy have a robust environmental protection program.

You think about that, Mr. Speaker. You will not find a single nation living in poverty that has advanced environmental protections. You can't afford to care about the environment if you can't keep the lights on. You can't afford to care about the environment if you can't feed your families.

We do both in this country, Mr. Speaker. In the name of protecting the environment, the President is forcing these natural resources overseas, which has the combined negative effect of polluting the planet to a greater degree and making American workers competitive to a lesser degree.

You are shipping cheap energy overseas, which makes that manufacturing more productive. You are raising energy prices in America, which makes our manufacturing less productive.

Mr. Speaker, I am all about making a difference. I am all about solving a problem.

The President wants to spend half a trillion dollars, more than 10 percent of what we spend in this country every year, focused solely, solely, solely, on reducing carbon emissions by the size of this line that you can't even see.

And the people who are going to pay the price for that, literally, the price, are going to be American citizens with higher energy bills and American workers with fewer job opportunities.

We have two models that we can choose from, Mr. Speaker. We can choose from the model that we used in the Clean Air Act of 1990, where we came together in a bipartisan way, and we solved a problem together. We identified the problem, we solved the problem, and we have measurable results.

Or we can go it alone—and by alone, I don't mean America going it alone. I mean the administration and the EPA going it alone—unlawful, unwise, unconstitutional, spend a half a trillion dollars more than the size of our budget deficit this year, making us less competitive, trapping more American families in poverty, to achieve absolutely no result at all.

Mr. Speaker, I will end where I began, an obscure section, section 11(d), 292 words that were never intended to allow the President to do what the President is doing; where the President's own constitutional law professor, Laurence Tribe, says the President's desires cannot justify throwing the Constitution overboard to rescue this 130-page proposal; this 130-page proposal which promises to do virtually nothing to change global emissions but promises to disadvantage the American economy in a global economy.

Mr. Speaker, we can solve our energy challenges. We can find energy independence in this country, energy security in this country. We can solve our environmental stewardship responsibilities. We are doing things cleaner and better today than we ever have, and we will continue to do so.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, the value of divided government, as it is today; the value of folks who hold different ideas, as we do today. Two ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, Mr. Speaker: the President and the Democratic Party on one end, and Republicans and Congress on the other. The value of that divided government is that it allows us to do the big things, the big and necessary things. If it is all Republicans or all Democrats, folks just tend to try to jam their own ideas through, whether America likes it or not. That is not the way to build a stronger nation. Divided government requires—not just allows, but requires—that we come together to solve problems. Every time the President goes it alone, every time Congress goes it alone, we miss an opportunity to come together and solve a problem.

To justify the clean power plan, the President's power plan, the EPA has brazenly rewritten the history of an obscure section of the 1970 Clean Air Act. Frustration with congressional inaction cannot justify throwing the Constitution overboard to rescue this lawless EPA proposal.

We have an opportunity to do better, Mr. Speaker; and more importantly, we have the ability, with the men and women in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker—the men and women who serve this entire institution, this entire Nation, good men and women on both sides of the aisle who care about American workers and who care about the American economy and who care about not just America's environment, but the global environment—we can come together, and we can do better. But this proposal by the President is not it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will help me to encourage all of our colleagues to reject this proposal, to rein in this overreach, and then to work together to do those things that matter to our constituents—our bosses back home.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. HUIZENGA, Michigan, Chairman

## COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE TONY CÁRDENAS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Gabriela Marquez, District Director, the Honorable TONY CÁRDENAS, Member of Congress:

TONY CÁRDENAS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, DC, April 13, 2015.*

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a grand jury subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoena, I will make the determinations required under Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

GABRIELA MARQUEZ,
*District Director for the*
*Hon. Tony Cárdenas.*

## GOVERNMENT IS NOT GOD

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, I appreciate my friend from Georgia, ROB WOODALL, so much. What clarity.

We lost a good man when John Linder didn't run again, and we gained a good man when ROB WOODALL ran for that seat. So it is a good day.

Well, there is a matter of concern. Let me just say this:

We have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that

all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

It behooves us then to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.

Now, there are some people these days that say it is not appropriate to mention God, that that has no place in government. Yet the very God that I speak of and those very words that I spoke are not from me; they are from 152 years ago.

Abraham Lincoln didn't just say those words. He made that his Presidential proclamation. On March 30, 1863, he called for the Nation to have a national day—and these are his words—of ''humiliation, fasting, and prayer.'' So he made that official proclamation.

Sometimes my office starts getting calls if I mention the three-letter word that some find to be such a heinous word to use on the House floor, even though it was one of the most used and most called-upon names, certainly, in our Congress for the first 150, 175 years or so. The Bible was the most quoted book for most of our history.

So the problem is those people that will call and email irate about a Member of the United States Congress saying we have forgotten God.

We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own.

That was Abraham Lincoln who said those words. And he didn't just say them; it was an official proclamation of the United States of America. So at this day and time it is more popular to issue executive orders, as if one person in our government were God, but Abraham Lincoln knew better.

Two years later, he was assassinated. He could have done so much to bring this country together after the worst war the country had ever faced, yet his life was cut short 150 years ago.

He was an extraordinary man. It was an extraordinary time. But he tells us with his written word that we have forgotten God.

He said: We are too proud to pray to the God that made us. Some find that offensive. Some think the government should be god; that the government should tell people: You can see this doctor, but you can't see this doctor. This doctor may be able to heal you, but you can't see this doctor. Why? Because we are the government, and we are the new god. Seniors, look, we know you had plans for health care to last longer, but, sorry, you don't get as good health care as you did 5 years ago.

In my own family, my dad is not going to get the same health care that my mother did, which kept her alive 15 more years after her tumor was discovered. As Dad told me last week: I am not going to be able to have the health care your mother got because of Medicare and all these cuts. I can't even have the option to do what we did for your mother.

Well, that is what happens when the government becomes god. Unfortunately, if we were going to have the government become the god of the United States, it would be nice if the government were a little more truthful, a little more honest, a little more just.

One of the major problems that has been revealed recently is the fact that the Department of Homeland Security has lied to a United States district judge in Texas. He was told that because he was going to issue an injunction, and was issuing an injunction, that there would be no 3-year amnesty provided that the President spoke into being, and after he spoke into being the new law overriding with his very oral words, the laws that were passed by the House and Senate, signed into law by other Presidents, disregard those.

Then the Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson wrote memos—memos—overriding laws that were worked on in subcommittee, committee, brought to the floor of the House, debated, fussed over, eventually voted on, and approved in the House; debated, fussed over, eventually passed in the Senate, signed into law by another President. We disregard that, because the government is god now. We don't need to pray to anybody except Washington these days.

Well, some of us believe the government is not god. Nobody wants a dishonest god. And we have had too much of that from Washington.

So with recent revelations about the Department of Homeland Security and its failures, many Americans have become gravely concerned that their actions and performance are causing additional misrepresentations, and that is why it was critically important that we have a thorough investigation of the Department of Homeland Security.

I know there were misrepresentations by the prior Director of Homeland Security before our committee. I talked about those previously.

But the American people deserve to be protected by their government—not spied on, not lied to, not pay to have the Department of Homeland Security ignore the law. So there were 22 of us that just signed a letter going to the Comptroller General of the United States.

Some pronounce it ''comptroller'' because that is how it is spelled. As my late English teacher mother told me many years ago, that may be the way it is spelled. If you look in the dictionary, which I was forced to do, then you will see that the number one pronunciation is ''controller,'' but because of usage—I don't know. I haven't looked recently. Maybe number one now is ''comptroller,'' but it didn't used to be.

To the Comptroller General Dodaro, here is the letter that 22 of us sent yesterday: ''As you know, on November 20, 2014, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson, issued a series of memoranda affecting federal immigration law. Included in the new DHS policy directives was an order to extend and expand the existing Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, as well as an order to establish a new program that provides work authorization permits to an estimated five million undocumented immigrants residing in the United States. This new program was termed, 'Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents,' or DAPA.

''U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services is the federal agency that adjudicates applications for immigration benefits. This agency's website claims a workforce of 19,000 people operating throughout 223 offices worldwide with an annual operating budget of $4 billion. This agency is very unique from many other agencies. According to its own FY16 USCIS Budget Request, 96.8% of the agency's annual operating budget comes from fees collected from applicants for most types of immigration benefits, from petitions to sponsor relatives or employees, to replacement green cards, to naturalization applications. These fee-based revenues appear to be considered 'permanently appropriated' mandatory funds compared to annual discretionary appropriations which apply to federal agencies. As a result, this permanently appropriated mandatory spending allotment for USCIS falls outside the annual appropriations process.

□ 1400

''While Congress determines the categories of aliens that are to be admitted into the United States, it does not always set the fees USCIS charges or constructively control how USCIS allocates its resources. This fee-generated portion of its annual budget, translating to $3.874 billion in FY16, appears to be completely fungible. That is, this money, raised for one purpose can perhaps be used for other purposes. This arrangement creates the potential for USCIS to, in effect, create slush funds and skim off congressionally authorized fees imposed on legal immigrants and their sponsors in order to fund programs that may not be specifically authorized by Congress. Mr. Joseph Moore, the Chief Financial Officer of USCIS, testified in a Senate hearing on March 3, 2015, that the agency determines the fees it charges based on a practice known as activity-based costing. Thus, transaction fees are proportional to the amount of time and resources to fulfill that transaction. However, records indicate that USCIS has a carry-over balance from excess revenues at the end of FY14 of approximately $1.27 billion. Mr. Moore claimed that he seeks to maintain a rolling reserve balance of about $600 million to cover unexpected costs and surge activity. He further stated that funds from

this account helped USCIS handle early spending in response to the executive actions. Eventually, new fees paid by illegal immigrant applicants are intended to replenish that account, plus cover all the new costs. What is not clear is why or how this agency has built up reserves of more than twice the amount it says it aims to keep for contingency requirements. This draws scrutiny as to how long this practice has occurred, for what reasons, what can or cannot be done with that money and, ultimately, how Congress can effectively conduct oversight.

''Experts refer to this arrangement where an agency can skim off, or 'tax,' certain types of applications in order to fund others as 'cross-subsidization.' Currently, fees from legal immigrants and their sponsors subsidize refugee and asylum applications, military naturalizations, the anti-fraud division, and other activities—with 'other activities' being very broadly defined.''

So we go on and ask for the Comptroller General to audit the Department of Homeland Security because we haven't gotten truthful answers, and we haven't gotten complete answers.

It appears we have a shadow government in existence that can go across the river and lease or purchase, spend tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars, millions of dollars—we don't know—without any accountability to anybody.

It moves toward being like a Kafka novel of just a completely unaccountable mammoth government that no individual can ever take on. That was never the intention of the Founders, nor those who have given their lives throughout the history of this, the greatest country in the history of the world.

We are calling for an audit. We are asking the GAO to audit USCIS and find out critically needed answers. Homeland security agencies continue to be hindered by leadership that breaks the law and ignores the Constitution while using highly suspect spending practices. It has got to stop, and we have to know exactly what they are doing so that we can get them back with acting within the constitutional requisites.

The Department of Homeland Security has been so obsessed, as directed by the President, with having open borders and bringing in illegal immigrants. As one border patrolman told me: We, in homeland security, are called logistics by the drug cartels, the gangs, all those people that bring in illegal aliens into the United States.

Like the commercial that is widely seen on television, the logistics they are referring to are the fact that they can bring people into the United States illegally, the drug cartels and the gangs, for a huge, whopping fee.

Once they get them in to the United States, they can count on Homeland Security to spend this money that many trying to do things the right way, the legal way, are paying to have their immigration, their visa application, expedited.

We don't know where those expedited fees are going, but their visas, their applications are not really being expedited, so it would appear probably the Homeland Security Department is taking fees that are being paid for one thing by people wanting to do things the right way, the legal way, the constitutional way, and Homeland Security is subverting the law and the Constitution and spending it on people who keep coming in, pouring in naturally, illegally, because they are taken care of.

Homeland Security will ship them around the country. All you have to do is come in, we will give you a hearing date some years in the future, ship you off, and don't worry about showing up for your hearings.

How long can a country last doing these kinds of absurd governmental actions? It is insane. The book that will be written about the rise and fall of the United States will be very easy to write. These things are not new.

They are very predictable that, when a country starts ignoring the law, then it becomes lawless, and it is not long before the people take up that position and the country becomes a terrible place to live.

This country became the greatest country in the history of the world—more freedoms, more personal assets. Now, we see that being frittered away by a government that is being allowed to do so, and at the same time, the head of the government still may have around 50 percent approval rating.

It is, once again, making very clear the old adage is true: democracy ensures a people are governed no better than they deserve.

America, as at least 50 percent sits on their hands, they are okay with total disregard of the Constitution. One survey found there were more, I believe, college students that could name the Three Stooges but could not name the three branches of government, and they are eligible to vote.

Well, if that is the way you educate the generations coming up to vote, then you will, once again, get the government you deserve.

Well, because the Department of Homeland Security has been taking funds paid by people trying to do things legally, do them the right way, and subverting them for uses for those who are wanting to act illegally or have acted illegally. They haven't been able to pay enough attention to securing our homeland, which was originally their charter.

I didn't think we needed a Department of Homeland Security. I thought it was another huge bureaucracy that was created before I got to Congress in the name of, Gee, let's help all these agencies work together. Well, it hasn't done that. It has just added another level of bureaucracy.

We get this report. This is from The Washington Times, dated Tuesday, April 14, that:

''The Islamic State terror group is operating a camp in the northern Mexican state of Chihuahua, just eight miles from the U.S. border, Judicial Watch reported Tuesday.

''Citing sources that include a 'Mexican Army field grade officer and a Mexican Federal Police Inspector,' the conservative watchdog group reported that the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL, is organizing only a few miles from El Paso, Texas, in the Anapra neighborhood of Juarez and in Puerto Palomas.

''Judicial Watch sources said 'coyotes' working for the notorious Juarez Cartel are smuggling Islamic State terrorists across the U.S. border between the New Mexico cities of Santa Teresa and Sunland Park, as well as 'through the porous border between Acala and Fort Hancock, Texas.'

'' 'These specific areas were targeted for exploitation by ISIS because of their understaffed municipal and county police forces, and the relative safehavens the areas provide for the unchecked large-scale drug smuggling that was already ongoing,' Judicial Watch reported.

''Mexican intelligence sources say the Islamic State intends to exploit the railways and airport facilities in the vicinity of Santa Teresa, New Mexico.

'' 'The sources also say that ISIS has ''spotters'' located in the East Potrillo Mountains of New Mexico (largely managed by the Bureau of Land Management)' ''—I would submit mismanaged—'' 'to assist with terrorist border crossing operations,' Judicial Watch reported. 'ISIS is conducting reconnaissance of regional universities; the White Sands Missile Range; government facilities in Alamogordo, NM; Ft. Bliss; and the electrical power facilities near Anapra and Chaparral, NM.' ''

There were some reports then that: Oh, Judicial Watch had it wrong. There is really nobody from ISIS in Mexico. There is no threat. Then this report came out today from our friends at Judicial Watch, April 16, 2015:

''Responding to Judicial Watch's report earlier this week of ISIS activity along the Mexican border, Federal Bureau of Investigation supervisors called a 'special' meeting at the U.S. Consulate in Ciudad Juarez.

''A high-level intelligence source, who must remain anonymous for safety reasons''—let me insert parenthetically, what that means is, if you don't get that—and I sure do because I have people tell me about problems in the executive branch and Homeland Security, Justice, and Intelligence.

What we find is this administration has prosecuted more people they called whistleblowers than every administration put together in the history of the country. What I know is if you have information that exposes corruption or illegal or improper action by leaders in this administration, they are coming after you and calling you a whistleblower, and they will convene a grand jury, as they have done, and one is

right now in Atlanta going on. They are coming after you if you can expose impropriety in this government, so that is why this says what it does in the article.

''The meeting was convened specifically to address a press strategy to deny Judicial Watch's accurate reporting and identify who is providing information to JW. FBI supervisory personnel met with Mexican Army officers and Mexican Federal Police officials, according to JW's intelligence source. The FBI liaison officers regularly assigned to Mexico were not present at the meeting and conspicuously absent were representatives from the Department of Homeland Security. It is not clear why DHS did not participate.''

Again, parenthetically to the article, since I have known of the sector of Homeland Security not being truthful in testifying before our Judiciary Committee, then if I were the FBI and I were trying to get to the bottom of something, the last people I would tell are people at Homeland Security at the top, I trust the ones I know at the bottom, but not the ones at the top.

So perhaps the head of the FBI is realizing we have such big problems in Homeland Security.

□ 1415

For example, when I complained to Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano, You have given a secret security clearance to a person who was a featured speaker about the Ayatollah Khomeini being the man of vision for the 20th century, a man that thinks the Holy Land Foundation, convicted of over 100 counts of supporting terrorism, was improperly prosecuted, who ended up tweeting last August that the caliphate was going to happen, so you might as well get used to it.

Well, I wouldn't trust them either. The FBI apparently doesn't. Publicly, U.S. and Mexico have denied that Islamic terrorists are operating in the southern border region, but the rapid deployment of FBI brass in the aftermath of Judicial Watch's report seems to indicate otherwise.

A Mexican Army field grade officer and a Mexican Federal police inspector were among the sources that confirmed to Judicial Watch that ISIS is operating a camp just a few miles from El Paso, Texas. The base is around 8 miles from the United States border in an area known as Anapra, situated just west of Ciudad Juarez, in the Mexican State of Chihuahua.

Another ISIS cell to the west of Ciudad Juarez, in Puerto Palomas, targets the New Mexico towns of Columbus and Deming for easy access to the United States, the same knowledgeable sources confirm.

During the course of a joint operation last week, Mexican Army and Federal law enforcement officials discovered documents in Arabic and Urdu, as well as plans of Fort Bliss, the sprawling military installation that houses the U.S. Army's 1st Armored Division. Muslim prayer rugs were recovered with the documents during the operation.

The administration can deny and they can say, Oh, this is these crazy people in Congress or Judicial Watch, when the truth is that the more time that goes on, the more we are proved right on everything Judicial Watch has been claiming, the things that we have been asserting, the things that we have been saying we have to wake up about because this is a time of danger.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the original point, this is the danger that arises when government begins to think of itself as God and infallible, and it is time for those who think that to fall, it is time for the people to wake up and demand better because, the minute a majority of American people demand better government, they will get it.

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

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PERRY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a death in the family.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 17, 2015, at 10:30 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1156. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2012 Report to Congress on Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Activities — Community Economic Development and Rural Community Development Programs, pursuant to Sec. 680(c) of the Community Services Block Grant Act of 1981, Pub. L. 97-35, as amended by the Community Opportunities, Accountability, and Training and Educational Services Act of 1998; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1157. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the first report to Congress on the National Agriculture and Food Defense Strategy, as mandated in the Food and Drug Administration's Food Safety Modernization Act of 2011, Pub. L. 111-353; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1158. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Pakistan, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-05; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1159. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of proposed lease of communications equipment to the Government of Honduras, pursuant to Sec. 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 01-15; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1160. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of proposed lease of communications equipment to the Government of Colombia, pursuant to Sec. 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 02-15; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1161. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1162. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1163. A letter from the Associate Commissioner/Equal Employment Opportunity Director, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1164. A letter from the Chairman, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1165. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Tripoli (HLLL) Flight Information Region (FIR); Extension of Expiration Date [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0246; Amdt. No.: 91-321B] (RIN: 2120-AK70) received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1166. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Coaldale, NV [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0871; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AWP-8] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1167. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31004; Amdt. No.: 3631] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1168. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31005; Amdt. No.: 3632] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1169. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31006; Amdt. No.: 3633] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1170. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31007; Amdt. No.: 3634] received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1171. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0229; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-186-AD; Amendment 39-18123; AD 2015-06-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1172. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0619; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-029-AD; Amendment 39-18124; AD 2015-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1173. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1032; Directorate Identifier 2012- NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-18122; AD 2015-06-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1174. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, National Cemetery Administration, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reimbursement for Caskets and Urns for Burial of Unclaimed Remains in a National Cemetery (RIN: 2900-AO99) received April 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1175. A letter from the Chairman, National Health Care Workforce Commission, transmitting a letter describing the status of the National Health Care Workforce Commission; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

## 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. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. REED, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 1830. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and to require the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to develop water planning instruments consistent with State law; 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. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1831. A bill to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 1832. A bill to provide for the permanent funding of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1833. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include guidance on how dependent students with parents without SSNs may obtain Federal student assistance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 1834. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit certain E-2 nonimmigrant investors to adjust status to lawful permanent resident status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 1835. A bill to establish an employee stock ownership plan for air traffic control personnel; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1836. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with State and local governments to provide for the continued operation of public land, open air monuments and memorials, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System during a lapse in appropriations, 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. ISSA (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 1837. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to enhance the security and efficiency of nationwide mail and parcel delivery; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 1838. A bill to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, to designate additional components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1839. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RIGELL (for himself, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1840. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and gas Lease Sale 220 as soon as practicable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1841. A bill to amend section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, known as the Volcker Rule, to exclude certain debt securities of collateralized loan obligations from the prohibition against acquiring or retaining an ownership interest in a hedge fund or private equity fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FARR, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. KNIGHT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income payments under the Indian Health Service Loan Repayment Program and certain amounts received under the Indian Health Professions Scholarships Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 1843. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to improve access to supportive services and community coordination for families of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1844. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate high priority corridors on

the National Highway System in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VELA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1845. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant family of members of the uniformed services temporary annual leave during the deployment of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 1846. A bill to provide for sustainable highway funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 1847. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Commodity Exchange Act to repeal the indemnification requirements for regulatory authorities to obtain access to swap data required to be provided by swaps entities under such Acts; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1848. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 1849. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diagnosis and treatment of hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia, 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 Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1850. A bill to protect Federal employees and visitors, improve the security of Federal facilities, authorize and modernize the Federal Protective Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1851. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to apply certain annuity benefits to Federal Protective Service law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KEATING, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for increasing research activities, to increase such credit for amounts paid or incurred for qualified research occurring in the United States, and to increase the domestic production activities deduction for the manufacture of property substantially all of the research and development of which occurred in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1853. A bill to direct the President to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the International Criminal Police Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 1854. A bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HANNA, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1855. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow deductions and credits relating to expenditures in connection with marijuana sales conducted in compliance with State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1856. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the National Labor Relations Act to protect the health benefits of retirees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1857. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Major Dominic S. Gentile of the United States Army Air Forces for acts of valor during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 1858. A bill to promote the tracing of firearms used in crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1859. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pediatric subspecialists in the National Health Service Corps program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1860. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to publish information on the provision of health care by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 1861. A bill to stop motorcycle checkpoint funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 1862. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct outreach to veterans regarding the effect of delayed payments of claims for emergency medical care furnished by non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical providers by the Chief Business Office and to direct the Secretary to submit to Congress an annual report regarding such delayed payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1863. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to expand the Veterans Choice Program to veterans who would otherwise receive medical care from a deficient medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 1864. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to designate a single senior official of the Department of Defense to procure wideband satellite communications necessary to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. FARR, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 1865. A bill to designate certain Federal lands in California as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 1866. A bill to establish a grant program in the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to fund the establishment of centers of excellence to support research, development and planning, implementation, and evaluation of effective programs in financial literacy education for young people and families ages 8 through 24 years old, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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 Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 1867. A bill to encourage benchmarking and disclosure of energy information for commercial buildings; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1868. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to follow certain procedures in placing a child who has been removed from the custody of his or her parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES,

Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 1869. A bill to provide for transparency and reporting related to direct and indirect costs incurred by the Bonneville Power Administration, the Western Area Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southeastern Power Administration related to compliance with any Federal environmental laws impacting the conservation of fish and wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1870. A bill to authorize Energy Innovation Hubs; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1871. A bill to authorize a nuclear physics program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1872. A bill to authorize Energy Frontier Research Centers; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. WOODALL (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 1873. A bill to eliminate the use of the frank for mail transmitted by Members of Congress and Congressional officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1874. A bill to amend the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding school library media specialists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 1875. A bill to extend the Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund and to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to accept certain documents as proof of service in determining the eligibility of a person to receive amounts from such Fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1876. A bill to recognize a primary measure of national unemployment for purposes of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1877. A bill to amend section 520J of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1878. A bill to require servicers to establish a deed-for-lease program under which eligible mortgagors may remain in their homes as renters; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1879. A bill to allow homeowners facing foreclosure to avoid deficiency judgments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 1880. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1881. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to secure the rights of visual artists to copyright, to provide for resale royalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOLD, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HARDY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 1882. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1883. A bill to improve the process by which the Librarian of Congress considers requests for exemptions to section 1201(a)(1)(A) of title 17, United States Code, and to ease restrictions on the use of certain statutory exemptions to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1884. 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 Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to cap rural post office closures at no more than 5 percent of total closures in any given year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1886. A bill to amend section 1341 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal the funding mechanism for the transitional reinsurance program in the individual market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend certain appropriation Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1888. A bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.J. Res. 45. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution recognizing the need to improve physical access to many federally funded facilities for all people of the United States, particularly people with disabilities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. NEAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FARR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network's (GLSEN) National Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools; 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 Mrs. TORRES:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BERA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DOLD, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. DENT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIMES,

Mr. NOLAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. FATTAH):

H. Res. 207. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding establishing a National Strategic Agenda; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, 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. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H. Res. 208. A resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals should be protected from discrimination under the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Mr. VEASEY):

H. Res. 209. A resolution deploring the actions of the Palestinian Authority to join the International Criminal Court and undertake legal action through the Court against Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HUNTER introduced A bill (H.R. 1889) for the relief of Roberto Luis Dunoyer Mejia, Consuelo Cardona Molina, Camilo Dunoyer Cardona, and Pablo Dunoyer Cardona; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4 Section 3 Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which states the Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 1833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 1834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 1835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 1838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Section 8 U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: 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. RIGELL:

H.R. 1840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution: ''The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 1842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 1843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14—To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and 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. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states 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 . . .

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 1846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have the 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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to ''regulate commerce . . . among the several States . . .''.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 1848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 1849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 1852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.'' Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, ''to promote the general welfare.''

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 1853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass tax legislation. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that ''Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .'' (Section 8, Clause 1). This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 1857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 1858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. II, Sec. 3, Cl. 3 (''[The President] shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed[.]''); US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 (''Congress shall have the power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.'')(This bill would instruct the Attorney General to give preferential treatment to police forces that meet certain criteria when distributing grant money, therefore this bill is a valid exercise of Congressional authroity per the Necessary and Proper Clause provided the Attorney General's duties, as an agent of the President, to enforce federal law and punish criminal wrongdoing).

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 1859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 1864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 enumerates to Congress the power 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''.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 and Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 1867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3. (Commerce Clause) The Commerce Clause give Congress the power to ''regulate commerce . . . among the several States.'' If the matter in question is not purely a local matter or if it has an impact on inter-state commerce, then it falls within Congress' powers. National Federal of Independent Business v. Sebilius. (2012).

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WOODALL:

H.R. 1873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and Clause 7, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 1875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1 and 18

''The Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . .''.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 1877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

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 Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1878.

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 Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1879.

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 Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1880.

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. NADLER:

H.R. 1881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, sec. 8, cl. 3 (commerce clause), cl. 8 (copyright clause), and cl. 18 (necessary and proper clause).

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 1882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 1885.

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 establish Post Offices and post Roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 1886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sections 8 and 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which provides Congress the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 45.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution: ''The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . .''

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills as follows:

H.R. 12: Ms. GRAHAM and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 24: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 91: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 126: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 131: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 200: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 213: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 224: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 232: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 251: Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 282: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 292: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 306: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 343: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 348: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 353: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 366: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 372: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 379: Mr. DENT and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 413: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 463: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 501: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 539: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 540: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 564: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 586: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 592: Mr. DENT, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 595: Mr. NUNES, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 605: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 612: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 665: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 703: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 704: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 707: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 767: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 789: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 793: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 815: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 831: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 832: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 836: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 837: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 865: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 868: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 879: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 927: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 928: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 970: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 986: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 1002: Mr. KLINE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1042: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1062: Mr. KLINE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1073: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1142: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1145: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1151: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1170: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1171: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1178: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 1187: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1193: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1202: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1211: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1212: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1218: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1220: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HARPER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1256: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1267: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1286: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1287: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1288: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1300: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1306: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1308: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1378: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1389: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1427: Mr. POCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1434: Mr. WELCH, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1436: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1437: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1438: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1441: Mr. HIGGINS and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1454: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1462: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1464: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1474: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1476: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 1478: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1516: Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HANNA, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1519: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1534: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1541: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1552: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1559: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1568: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1574: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1578: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1590: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1598: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1605: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1608: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1610: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1612: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1618: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1624: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LONG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1635: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1642: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1653: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1660: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARR, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1661: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1664: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 1667: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1669: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1671: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 1674: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1676: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1680: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1684: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 1690: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1714: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1717: Mr. DOLD, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1732: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 1737: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1752: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1762: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1782: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 1784: Mr. TURNER and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1806: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1807: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.J. Res. 42: Mr. YOHO.
H.J. Res. 43: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. MULLIN.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H. Res. 54: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 123: Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 140: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H. Res. 182: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 194: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2015 No. 55

# Senate

The Senate met at 10 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.

Immortal God, You rule the Earth with goodness. Great and marvelous are Your works. Help us so to live that we can be Your instruments for good in our world. Lord, fill our hearts with Your peace and undergird us with the unfolding of Your loving providence.

Bless our Senators. Enlighten and illumine them that they may know You and Your precepts. Touch their lips so that they may speak no words that grieve You. Give them faith for every challenge, strength for every temptation, and wisdom for every perplexity.

We pray in Your majestic Name. Amen.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

## RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The majority leader is recognized.

## HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, human trafficking affects every State in this Nation—every single one of them. In Kentucky we have heard reports of victims as young as 2 months old—2-month-old victims of human trafficking. We heard about a Kentuckian who said she was sold for sex from the age of 5 until she was able to physically break free as an adult. Stories such as these may shock the conscience, but they are hardly unique in our country.

The Judiciary Committee recently heard the story of Aviva, who was barely a teenager when she was kidnapped and forced into modern slavery. Listen to this. Aviva was sold to as many as 10 different men a night. Freedom was stolen from her, innocence ripped away. Aviva's trafficker tried to stamp out everything that made Aviva Aviva. Aviva even forgot what it felt like to be human anymore.

Democrats have said they were in favor of helping victims such as Aviva. Democrats demanded that I bring the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act to the floor. But now that the very legislation is here on the floor, our Democratic friends seem to have changed their tune completely—a totally different tune. Now that they have a chance to actually help the victims, they decided they are more concerned about a few sentences in the bill—a provision they seemed perfectly fine with until just recently. They are more concerned about those few sentences than actually solving the problem the bill would address.

Now, this provision has been included in countless bills they have voted for and cosponsored. It is language they were perfectly happy to endorse again in another bill this very week—2 days ago. But that bill was designed to help doctors, not children enslaved by sex traffickers. So it is OK to vote for that kind of language if you are trying to help doctors, but not OK to vote for that kind of language if you are trying to help these poor young children. Obviously our Democratic friends think that doctors are worthy of their help. What about the victims of modern slavery?

Now, the rationale for this filibuster seems to shift by the day, and it is almost incomprehensible. Their foremost concern seems to be about treating this specific kind of money this way, versus treating that specific kind of money that way. It is hard to follow; isn't it? Focusing all their attention not on the victims of these crimes but on financial assessments levied on the people who perpetrate them—the traffickers.

Honestly, I am not sure why anyone would think money collected from criminals ought to get more consideration than money collected from law-abiding taxpayers. What a strange argument. But this is where they have planted their flag. That ridiculous argument is where they have planted their flag.

Their contention is essentially that the victims of trafficking should get no help at all because Democrats say the money they would receive might be considered ''private'' and that this bill should not pass, therefore, because the bipartisan Hyde principles it contains might apply to those private funds. If that argument sounds contrived and illogical to you, you are not alone.

Now we find out it is not even true. Let me repeat that. The very heart of the Democrats' argument isn't even true. That is what the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service told us just yesterday.

So I would ask my Democratic friends to listen to this closely. CRS, the Congressional Research Service, answered some very straightforward questions posed by the senior Senator from Texas, my friend and colleague Senator CORNYN. Here is what they said to Senator CORNYN: Money deposited in the General Treasury from traffickers, as the Federal law requires, is Federal money, according to CRS.

So let me repeat. The Democrats have been blocking an antislavery bill over money they call private, and they are not even correct about this. Our Democratic colleagues have also blocked this bill because they say Hyde has only applied to annual spending or

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

appropriations—not mandatory spending. It is another argument that the Congressional Research Service tells us is simply not true—not true.

The experts at CRS say Hyde has applied to mandatory spending of Federal funds out of the General Treasury, as the Cornyn amendment provides. And CRS concludes that Hyde just applied to mandatory spending in the very doc fix bill that 100 percent of our Democratic friends voted for 2 days ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the CRS memorandum be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I ask my Democratic friends to stop this. Stop this. Take a breath and think about what is being done. Children are being sold into sexual slavery, having their freedom and self-respect ripped away. Will they finally allow the Senate to help them or will they continue some debunked crusade?

We have offered several compromises to address the concerns they have raised. We will soon vote on another one that Senator CORNYN has been offering. He has been reaching out to our Democrat friends for weeks now to try to find a solution to this nonproblem. The findings of CRS make it clear that we are doing nothing extraordinary or unusual here. We are simply applying long-accepted principles that Americans overwhelmingly support. Most people would think that sounds pretty reasonable. It is time to get serious and pass this important legislation.

A large, bipartisan majority of the Senate has already voted repeatedly to approve this bill. With the support of a couple more courageous Democrats, we can bring an end to this debunked filibuster today.

The victims who survive brutal abuse don't need more of our friends' illogical contortions and justifications. They just need help, and they need it now. They need the help the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act would provide.

Why don't we finally get around to fixing this problem? The time to do that is now.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM

APRIL 15, 2015.

To: Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

From: Edward C. Liu, Legislative Attorney; Jon O. Shimabukuro, Legislative Attorney.

Subject: Analysis of S.Amdt. 1120 to S. 178.

This memorandum responds on an expedited basis to your request for an analysis of specific questions you have posed regarding a draft amendment denoted ''ALB15639'' which appears to be identical to S.Amdt. 1120 to S. 178. Your questions have been reproduced below verbatim followed by our responses.

''1. DOES THE TEXT OF ALB15639 REQUIRE ALL SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS TO BE DEPOSITED IN THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND?''

Yes. Section 3302(b) of Title 31 of the United States Code, also known as the miscellaneous receipts statute, requires that all money received for the federal government must be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury unless disposition of the receipts is otherwise specified by law. S. 178, as amended by S.Amdt. 1120 does not appear to specify a different treatment for the assessments received.

The new §3014(d) created by S.Amdt. 1120 would specify that ''consistent with [the miscellaneous receipts statute], there shall be transferred to the [Domestic Trafficking Victims'] Fund from the General Fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section, which shall remain available until expended.'' The transfer of funds from the General Fund does not affect the disposition of the assessments in a way that would supersede the miscellaneous receipts statute, though the end result for the respective balances of the General Fund and the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund appears to be mathematically equal to directly depositing the assessments into the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund. The conclusion that the assessments are deposited into the General Fund is reinforced by the clause requiring that the transfer occur ''consistent with'' the miscellaneous receipts statute.

''2. ONCE THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS IN ALB15369 ARE DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND, WOULD THEY BE CLASSIFIED AS FEDERAL FUNDS?''

Yes, amounts in the General Fund are considered ''federal funds'' by the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB''). In the Analytical Perspectives volume of the Budget for FY2016, OMB provides background information on budget accounts. This information would seem to be instructive for determining how funds, i.e., amounts, in the Treasury account will be classified. OMB observes:

When money is received by the federal government, it is credited to a budget account, . . . . All budget accounts belong to one of two groups of funds: federal funds and trust funds. . . . The federal funds group includes the ''general fund,'' the largest fund in the government used for the general purposes of government and special funds and revolving funds, both of which receive dedicated collections for spending on specific purposes. Where the law requires that federal fund collections be dedicated to a particular program, the collections and associated disbursements are recorded in special fund receipt and expenditure accounts. . . . Money in a special fund must be appropriated before it can be obligated and spent. The majority of special fund collections are derived from the government's power to impose taxes or fines, or otherwise compel payment.

''3. DO PRECEDENTS EXIST FOR APPLYING THE HYDE AMENDMENT TO MANDATORY SPENDING FROM THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND?''

Yes. Mandatory spending can be generally defined as federal spending which is controlled by laws other than appropriations acts. In recent years the Hyde Amendment has included a clause extending its scope to trust funds to which money was appropriated in that same annual appropriations act. For example, the consolidated appropriations act for FY2015 includes a Hyde Amendment with this clause, and also appropriates funds from the General Fund to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund. The Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund is used to pay for services provided to Medicare beneficiaries under Part A of the program. Because these payments from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund are controlled by the Social Security Act and are considered to be mandatory spending, this would appear to constitute an example of mandatory spending that was subject to the versions of the Hyde Amendment.

''4. IS NOT THE LANGUAGE IN SECTION 221(C) OF H.R. 2 (HYDE LANGUAGE IN HOUSE-PASSED SGR LEGISLATION) ATTACHED TO MANDATORY SPENDING FROM THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND ?''

Yes. Section 221(a) of H.R. 2 amends §10503 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) which appropriates funds to the Community Health Center Fund (CHC Fund) for certain fiscal years, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Section 221 extends the funding provided in §10503 for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. Pursuant to §10503, amounts in the CHC Fund are available until expended, and are to be used by the Secretary to increase funding of community health centers and the National Health Service Corps. Subsection 221(c) of H.R. 2 further provides that:

Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section for fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017 are subject to the requirements contained in Public Law 113–235 for funds for programs authorized under sections 330 through 340 of the Public Health Service Act.

On its face, this restriction would appear to apply to the amounts appropriated to the CHC Fund for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. The spending of funds appropriated for those fiscal years would appear to be controlled by §10503 of ACA, and would not appear to be controlled by an appropriations act. Therefore, spending from the CHC Fund would appear to be classified as mandatory spending subject to the restriction in subsection 221(c) of H.R. 2.

''5. IS THE LANGUAGE ON PAGE 4, LINES 8–14 OF ALB15639 (HYDE LANGUAGE) ALSO ATTACHED TO MANDATORY SPENDING FROM THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND''

Yes. The new 18 U.S.C. §3014(e)(3), as added by S.Amdt. 1120, states that:

Amounts transferred from the [Domestic Trafficking Victims'] Fund pursuant to this section for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019 are subject to the requirements contained in Public Law 113–235 for funds for programs authorized under sections 330 through 340 of the Public Health Service Act.

S.Amdt. 1120 further provides that amounts in the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund shall be used by the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to award grants or enhance victims' programming, ''without further appropriation.'' This provision is found in an authorizing measure which amends Title 18 of the United States Code, and not an appropriations act.

Therefore, using the same definition of mandatory spending as provided above, the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund would appear to be mandatory spending that is subject to the restrictions in the new 18 U.S.C. §3014(e)(3) that would be added by S.Amdt. 1120.

## RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

## HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am not an expert in the field of etymology, which is the study of the origin of words, but I do find the origin of English words to be enlightening. For example, the word ''govern'' is one we hear often in the Capitol. ''Govern'' is derived from the Greek word meaning ''to steer or pilot

a ship.'' The most important question for a party in power is simply this: Can you govern? I say this to my Republican friends. In other words, can you steer the ship? Can you pilot this great Nation of ours in the right direction?

We are just over 100 days in this Republican-controlled Congress, and it is already clear that the Republican leader and his side have not been up to the task. One need look no further than the Republicans' botched handling of the human trafficking bill before the Senate.

I would just say in partial response to my friend the Republican leader that I have never been a big fan of polling—political polling or any kind of polling—because you can get any answer you want by asking the right question. Of course, the Republican leader, in the questions submitted to the Congressional Research Service, asked the wrong questions.

The majority leader and the assistant majority leader took a piece of legislation and steered it right into the rocks. The ship has sprung many leaks. All Democrats and Republicans support the provisions of this bill to help the victims of sexual trafficking and hold the offenders accountable, but instead of legislating on common ground, the Republicans are legislating to obstruct. When they were in the minority, all they did was obstruct. So they know how to do that. I vouch for that. One of the things I said was that we are not going to treat them the way they treated us. And we haven't done that.

The Republicans, now in the majority, can't filibuster themselves so they are resorting to tanking good legislation—bills they themselves wrote and support—in order to score some type of political point. Does that seem like reasonable governance to anyone? I don't think so.

Yesterday, I sat listening to the majority leader—and I did today—claiming that they are seeking a compromise, even saying that Republicans have offered three compromises. Well, if we are just going on the number of offers made, we have done 10. We have made 10 good-faith offers to get this human trafficking bill on the right path. We have tried and tried and tried to reach an agreement. We have done 10. I will mention just a few.

We proposed that they strip the Hyde language from the bill. Then we proposed the Leahy substitute, which would strip the Hyde language and also include LEAHY's Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and Senator KLOBUCHAR's Stop Exploitation through Trafficking Act, which would strengthen the legislation. Then we proposed to use the entire trafficking bill passed by the House instead of the Cornyn bill. That is the bill the House passed. Let's bring it to the floor here and pass it. We even proposed to keep the Cornyn fund but use it only for law enforcement efforts to help catch sex traffickers and use the House bill's authorization for victims services, including health care.

But Republicans would not agree to any of those changes. They simply are not interested in getting to ''yes.'' This morning, I heard some talk that maybe we can work something out. I hope that, in fact, is true. I hope they are not using this urgently needed trafficking bill to continue to push through the party's backward agenda relating to women's health.

The Hyde language—I served in the House of Representatives more than 30 years ago. I served with Congressman Hyde, a fine man. If there ever were anyone who looked like a public servant, it was Henry Hyde—big man, beautiful white hair, great speaking voice. He, this good Congressman, is responsible for the Hyde language. It has been in bills since then, but it applied and has always applied to government money, taxpayer money—taxpayer money.

What we have said over the last couple of weeks time and time again is that Hyde should not be expanded to cover nontaxpayer dollars. That is what this is all about. We are not going to bend on that issue. It is not right. We do not need to expand Hyde. We think the Republicans believe this is a way to pacify the right-to-life community, some of these—not all but some of these ideologues out there who want to expand Hyde. We are not going to allow that to happen. Hyde should apply to taxpayer-funded money and nothing else.

What has taken place on the direction of human trafficking is an effort to obfuscate—to hide the real purpose of the legislation. We all agree that human trafficking should stop. This legislation we have before us is a step in the right direction. We want to support that legislation.

My friend the Republican leader said: Well, all they are complaining about is a sentence or so. Well, that is why people spend all these years going to law school, taking contracts courses. That is why my friend the assistant Republican leader, who served as a trial court judge, a supreme court justice—during his entire career, he dealt with lawyers coming to him talking about sentences in a contract or sentences in a piece of legislation. That is what this is all about.

We should eliminate those sentences that allow Hyde to be expanded to nontaxpayer money. We cannot allow that to happen.

So, over 100 days into this Congress, we should move forward and get this bill done. It is time that, on this legislation, Republicans right the ship. If human trafficking legislation is any indication, Republicans have not had a desire to govern dependably. I think that is unfair.

I hope this cloture vote will be defeated. I hope at that time people will finally come to the realization that we are willing to do whatever needs to be done to change this language so that the Hyde language is not applied to taxpayer dollars. If that is the case, we can move forward expeditiously.

## 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 by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

McConnell (for Cornyn) amendment No. 1120, to strengthen the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act by incorporating additional bipartisan amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Texas

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote at 11 a.m. this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### 100TH DAY OF THE NEW CONGRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am an optimistic person. As a matter of fact, I think everybody from Texas is an optimist. Can you imagine the challenges the people who founded our State had—Indians, wide-open hostile territory, tough weather. But they persevered because they were optimists. They thought the fight was worth the struggle. They thought the goal and the accomplishment—the hope for accomplishment—was worth the struggle.

I still remain optimistic—despite the last few weeks that have challenged that optimism—that we will actually break through here and get to consider and vote on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act and get help to the people whom the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, described, the children who cannot help themselves. I mean, for heaven's sake, if we cannot help the most vulnerable people in our country—children who cannot help themselves, who are the victims of modern-day slavery—what in the world can we do?

So we have marked 100 days here in the Senate with the new Republican majority. As I look back, I do not think anybody can deny that under the majority leader's stewardship we have had some significant accomplishments in a relatively short period of time. Sure, it has been bumpy along the way. The Keystone XL Pipeline was a significant bump in the road. But we had a strong bipartisan vote. Unfortunately, the President decided to veto that legislation.

After years of this Chamber being used solely for the purpose of messaging and conducting political show votes, we are actually starting to get

some things done. It is pretty exciting. As somebody who has been here since 2002, it is hard to believe, when I say that, that I have actually been here during different phases and cycles of the Senate operating. I have to tell you that the last 4 years or so has been a dark period, a stain on the reputation of the Senate in terms of actually getting things done in the interests of the American people.

I understand the he said-she said and the blame game. The blame game is a world-class sport here in Washington, DC. But most of our constituents couldn't care less about the blame game; they actually want to see government function in their interest. Consistent with our principles, we are going to have some disagreements, there is no doubt about it. But they hate the dysfunction. They hate the political posturing. You know what. I do, too. I dare say that the vast majority of Senators hate the dysfunction the Senate has experienced.

So there is a new spirit of optimism and, yes, hope, not that the Age of Aquarius has suddenly broken out—peace, love and understanding and we are all going to hold hands and sing ''Kumbaya.'' That is not going to happen. But can we work together as Americans, as people who love our country, who have taken an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States, who owe a fiduciary duty to the people we represent? I represent 26.9 million people. That just staggers my imagination when I think about it, when I think about the responsibility associated with it. But I am encouraged when we have the chance to help people, especially those who cannot help themselves.

Well, one reason for my optimism about the new Congress is that we have held a lot of votes. We had 15 votes last year, 15 rollcall votes in the Congress last year. We have had about 100 in the 100 days we have been here. As a matter of fact, I have heard some of our colleagues say: I am a little tired of voting quite as much as we have, particularly on the budget vote-arama which lasted until 4 in the morning. I understand that. But, you know, we have passed a balanced budget in the Senate without raising taxes. The Congress has not passed a budget since 2009. What more fundamental, basic function of government is there than to pass a budget?

The distinguished Presiding Officer was Governor of his great State. I am absolutely confident he viewed that as one of the fundamental responsibilities of his State government and of his office in particular—to get the fiscal house in order. The way you do that is by passing a budget and determining what your priorities are—things you absolutely have to do, things you perhaps want to do but maybe have to delay, and things you simply cannot afford.

Every State, every local government, and, yes, the Federal Government should pass a budget. We will in short order. The Senate has, and now we need to reconcile our differences with the House, which we will shortly. But it is not just government; every family and every business has to work on a budget. So that is progress. I am happy about that.

On Tuesday night, we actually fixed a problem that had been nagging the Congress since 1997. Back in 1997, we, the Congress—we were not here; the Presiding Officer and I were not here. The Congress had this bright idea: We are going to save money on health care by whacking the payments we make to providers and hospitals. Well, after a while we found out that if we do not pay doctors and hospitals for treating Medicare patients, they will not see them.

So our seniors, to whom we had made a sacred promise—we will continue to make sure Medicare provides quality service and is accessible—all of a sudden, it was not quite so accessible because people could not find a doctor who would take a new Medicare patient.

That is still a problem, so we came back over the intervening years and 17 times out of the 18 times those cuts would have been imposed, Congress reversed them. We had an expression around here that unfortunately we had to use a lot; we called it the doc fix. That is an inelegant way, perhaps, of describing what we were doing, but basically what we were trying to do was preserve Medicare and access to doctors and hospitals for our seniors who are the beneficiaries of the Medicare system. That, to me, represents some progress, that we have fixed that once and for all.

Then, imagine my surprise that, after the contentious issue of congressional approval of the anticipated Iranian-U.S.—along with our allies—nuclear negotiations, this deal that could be forthcoming this summer, imagine my surprise, after the President said he would veto it, when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously passed a bill out of the committee. All Democrats voted for it. All Republicans voted for it. Oh, by the way, when the President began to count the numbers and the support in the Senate on a bipartisan basis, he said: You know what. I think I will sign that piece of legislation when it comes to my desk. I think that represents progress.

One other item that has made me somewhat optimistic on this 100th day of the new Congress is that we are very close to working out a trade deal that the President supports and I would say Republicans by and large support. Honestly, there is probably more controversy on the Democratic side than there is on the Republican side. But in a world where 80 percent of the purchasing power and 95 percent of the population exists beyond our shores, why in the world would we not want to open new markets to the stuff we grow—our farmers, our ranchers—the livestock we raise, and the things we make? I think it makes good sense.

So you can see why I, perhaps, am optimistic about this new Congress and what we have been able to do together on a bipartisan basis to make progress in the interests of the American people.

The one thing that has me completely bamboozled and befuddled is the objections over this antitrafficking legislation that had 30 cosponsors—roughly an equal number of Democrats and Republicans—and passed—sailed out of the Judiciary Committee.

My friend the Senator from Illinois, the Democratic whip, knows that the Judiciary Committee is no place for the faint of heart. We have a lot of disagreements. Maybe that is because we have a lot of lawyers on the Judiciary Committee. We fight a lot about things we believe in strongly. But this antitrafficking legislation sailed out of the Judiciary Committee on a unanimous basis.

I hope we can work out these differences, and I have made multiple suggestions and compromises in an effort to try to get everybody to yes.

I agree with the majority leader's description of the sordid, unspeakable, evil of human trafficking and the compelling reason we ought to do something to address it.

I know that is where the hearts of all of our colleagues are, but somehow we have just gotten stuck. We need to get unstuck, and I hope today will be that day. Of course, human trafficking is a plague in all 50 States, and my State, unfortunately, has way too much of its share.

I, like all of our colleagues, have had the chance to meet many of the brave victims of human trafficking. One victim I met last week in Austin is Brooke Axtell.

Our friends at Google convened a meeting in Austin. The technology community understands that a lot of the solicitation of underage girls and victims of human trafficking occurs online. So they have come together to try to work with law enforcement, work with victims' rights groups to try to come up with a comprehensive way to combat it.

At Google last week in Austin, I met Brooke Axtell, who was introduced to America when she gave a moving speech at this year's GRAMMY Awards. In Texas, she is better known for her work with a number of nonprofits that are focused on ending domestic violence and human trafficking. I can't begin to tell you how inspiring she is and her words were, particularly when you comprehend the horror, the absolute horror of what she had been through as a victim of human trafficking herself.

Starting at the age of 7—7 years old—Brooke was sexually abused. She was literally put in chains and a cage—treated like an animal—in a basement. She was repeatedly sold to men who raped and abused her.

Out of this horror that she experienced as a young child, Brooke has brought life to her pain, and I think her leadership in the antitrafficking effort has actually helped her heal. She is one brave, courageous, young woman. She founded a group called Survivor Healing and Empowerment, which is a healing community for the survivors of rape, abuse, and sex trafficking.

That is why, today, at 11 o'clock, I hope all of our colleagues listen not only to Brooke's voice and her experience, but each one of us on the floor could tell a similar story about somebody in their State, somebody they know, they have met, who would be helped by this legislation.

I hope we don't tell them no. I hope we don't shut another door in their faces.

I see some of our colleagues on the floor. I want to briefly give them a chance to speak before we vote at 11 o'clock, just to say that the underlying legislation is not partisan. It would strengthen law enforcement tools and authorities to rescue victims, while taking down the human traffickers and the criminal networks that support them. The goal is to provide at least $30 million through fines and penalties paid into the public Treasury that would then go to help heal and rescue the victims of human trafficking.

Now, this is not tax money, so it is deficit neutral. We are not raising taxes to do it. We are making the people who purchased these services, who were convicted and have to pay fines and penalties, pay to help rescue and heal the victims.

Shortly, we will vote on another compromise I have offered. I have tried to listen to the objections of our friends across the aisle—and I don't want to relitigate those because, frankly, that is not particularly productive. They seem to be locked in. I am sure they would say we are locked in, and so we are trying to find a way forward.

First, and most important, this amendment would completely replace a provision that Members on the other side have objected to regarding the application of the Hyde amendment. The amendment would replace the language or the provision negotiated by Leader PELOSI from the doc fix bill I mentioned earlier that passed the House with 392 votes; 180 House Democrats voted for this bill, including Leader PELOSI. So we have substituted that language for the original language.

Of course, in the Senate we had 92 Senators vote for that same language, and our colleagues across the aisle have repeatedly voted for similar language.

So the Pelosi language from this bill that my amendment includes would simply say any funds used to provide services for victims of human trafficking would be subject to the same requirements as funds of the Public Health and Services Act.

The majority leader has said it well: If this language is good enough to help the doctors and the hospitals, surely it is good enough to help young 7-year-old victims of human trafficking, such as Brooke Axtell.

To further clarify, to address the stated concerns of our friends across the aisle, this amendment would also clarify that all money—all the money in the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund—must be derived from the General Treasury. This is an objection I don't personally understand, but we want to make it clear—just perhaps to help our colleagues get to yes—that all of the money would be derived from the General Treasury, which, of course, is where all Federal funding comes from, and we would make clear that all of the money would be public dollars.

I don't get this because tax dollars are private dollars until you give them to the government, and then they are no longer public-private, they are public. Private penalties are private until you pay it to the government, and then it is public.

But we want to make clear, to eliminate any rationale for any objection, and say that explicitly these would be public dollars. The requirements placed on funds under the bill would not be placed on the fees and penalties. That seemed to be a matter of concern, and we tried to address that.

As I explained, the pending amendment would do what I have tried my dead-level best to do, to try to address the concerns our Democratic colleagues, who have blocked the bill so far, have continually expressed.

So the language is just the same as the doc fix, and we have made clear that none of the fines and penalties themselves—but rather funds derived from the General Treasury—would be used to pay for these services in an equivalent amount to the fines and penalties.

I would add, parenthetically, when I was talking to one of our colleagues about it, they said: Well, that is money laundering. You are taking fines and penalties and you are transferring it, you are substituting it into a general fund.

I mean, give me a break. What we are trying to do is find a solution. I think we have given our colleagues every opportunity to get to yes.

I know, because I have talked to a lot of them—including the Senator from Illinois—people want to get to yes. I hope we have found a way to do that. So I hope we will not let the political gamesmanship continue to get in the way of a bill that would bring relief and healing to victims of human trafficking.

I hope we will have that vote at 11 o'clock, and there will be broad, bipartisan support to proceed to the bill and to pass the legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time remains on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will be very brief because I see my colleague from Connecticut on the floor.

Let me say at the outset, in the most positive way, I thank Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota for their bipartisan effort to bring this issue to the floor and to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

We had a hearing in a subcommittee on this subject, and it was heartbreaking to hear about the exploitation of these young women at such a tender age. Unspeakable things were happening to them.

Sadly, in many States, when they finally came into the custody of law enforcement, some of them—some of the children—these young girls, were being charged as criminals until it was clear they had been enslaved and they had been exploited for so many years. So thinking on this subject is moving in the right direction. The suggestions of Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR are also in the right direction.

So why don't we pass this bill? We have all of this bipartisan support. One provision in this bill turns out to be fraught with controversy.

Thirty-nine years ago, a Congressman from Illinois named Henry Hyde offered compromise language on the issue of abortion. It was just a few years after Roe v. Wade. It was still very controversial. He said: We will prohibit the expenditure of taxpayer funds for abortion except in cases of rape, incest, and the life of the mother.

For 39 years, that has been the standard. There has been an uneasy truce between those who see this issue in many different ways. They have come to the conclusion this will be the standard that would be applied to the expenditure of taxpayer funds, and it is renewed year after year.

Senator CORNYN, perhaps by accident or perhaps by design, crossed the line and started talking about not taxpayer funds but funds collected in fines from those guilty of human trafficking to create a victims' fund.

That has brought all of the debate and controversy—in fairness to Senator CORNYN and to Senator MURRAY, who has joined with others in this battle, there has been an active exchange of compromise language. We have counted, I think, 12 different versions we have sent over to Senator CORNYN. He sent probably as many our way.

So it isn't as if both sides have hunkered down and are just staring one another down. There is an honest effort to find a solution. The solution would not be embodied in the vote that had been scheduled for 11 o'clock; it is the old language. But they are still working on new language, and I hope we reach a point soon where we achieve that. We all agree human trafficking should stop and victims should be compensated.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise with regret because, unfortunately, we remain divided. There is so much common ground, so many good ideas in this bill, and so much that unites us. We have so much more in common than in conflict on this bill.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act has involved so much work by great colleagues—Senator CORNYN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator MURRAY, Senator FEINSTEIN, and my colleague who has just finished speaking.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill. We are divided on one paragraph that is simply unacceptable, and it is fundamental to the goals of this bill, which is to restore human dignity and freedom to victims and survivors of human trafficking. Restoring freedom involves giving those survivors choices over whether they will bear children as a result of that trafficking. Trafficking is, fundamentally, modern-day slavery. It is sex slavery and sex exploitation, which results, all too often, in pregnancy. At its core, the human trafficking bill before us today is about restoring human dignity to those victims and survivors and enabling them to avoid the long-lasting and enduring consequences of that slavery.

This legislation is an acknowledgment of our common commitment to these survivors and to providing them the services and support they need so much. One of them is abortion. Where we are divided is on guaranteeing that reproductive right—the essence of freedom, dignity, and choice. So it is well beyond a technicality here. It is about the fundamental goals of this bill, which are contradicted by this provision in the law.

Senator CORNYN's proposed amendment changes the words of this paragraph that we find objectionable, but it doesn't change the basic substance or its practical effect. We are told the provision in question doesn't matter because it includes a rape exception, but it requires the survivor to request, to ask, to entreaty and supplicate to the State whether the rape was really rape, whether it is a pretense or they must bear a rapist's child.

We are told the provision in question is essentially the same as the Hyde amendment, but that is flatly untrue because the Hyde amendment applies to taxpayer funds. I would say to my colleague from Texas, a good friend, who is determined to address this problem of human trafficking, there are no taxpayer funds in that $30 million that is taken from criminal fines and penalties. It is an entirely different source of funds.

As a former prosecutor, I view those moneys as restitution. They come from criminals and they are used to try to support and serve the victims of that criminal activity. There is nothing more fundamental than using funds taken from criminals for the benefit of their victims. Congress has never before privileged the concerns of criminals over the rights of women, and we should not start now.

I respect my colleague from Texas and other colleagues who may differ with me on this issue. He has stated, in heartbreaking and eloquent terms, the practical human impact of trafficking, sex slavery. I ask my colleagues now to give these women the real freedom from that sex slavery. Liberate them, truly, from this heinous and horrific violation of basic human rights by guaranteeing them one of the basic human rights, which is the right to make choices about their own bodies, about their futures, about their hopes and dreams as they are liberated from this slavery. Let this Chamber and my colleagues recognize the rights they have to truly be free from those who enslave them. I urge this body to strike the Hyde language from S. 178 and to make good on its promise.

As cochair of the bipartisan Senate caucus to end human trafficking, I agree completely this cause ought to be bipartisan. It ought not to divide us along any partisan or party lines. I am proud to have worked with Members on both sides of the aisle, and I hope we can come to agreement now with my good friend and my excellent colleague Senator CORNYN and others who have worked so hard and who are so genuinely determined to solve this problem and to take a step—it is only a first step—in the direction of combating human trafficking.

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. 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, my friend and colleague Senator CORNYN has been involved in discussions with the minority about a path forward on the trafficking bill, and I would like to ask him if he is optimistic that we may be able to reach an agreement at some point in the near future about a way to go forward.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished majority leader that I am more optimistic than I have been at any time in the last few weeks. I just talked to the Democratic leader who told me there are active discussions taking place by all of the key people who can help us break this deadlock, and so I am more optimistic. We are not there yet, but we are in a much better place than I think we have been certainly in the last 3 weeks. So I am hopeful and somewhat more optimistic.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we would like to be able to process this important bill and move on to a vote on the President's nominee for Attorney General. Based upon the progress that is being made by my friend and colleague from Texas, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the cloture motion on the Cornyn amendment No. 1120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, as I have done for the last several weeks, I am back again for this week's ''Waste of the Week,'' a series of weekly speeches which points out how we can save taxpayer dollars by looking at waste, inefficiency, duplication, and other factors that are simply a waste of taxpayer money.

Because this is April and because it is just a day after that fateful day in April, April 15—and we all know what that means—our waste of the week.

Clearly, there is a growing consensus that our Tax Code is hopelessly complex, hopelessly burdensome, hopelessly anticompetitive, and needs comprehensive reform. That is not what we are here to talk about today, but I am a strong proponent of moving forward on that issue. It has been almost 30 years now—1986 was the last time a comprehensive reform was enacted by Congress. It turned out to be a tremendous stimulus to our economy. It created a boost in growth and boosted the economy in a way that provided us with the necessary funding without having to raise taxes, and, in fact, it lowered taxes because of its dynamic effect. That is an issue for another day. We will continue to try to pursue that. As a member of the Finance Committee, I know that is one of our major goals this year, as it is in the House of Representatives. Whether or not we are able to achieve our goal, we need to keep working on that.

Today, I want to talk about the waste of the week by looking at the Tax Code and doing something I think would be a relatively easy and simple way to save the taxpayer some money. It involves a refundable child tax credit. The tax laws allow a refund which is not an offset of taxes owed but an actual direct payment that occurs if you have children. The refundable child tax credit is pretty straightforward. It qualifies a taxpayer for a credit of up to $1,000 per child depending on their income level.

I am not here today to talk about the merits of that tax credit. I have supported it in the past, and I think it is something that ought to be given serious consideration in any kind of tax reform. Rather, I am here to discuss the cost to the American taxpayer due to

the improper use of payments that are made to recipients who don't legally qualify for this refundable payment.

According to the inspector general at the IRS, the Internal Revenue Service sent out at least $5.9 billion in improper payments in 2013—payments that went to people who did not legally qualify for the benefit.

Listen to what Russell George, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, said:

> The IRS has continually rated the risk of improper Additional Child Tax Credit payments as low. However, [our] assessment of the potential for improper payments in this program indicates that its improper payment rate is similar to that of the Earned Income Tax Credit.

What is that rate? Nearly $6 billion and even more than that over a period of time.

He goes on to say:

> It is imperative that the IRS take action to identify and address all of its programs that are at high risk for improper payments.

Today, we are talking about one of those programs that Russell George, the Treasury Inspector General, defined and suggested we look at, and we will be looking at some others later.

We are proposing a pretty easy fix, and I am supporting legislation that will require the submission of a valid Social Security number in order to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit. Requiring the submission of a valid Social Security number does not take the credit away from anyone who legally qualifies for this credit, but it does help ensure that only those who are truly legally qualified will benefit from the credit and will receive the payment.

According to the most recent estimate by the Joint Committee on Taxation, this simple fix—simply requiring a valid Social Security number before a payment is given so we can weed out those improper payments—could save taxpayers $20 billion over a 10-year period. Compared to our multitrillion-dollar budget, $20 billion is a fairly small percentage, but compared to the way the taxpayer looks at this, $20 billion is a lot of change. It is a lot of money, and the savings from that can be used in any number of ways. Hopefully, it will be used to lower rates people have to pay in terms of the tax revenues they send to Washington, but if it is needed for essential programs, such as national defense or homeland security, and we can prove a need for that—we are constantly looking for ways to pay for things that are essential and need to be done—this is a perfect pay-for. So one way or another, it is a benefit to the American taxpayer.

As we mark tax day this week, I wish we could say we are getting close to major tax reform, but since we are not, it is important that we continue to look at the Tax Code as well as other functions of government to determine how we can continue to save taxpayers money and how we can continue to identify unfair and complicated areas of our Tax Code.

So with that we add to the gauge, which is growing every week that we identify a program. We started off at zero. Now we are approaching $50 billion worth of savings for the taxpayer. Our goal is $100 billion. We are going to keep doing this week after week, and we are going to keep adding money that is identified by our politically neutral accounting efforts. We are going to keep adding to this gauge until we reach our goal and hopefully go well beyond it.

Mr. President, $20 billion is no small amount of change. It is being used improperly, and we can save that money.

Stay tuned for next week's ''Waste of the Week.''

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. FLAKE assumed the Chair.)

Mr. JOHNSON. 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.

DEYO NOMINATION

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I come to the floor today to recommend to the Senate the confirmation of a very qualified individual, Mr. Russell C. Deyo, to become Under Secretary for Management at the Department of Homeland Security.

We are very fortunate to have an individual of Mr. Deyo's qualifications and integrity willing to serve our government working with Secretary Jeh Johnson and trying to help him succeed in his mission of keeping this Nation safe.

Mr. Deyo has a long and successful career and background. After law school, he clerked for Judge John Hannum of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and then spent 2 years at a private law firm.

In 1978, Mr. Deyo joined the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey as an assistant U.S. attorney.

In 1983, he was promoted to chief of the special prosecutions unit for public corruption.

In 1985, he came to Johnson & Johnson as a litigation attorney and became associate general counsel in 1999. He ultimately became vice president and general counsel later in 2009 and was responsible for human resources.

After retiring from Johnson & Johnson in 2012, Mr. Deyo served as both a standing member of a panel for potential product liability arbitration for Eli Lilly and as chairman of the Corporate Board of Advisers of the National Counsel of LaRaza.

He obtained his education at both Dartmouth College, with an associate bachelor's degree, and at Georgetown University with a J.D. in June of 1975.

Again, I wish to thank Mr. Deyo for being willing to serve his Nation in this crucial capacity.

I would also like to thank the members of our conference for clearing his name. I have worked very closely with our ranking member, the Senator from Delaware, in trying to develop not only a mission statement but also a commitment to enhance the economic and national security of our Nation. We listed a bunch of priorities. The Presiding Officer is on our committee, and she is also committed to those exact same goals. One of the priorities we listed was our commitment to do everything we can to help the Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Jeh Johnson, succeed in his mission of keeping this Nation safe. Our committee worked hard over a number of obstacles to make sure Mr. Deyo has his vote now for confirmation.

I certainly thank my ranking member, the Senator from Delaware. I thank my Republican colleagues for clearing the way for this vote.

I urge all of our colleagues here in the Senate—I would love to see a unanimous vote to approve Mr. Russell Deyo as the Under Secretary for Management at the Department of Homeland Security.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, today I wish to express my gratitude to the chairman for his work with his conference to clear the path to this discussion today of the nomination of Russ Deyo and to bring his name forward for hopefully confirmation this afternoon.

When I first met Russ Deyo, I asked him: How do you pronounce your name?

He said: ''Dio'' as in Rio.

I said: I think you mispronounce your own name.

He said: No, no. It is ''Dio'' as in Rio.

So I try to do that, but he has been called a lot of things. Some of the things he ought to be called are talented and dedicated, and we should call ourselves lucky that a guy or gal with his credentials from the private sector is willing to come and go to work for the people of America and to serve all of us.

The Department of Homeland Security is a Department that, as we know, does enormously important work to protect us. People all over this Nation—in the air, on the ground, on the borders, in our cities, and all over our countryside—have my gratitude and I know the gratitude of all of us.

Every organization of any consequence needs good management, and the idea of bringing in Russ Deyo is—this is a fellow who will offer real strength to the management team at the Department of Homeland Security. We need him. We are glad he is ready to go into the lineup, and I hope we will put him in there later this afternoon.

The position for which he has been nominated, the Under Secretary of

Management, is the third highest position in the Department of Homeland Security.

While this vote is long overdue, he has been approved by our committee now not once, I think, but twice. Unfortunately, we failed in the Senate to act on his nomination before the end of the last Congress, so we had to start over again. I am just glad he is willing to serve in this role.

As of this week, more than a year will have passed since the last Senate-confirmed Under Secretary for Management—a fellow named Rafael Borras, a very good leader—stepped down from this post. I again thank Chairman JOHNSON for his efforts and our joint efforts to move this nomination forward.

Everything I have learned about Russ Deyo over the past several months has led me to conclude that he is an exceptional candidate to be the next Under Secretary for Management at DHS. Chairman JOHNSON has already walked through his impressive career.

Russ Deyo is also no stranger to public service. We tend to emphasize his very significant responsibilities at Johnson & Johnson and as a partner in a major law firm, but he has also worked with law enforcement organizations. He was an assistant U.S. attorney in New Jersey for 8 years—something we don't always note—including a period as chief of the public corruption unit. His perspective from the private and public sectors is going to be a great asset to Secretary Jeh Johnson and to Alejandro Mayorkas, the Deputy Secretary at the Department, as they work together to get the Department operating in a more unified and cohesive manner, in creating one DHS.

If confirmed, Mr. Deyo is going to face plenty of challenges. For example, the Government Accountability Office continues to remind us that the overall management of the Department remains on GAO's high-risk list of government operations that need urgent attention. Of course, if confirmed, Mr. Deyo will inherit the challenge of improving morale across the Department. I believe Mr. Deyo has the leadership, the experience, and the skills necessary to tackle these and other challenges at the Department and that he really will make a difference.

I would just say in closing that all of the organizations I have ever been a part of or observed, whether they happen to be a school or a university, a sports team, a military unit, a business, a church, the House or the Senate—here or at the local level—the most important element in the success of those organizations is almost always leadership. What we have endeavored to do over the last year, or actually a little more than a year, is to take the Department of Homeland Security—which was largely bereft at the senior levels of Senate-confirmed leadership—and with the addition of Russ Deyo in this No. 3 position to be in charge of the management shop at DHS, they will have a full slate. They will have a full slate for not the C team or the D team or the B team but I think in many respects the A team. We expect them to rise to the challenge—there are plenty of challenges they face today—and Russ will help make that possible.

I wish to say to Russ Deyo, if he is listening: Thanks for your willingness to hang in there with us until we could get to confirmation.

To the Deyo family: We appreciate very much your willingness to share your spouse and in this case your dad with the people of this Nation. We need him. We will put him to good work, and after a while we will send him back to you safe and sound.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## NOMINATION OF RUSSELL C. DEYO TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

## NOMINATION OF JONODEV OSCEOLA CHAUDHURI TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security; and Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years.

### VOTE ON DEYO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Deyo nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 154 Ex.]

YEAS—95

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Flake | Murray |
| Ayotte | Franken | Nelson |
| Baldwin | Gardner | Paul |
| Barrasso | Gillibrand | Perdue |
| Bennet | Graham | Peters |
| Blumenthal | Grassley | Portman |
| Blunt | Hatch | Reed |
| Booker | Heinrich | Reid |
| Boozman | Heitkamp | Risch |
| Brown | Heller | Roberts |
| Burr | Hirono | Rounds |
| Cantwell | Hoeven | Sanders |
| Capito | Inhofe | Sasse |
| Cardin | Isakson | Schatz |
| Carper | Johnson | Schumer |
| Casey | Kaine | Scott |
| Cassidy | King | Sessions |
| Coats | Kirk | Shaheen |
| Cochran | Klobuchar | Shelby |
| Collins | Lankford | Stabenow |
| Coons | Leahy | Sullivan |
| Corker | Manchin | Tester |
| Cornyn | Markey | Thune |
| Cotton | McCain | Tillis |
| Crapo | McCaskill | Toomey |
| Daines | McConnell | Udall |
| Donnelly | Menendez | Warner |
| Durbin | Merkley | Warren |
| Enzi | Mikulski | Whitehouse |
| Ernst | Moran | Wicker |
| Feinstein | Murkowski | Wyden |
| Fischer | Murphy | |

NAYS—2

| | |
|---|---|
| Lee | Vitter |

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Boxer | Cruz | Rubio |

The nomination was confirmed.

### VOTE ON CHAUDHURI NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

Mr. SCHATZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015—Continued

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am going to have, later on—I was hoping

we would be able to do this today—a couple of amendments that I can't imagine will be any problem on the floor. But it has been a problem that has been with us for a long period of time, and we are in a position to do something about it.

Due to a couple of Supreme Court cases, ICE cannot detain convicted criminal aliens awaiting deportation beyond 6 months. So what they have to do is—they have no choice—they have to put them back into the community, and they are back where they can continue to commit the same crimes that they committed before.

In 2013, over 36,000 criminal immigrants with over 88,000 convictions were released back into our communities, including convictions of over 100 commercialized sexual offences, over 700 sexual offences, and many others. But that is 36,000, all in 1 year. Now, since that time, 176,000 of nondetained convicted criminals have gone back into our society. This is something I can't imagine anyone would want to continue.

My amendment would allow for the government to renew detention of these criminal aliens every 6 months to determine, should they be returned to society, what the risk is. Then we can let justice take place. But it does away with that prohibition of anything over 6 months. So we have people out there right now—167,000 alien criminals—who very likely could repeat their crimes. That is my amendment No. 275.

Amendment No. 276. Last summer, we saw tens of thousands of kids come across our southern border. Some were housed in my State of Oklahoma at Fort Sill. This summer, experts are predicting another wave of children from Central America. This is the problem. If these were kids who came over from either Canada or Mexico, we could do something about it. We could actually send them back and have some authority.

But as it is right now, if one of them comes from Central America, even though they come through Mexico, they are citizens of a Central American country, and so we cannot do that.

I have an amendment that would—well, in fact, our situation in Oklahoma is that we had several hundred who were just put there, and what do you do with a bunch of kids? So they put them in Fort Sill, and they had a place where they could temporarily put them down. Then they kind of disappeared.

I had occasion to go into Los Fresnos in southern Texas. That is one of the largest centers where they will put these kids.

I went in there. They didn't really want me to go in there, take pictures, and see what was going on. But in that particular center—I am going from memory now. I think they had a total of 80 beds—only 80 kids at the time.

I asked the question: How many kids have come through here in the last 6 months?

And they said: Over thousands and thousands.

I said: Wait a minute. If you had thousands, where are they now?

They couldn't answer that.

So what happens is the kids come in, they temporarily identify them, and then they disappear into society.

Now, with this change, all we are doing is treating these kids who would be coming into this country by giving our enforcement officers the latitude and the opportunity to send them back or to let them go back voluntarily. Right now, they can't even go back voluntarily once they cross the line coming into this country.

That is amendment No. 276. It is one that we will be considering and hopefully getting a vote on when we return early next week.

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. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. FRANKEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 993 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FRANKEN. 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. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATING VIRGINIA TECH SHOOTING

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate a horrible tragedy, to honor a community, and to challenge this Congress. Eight years ago today I was the Governor of Virginia. I had just landed in Japan to begin a 2-week trade mission in Japan and India, and there was a knock on my hotel room door. State Police informed me there had been a horrible shooting on the campus of one of my State universities, Virginia Tech. We turned on CNN—that far away around the world—and saw the news unfold, the horrific events of that day. We went back to the airport, and we flew back home and spent weeks, months, and then years dealing with the aftermath of this horrible tragedy.

Thirty-two wonderful Americans, Virginians, and folks from around the world—students, professors, and graduate students of Virginia Tech—lost their lives that day. If you will allow me, I want to read their names into the RECORD:

Ross Alameddine, Jamie Bishop, Brian Bluhm, Ryan Clark, Austin Michelle Cloyd, Jocelyne Couture-Nowak, Daniel Alejandro Perez Cueva, Kevin Granata, Matthew Gwaltney, Caitlin Hammaren, Jeremy Herbstritt, Rachael Elizabeth Hill, Emily Hilscher, Jarrett Lane, Matthew La Porte, Henry Lee, Liviu Librescu, G.V. Loganathan, Partahi Mamora Halomoan Lumbantoruan, Lauren McCain, Daniel O'Neil, Juan Ramon Ortiz, Minal Panchal, Erin Peterson, Michael Pohle, Julia Pryde, Mary Karen Read, Reema Samaha, Waleed Mohammed Shaalan, Leslie Sherman, Maxine Turner, and Nicole White.

Thirty-two precious, precious people of amazing accomplishment and even more amazing promise. Seventeen others were shot that day and wounded. Six others were not shot but were injured leaping from windows in a classroom building to escape the carnage. And so many others were affected: first responders, pastors, counselors, and the entire Hokie Nation. That is what we call the Virginia Tech community.

I know there has been a presentation on the floor about mental health issues and first responders. Some of the most painful discussions I had were in the aftermath of the shooting. I had many with family members and students who were injured, but some of the most painful were from the first responders. The EMTs on the scene included students who were volunteering at the campus EMT operation. Their description of this carnage they walked into, as horrible as the carnage was—the physical carnage—the thing that many of them told me was the most difficult for them to get over was walking into classrooms where there were dead bodies and hearing in pockets and backpacks next to these prone forms the vibrating and ringing of cell phones from parents and friends who had seen the news on TV and were reaching out to try to find out whether their friend or their child was safe. Those unanswered phones were deeply, deeply difficult to those who were the responders.

I have friends who were pastors and counselors in the Blacksburg community. And their own experiences years later have profoundly transformed their lives. Even in tragedy, though, you can see examples of resilience and remarkable spirit. The Virginia Tech community, the Hokie Nation, on that day demonstrated resilience and in the years since. I do stand to honor that spirit and resilience of the entire community, even as we acknowledge the horrible tragedy.

Two years ago on this day we were in the midst of a grim debate on this floor inspired by another horrific shooting—the murder of schoolchildren in Newtown, CT. I stood on the floor and talked about the shooting at Virginia Tech and the lessons we had learned. I

told the story of just one of the victims. It is sort of unfair to single out a person because all were so special, but one of the victims who was killed that day was a professor of engineering, Liviu Librescu, Romanian-born, who survived the Holocaust and who survived the Soviet takeover of his native country, only to be killed by gun violence in America as he barred the door to his classroom to stop the shooter from entering so that his students could safely escape. He survived the Holocaust, survived the depredation imposed on his country by Soviet communism and was killed by gun violence at Virginia Tech University in Virginia in this country.

I want to tell you today about two students who were shot that day but survived. They offer a powerful lesson about the resilient human spirit and also offer a challenge to this body.

Colin Goddard was a senior just weeks away from graduation. He was badly wounded. He was shot four times that day. My wife Anne and I visited him in the hospital 2 days after the shooting. We see him and his parents often. They live in Richmond, where we live.

In the years since his graduation, Colin has become a passionate advocate for gun safety, especially focusing on the need for a national system of background record checks. He helped produce and was part of an award-winning documentary about his friends. The documentary is called ''Living for 32,'' and it is very powerful.

Elilta ''Lily'' Habtu was also a senior, and she was majoring in psychology. She was shot and badly injured that day. She is with us today in the Senate Gallery. Lily was already focused on helping people, but the shooting put her on a new path. Along with other survivors, she founded Students for Gun Free Schools, a grassroots movement to keep campuses safe. She received a master's degree in conflict analysis and resolution from George Mason University, and she has used that training to work on a number of gun safety issues. She also served as an intern at the White House.

I could tell wonderful stories about many of the others who were killed or injured, and all of them are precious. I hope to do that in the years to come because I have a feeling I will stand on this floor often on April 16. I focused on Colin and Lily today because of their passionate work for gun safety.

In the aftermath of the shooting at Virginia Tech, I commissioned a panel to review what went wrong that day. Lawyers said: Don't do that. People could use it to bring lawsuits against the State.

I said: No. We have to know what went wrong. We have to know what we can do to reduce the chance this will ever happen again. We will not be able to eliminate violence. We will not be able to eliminate shootings. But at least we can reduce the chance if we learn what went wrong.

My panel dug into it and made recommendations about mental health, campus safety protocol, first responders, the training of campus personnel, and about gun safety. These detailed recommendations led to numerous changes in State and Federal best practices and laws, and I saw legislators from both parties work together, with strong public support, to make changes so our campuses would be safer.

Mr. President, I would not be honest if I didn't say there was one recommendation by my panel that was opposed both at the State and Federal levels—the institution of a comprehensive background record check system to keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous individuals. I wish to talk today about that continuing failure.

The Virginia Tech student who killed and wounded so many, Seung-Hui Cho, should never have been able to purchase weapons at all. He had been adjudicated in a court in the Commonwealth of Virginia as mentally ill and dangerous and was thus barred by Federal law from purchasing or owning weapons. That is a longstanding Federal law, but the Federal law is only as good as the background record check system that is able to determine when someone purchases a weapon if they have, in fact, been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous. Because the record of his adjudication had not been entered into the national NICS database, he slipped through the cracks, and this troubled individual illegally bought the weapons that destroyed so many lives and removed so much promise from this Earth.

We fixed the narrow issue that led to Seung-Hui Cho's adjudication being left out of the database. I did it by executive order. My legislature confirmed it at the Federal level. Laws were passed and signed into law by President Bush to encourage States to enter mental health adjudications into the Federal database—a database that in the last 20 years has succeeded at stopping more than 2 million people from making illegal gun purchases.

But just months later, as Governor, when I tried to make sure we performed background record checks on everybody, especially those who purchased guns at gun shows, which account for a huge portion of the gun purchases in the United States—there is no law requiring background record checks at gun shows. When I made that effort, my general assembly basically caved in to pressure from a Virginia organization—the National Rifle Association—and other groups, and they voted against background record checks.

Two years ago, as a Senator, during the very week we were commemorating the anniversary of the most horrific shooting to ever happen on a college campus in the history of the United States and in the shadow of the horrific shootings in Newtown, CT, we tried to create a uniform background record check system at the Federal level, but the same groups that fought against us in Virginia fought against background checks here.

Even in the shadow of the horrific shootings of the little kids in Newtown—and since the Newtown shootings, more than 70,000 Americans have been killed by gun violence in this country—we still lack a comprehensive background record check system. It is estimated that 40 percent of all of the guns that are sold in the United States occur with no background record check.

The Presiding Officer knows the law. Convicted felons are not lawfully allowed to purchase their own weapons, but without a comprehensive background record check system, they can and they do. People who have been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous are not lawfully allowed to purchase their own weapons, but without a comprehensive background record check system, they can and they do. Domestic violence perpetrators who have been placed under protective orders are not lawfully allowed to purchase their own weapons, but without a comprehensive background record check system, they can and they do.

So why not fix our laws to create a record check system so we can keep weapons out of the hands of those who are not legally allowed to have them? Why are groups such as the NRA so passionately opposed to keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people?

I am particularly interested in the NRA's position on this issue because I know the organization very well. The NRA is headquartered in Virginia. I know many NRA members. When I was the mayor of Richmond and I helped implement an antigun program—Project Exile—that would send gun criminals to Federal prison, the NRA supported our effort. So why is the NRA opposed to background record checks?

The NRA opposes background record checks even though American gun owners and even NRA members have frequently indicated strong support for background record checks in polling.

The NRA opposes background record checks even though their avowed principles would suggest that they would support such laws. For example, the NRA has been fond of saying: We don't need new gun laws; we just need to enforce existing gun laws. That is exactly what a background record check does. It makes no change in the law as to who can and cannot have a weapon; it just enables us to enforce existing laws to stop dangerous people, such as Seung-Hui Cho, from purchasing weapons.

The NRA has also famously said that we should not take guns out of the hands of law-abiding citizens; we should instead focus on getting guns away from criminals. Again, that is exactly what a background record check system does. It only stops people from purchasing weapons if they are legally prohibited from purchasing weapons.

If gun owners and NRA members support background checks in polls, and if

the NRA's own principles suggest that background checks are in tune with their philosophy, why have they fought so hard and so long to keep our Nation from having a comprehensive background check system? I have pondered that question since 2007 because that day was one of the worst days of my life. I spent a lot of time thinking about it and thinking about what I ought to do as a citizen and elected official to reduce the chance that anybody will ever have to go through that experience again.

After pondering the question of why any legitimate organization would fight against background record checks, the only purpose of which is to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people who are not legally allowed to have them, I have come to the conclusion that there is only one answer, and the answer is this: The NRA does not really speak for or represent American gun owners. Instead, they speak for and represent and, most importantly, receive funding from gun manufacturers. If you make guns, it is in your financial interest to sell as many guns as you can to whomever you can, whenever you can, and wherever you can. And I believe that is the reason so many States and even Congress are not able to pass background record check laws to keep us safer.

Mr. President, let me be self-critical. I would not call out the NRA if I were not about to do what I am about to do. I will bring it home and talk about Congress. If the NRA is now beholden to gun manufacturers, I have to be honest enough to admit that Congress can hardly be self-righteous about this. I would argue that Congress is equally beholden to gun manufacturers as well.

As the Presiding Officer knows, Congress generally leaves the question of tort law as a matter for States to resolve. We generally don't have big tort reform at the Federal level. Republicans often advance notions of States' rights and oppose Federal laws that trump State laws. Democrats are generally against efforts that block plaintiffs' access to State courts to seek redress for injuries. So, in some ways, both Republican and Democratic principles have tended to be opposed to tort reform at the national level.

But here is an unusual example. In 2005, 10 years ago, both Democrats and Republicans joined together to support a major Federal tort reform act, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and that act restricts the ability of people to bring lawsuits against firearm manufacturers in State or Federal court for negligent use of firearms. This 2005 act, which was a bipartisan one in this body—13 Democrats joined with Republicans to pass it—is highly unusual because if you look through the entire United States Code, you are not going to find many national, Federal-level tort laws that shield entire industries from State court claims based on negligence. There may be another one, but I don't know what it is. This is a highly unusual shielding of an entire industry—the gun manufacturing industry—from State and Federal claims based on negligence. This industry uniquely receives this very special protection from the Congress of the United States.

When the law was passed in this body and signed into law by President Bush, plaintiffs in State courts whose cases were being tried had to immediately close down their cases. Plaintiffs who had won cases and had cases on appeal immediately had their cases dismissed. This does not happen often, but for gun manufacturers, in this Congress, it has happened.

I will conclude by saying this: We have to make a decision about what is important. We have to make decisions every day about what is important. Should we keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous people, people who are prohibited by law from having them—if you think the answer is yes, then you should support background check laws—or should we embrace a policy that is based on the notion that we should sell as many guns as we can to whomever we can, whenever we can, and wherever we can? Because that is the current state of the law with an inadequate background check system. It serves no one's interest other than gun manufacturers', but the human cost is incalculably high.

As we commemorate the shooting at Virginia Tech, honoring those we lost and those brave survivors, such as Colin and Lily, who are using their painful experience to help others, and honoring the resilience of the entire Hokie Nation, it is my hope that my colleagues will get serious about gun safety.

I am a gun owner and a proud supporter of the Second Amendment, but the time is long overdue for a comprehensive background check system that keeps weapons out of the hands of dangerous people like Seung-Hui Cho. I look forward to the day when we will accomplish this and have a safer nation as a result.

With that, 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. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise again to speak about and honor our Nation's and North Dakota's Vietnam veterans, and, through my continuing series of floor speeches, specifically those brave servicemembers who gave the ultimate sacrifice.

As you know, we are in the midst of a commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam war. This special period of honoring our Vietnam veterans runs through 2025. I have partnered with students from Bismarck High School in researching these soldiers, and once again I thank their instructors Laura Forde, Sara Rinas, and Allison Wendel for coordinating this project and sharing their students' research with my office.

Last month, I visited these students and was so impressed with their commitment to this project. I want to say thank you again to the Bismark High 11th graders and their teachers for helping us gather important information about the lives of these servicemembers.

This week, I am especially happy to be able to include information they helped to find about the lives of Tom Alderson and John Tingley. I am also grateful to my friend Jim Nelson, a Vietnam veteran, who is dedicated to making sure each of these soldiers' immediate relatives receives a Gold Star Family member pin and certificate.

I was happy to be part of Jim's ceremony in Bismark last year in honoring these soldiers and their families. Through this effort, I hope to make sure our Nation never forgets the needs of our Vietnam veterans and the sacrifices of those who fell in service to our country.

There were 198 sons of North Dakota who did not make it home from the Vietnam War. One hundred ninety-eight sons of North Dakota gave their lives for their country and their State. Today, I am honored to tell you about a few of them.

CLIFTON ''CLIFF'' CUSHMAN

First is Clifton ''Cliff'' Cushman. Cliff was from Grand Forks and was born on June 2, 1938. He served in the Air Force—the 469th Tactical Fighter Squadron. Cliff was 28 years old when he went missing on September 25, 1966.

Cliff left behind his widow Carolyn and their son Colin, born just days before Cliff learned that he would be deployed to Vietnam. Colin was 9 months old when Cliff left for Vietnam.

Everyone in Grand Forks knows the name of Cushman because Cliff was a standout athlete and a Silver Medalist in the 1960 Olympics in the 400 meter hurdles. Grand Forks named their high school football stadium Cushman Field after Cliff.

Grand Forks kids are still inspired annually by the reading of the 1964 letter Cliff wrote to students about effort, after he fell while attempting to qualify for the 1964 Olympics. This is a quote from Cliff's letter: ''I would much rather fail knowing I had put forth an honest effort than never to have tried at all.'' Later in the same letter, Cliff wrote: ''Unless your reach exceeds your grasp, how can you be sure what you can attain?''

THOMAS ''TOM'' ALDERSON

I want to talk about Thomas Alderson. Tom was from Grand Forks. He was born on September 9, 1941. He served as a captain in the Army's 56th medical company. He died October 3,

1968, at the age of 27. He was survived by his wife, mother, brother, and two sisters.

Tom was an Army dental officer in the Vietnam Dental Corps. His father-in-law was his commanding officer.

In high school, he was an honor student and lettered in basketball, track, and tennis. He attended the University of North Dakota and the University of Minnesota, where he earned his dental degree in 1966.

In Vietnam, Tom was in charge of several dental offices, which required travel throughout the country. Tom's driver in Vietnam wrote the family a letter explaining that even as a dentist, Tom was ducking mortars all day long during his service.

RAYMOND ''RAY'' KRAMER

Next, Ray Kramer. Ray was from New Salem and he was born December 31, 1946. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division.

Ray died on February 2, 1968. He was 21 years old. Ray was the sixth of nine children. His brother, Cecil, also served in the Army. Ray's nephew, Cody, is very proud of his Uncle Ray's service.

Ray grew up on the farm where his family raised grain and dairy cows. He was an honor student at New Salem High School and later worked as a dedicated carpenter. Ray's sister, Beverly, remembers that Ray's dog loved him so much that he slept under Ray's car while Ray was in Vietnam. After Ray was killed in action, his parents left the farm and moved to town. His sister took Ray's dog to her farm 10 miles away, but the dog ran all the way back home to wait for Ray under his car.

RONALD ''CHRISTY'' GOODIRON

Ronald Christy Goodiron was from Shields and was born December 23, 1947. He served in the Marine Corps' 3rd Battalion, 5th Marines.

Christy was 20 years old when he died on February 28, 1968. His father Paul Goodiron served in World War I and was a code talker. Christy's close cousin, Paul Goodiron, also served in Vietnam. Unfortunately, Paul unexpectedly died last month. Paul's son, CPL Nathan Goodiron, was also killed in action in 2006 serving his country in the U.S. Army National Guard in Afghanistan.

Christy's family remembers him as smiling all the time. Today, they honor him at powwows by raising the American flag they received when he died and singing the Vietnam ''Warrior's Song'' to honor Christy.

Christy's family appreciates reading what his fellow marines serving with him wrote about their memories of him and the account of what happened the day he died.

RONALD ''RON'' BOND

Maj. Ronald Bond was from Fargo and was born on July 30, 1930. He served in the Air Force's 604th Air Commando Squadron. He was 37 years old when he went missing May 11, 1968.

Ron was the oldest of six kids and the first in his family to attend college. Ron's family remembers him as an adventuresome spirit. He loved hunting, fishing, water skiing, and even competitive sailing with his wife.

Ron's military career began as a Naval ROTC Cadet in his first year at North Dakota State University. Ron then served in the Naval Reserve, enlisted in the Navy, and upon discharge immediately enlisted in the Air Force.

Despite an aircraft accident that injured his spine, Ron became a flight instructor and flew in more missions until he was killed in action in Vietnam. His body has never been recovered.

GARY LOKKEN

Gary Lokken was from Bowman and was born on July 2, 1941. He served in the Army Reserve's Engineering CMD. He was 26 years old when he died on April 10, 1968. Gary left behind his widow Paige and infant twins, a boy and a girl. The twins were 10 days old when Gary left for basic training.

Gary was a medical doctor, who studied in North Dakota and Texas. He completed his medical internship in Hawaii and planned to return there with his family to live after his service. Six months after arriving in Vietnam, Gary was killed while transporting patients when his vehicle hit a landmine.

His twins both entered the medical field. His son is a histology technician and his daughter a medical doctor.

WILLIAM ''BILL'' ECKES

William ''Bill'' Eckes was from Beach. He was born on September 20, 1940. He served in the Navy as a Petty Officer First Class journalist. Bill died March 10, 1967. He was 26 years old.

Bill was the oldest of seven children. His father was an Army sergeant in World War II. Bill was a well-known football player for Beach High School. He was on his second tour of duty in the Navy as a journalist when his aircraft crashed in South Vietnam.

He previously wrote for Stars and Stripes while he was stationed in Sicily and Iceland. Margot, Bill's sister closest in age, remembers him as an intelligent, determined person whose plan was to come home after attending the University of North Dakota and have a career in the Foreign Service.

JEROME ELLENSON

Jerome Ellenson was from Walcott and was born on April 3, 1946. He served in the Army's 196th Infantry Brigrade. Jerome died on January 10, 1968. He was 20 years old.

Jerome was the fifth of seven children. Jerome's oldest sister, Margie, remembers him as having a unique love of life, being a great storyteller, and everyone's friend.

Margie tells about how Jerome would often give his family side aches because he had made them laugh so much on long car trips. Jerome didn't say goodbye to anyone when he left for Vietnam.

His family was told he was the last survivor of his unit; that he manned the radio until his death.

CHESTER ''SKIP'' COONS

Chester ''Skip'' Coons was from Bismark. He was born March 29, 1936. He served in the Navy's Observation Squadron 67. He was 31 years old on February 17, 1968, when he went missing.

Skip and his two brothers, Larry and Ronald, all served in the Navy. Their mother Elsie still lives in Bismark and is 95 years old. Skip left behind two young daughters who were thankful to meet fellow sky sailors of their dad's old unit.

Skip had planned to make a career out of the military. In high school, he joined the North Dakota National Guard, then he joined the Air Force for 3 years, and later joined the Navy as a pilot. He was on his third tour of duty in Vietnam when his plane was shot down on a reconnaissance mission over Laos. In 1993, his remains were finally recovered.

RICHARD BURINGRUD

Richard Buringrud was from Argusville and was born on November 24, 1946. He served in the Army 12th Infantry Regiment. Richard died on June 9, 1969. He was 22 years old.

Richard loved softball and playing basketball in high school. Richard's father still lives in Fargo and his family remembers the letters he sent home describing having been in a swamp, which was the first kind of bath he had in a week.

Richard was an expert rifleman and was killed when he went ahead of his armored unit to help clear the way.

BRENT SVEEN

Brent Sveen was from Harwood and went to high school in West Fargo. He was born October 25, 1951. He was 18 years old when he died on September 7, 1970.

Brent's father also served in the Army in World War II. Brent's older brother Bruce, a marine, served two tours of duty in Vietnam.

Brent's sisters, Jean and Ava, remember Brent as befriending everyone, being the life of the party, and having a great sense of humor and wit.

Brent's sisters cherish one family picture in particular. Their older brother Bruce was wearing his marine uniform. Before taking the picture, Brent disappeared. He returned wearing his dad's old World War II Army uniform and the family took the picture with both boys in uniform.

Having an older brother serve in Vietnam, Brent could have waived out of his own service, but he was eager to serve his country and enlisted while in high school. Shortly before he died, Brent wrote this poem he mailed to his parents.

I think of my buddy I was talking to yesterday;
Now he's lying on the ground not far away;
They say he's dead, but I hope it's not true;
And if it is, to ease my tears I'll think of you.
I looked down at his body and began to cry;
I turned to the clouds and asked, God, why?
I waited awhile, but no answer came;

Only the unceasing falling rain.

I want to thank Brent's sister Jean Kraft for participating in this project. Jean joined me recently in a visit to the Bismarck High School sharing her own family's stories and encouraging these students to reach out to families and to learn about the lives of these young men whom we lost in Vietnam. She is among my very favorite people and a hero herself.

PETER BINSTOCK, JR.

Peter Binstock, Jr., was from New England. He was born May 5, 1947. He served in the Army as an Armor Recon Specialist. He died on January 3, 1969. He was 21 years old.

Peter was the oldest of 11 children. His family had eight girls and three boys. Peter planned on taking over the family farm when he returned from Vietnam. His sister Rose remembers Peter as always being in good spirits. While he was in Vietnam, he was fondly called ''Big Pete'' because he was 6 feet 3 inches and very strong. He was promoted to corporal after his death.

RONALD KENT

Ronald Kent. Ronald was from Page and was born April 21, 1943. He served in the Army 25th Infantry Division. He was 23 years old when he died on January 20, 1967.

Ronald was one of eight children. His family remembers him as a fearless man. He was small in stature but big in spirit. His sister Candice remembers that Ronald loved the outdoors, and he had the ability to talk his nieces and nephews into anything, including cleaning his car.

A few years ago, Ronald's brother Steven spoke to the young men who carried Ronald's body back to the base after he was killed. After hearing the description of that day, Steven knows that in those final moments, all that Ronald was thinking about was saving his brothers-in-arms.

WARD EVANS

Ward Evans. Ward was from Harwood, and he was born February 22, 1940. He served in the Army 5th Infantry Division. He died on February 8, 1969. He was 28 years old. Ward was the youngest of five children. His family remembers him as someone who was always ready to help others. His sister Maryann remembers that when he came home from Vietnam on a break, he seemed sad and that the war had gotten to him, but he went back to complete his duty.

On February 8, 1969, almost all the men near Ward were killed. When the chopper came back to pick up the survivors, Ward demanded to stay behind in order to rescue three men who were still alive but also wounded. While tending to the injured soldiers, Ward stepped on a land mine.

Ward's nephew Mark is so proud of him and will always remember Ward as a man who did what was right no matter what the personal cost.

JOHN TINGLEY

John Tingley was from Kathryn. He was born on August 19, 1946. He served in the Army 128th Aviation Company. He was 21 years old at the time of his death, January 10, 1968.

John was one of six children born in 8 years. John's sister Mary remembers John as someone who did it all. He played the trombone in band, sang in the choir, was a member of the 4H Club, and played sports. He had a photographic memory and his sister knew he would have had an enormously bright future.

In Vietnam, John was a helicopter gunner crew chief. The day he was killed, John's helicopter was responding to a helicopter that had just gone down. While they were going to assist soldiers involved in the crash, he was shot and killed.

All of these young men serving their country and serving each other remind us of the sacrifices we have experienced in war. They remind us that there are so many among us who will run to the sound of the guns and protect our freedom. We cannot let their sacrifice ever be forgotten.

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. 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are continuing to make progress on the bipartisan antitrafficking bill. Senator CORNYN is working with Chairman GRASSLEY and Senators on both sides of the aisle to resolve the remaining issues.

It is my hope we will be able to go through an orderly amendment process and pass the trafficking bill early next week. The Senate will then consider the Lynch nomination through the regular order, as I have already committed to doing, followed by consideration of the Iran bill as reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee earlier this week.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1191

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, with the concurrence of the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 30, H.R. 1191, and that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, Senator CORKER or his designee be recognized to offer a substitute amendment, which is the text of S. 615 as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I reserve my right to object, and would say that with the work done by Senators MURRAY and all the Judiciary Committee, led by Senator LEAHY and, of course, Senator KLOBUCHAR, working with Senator CORNYN, significant progress has been made. There is no question in that regard. But we are not there yet. Remember, we had a problem with this initially because of the language in the bill. So every word is going to have to be read with this new language that is drawn up, and then we will see if we can make it to the finish line. I think we can, but we are certainly not there yet. But progress has been made.

Mr. President, in my reservation to object I would say that I note that the request the majority leader propounded is seeking to move to a House revenue bill, which of course would provide a vehicle for the Foreign Relations Committee-reported Iran legislation. I support the Committee-reported Iran legislation. I commend Senators CARDIN and CORKER for their historic work on this package. I do hope the Senate can pass it with no changes.

But I note that the majority leader is once again choosing not to move to the nomination of Loretta Lynch as Attorney General. It has been more than 5 months—it will be 6 months in a week or 10 days—since President Obama nominated her. Her nomination has been on the Senate calendar for 49 days, longer than the last 7 Attorney General nominations combined.

So I ask whether the majority leader would modify his consent request to add this: That there be 2 hours for debate, divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination; further, that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. Part of the consent request is that on Monday, April 20, at 3:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as I have indicated, gosh, at least for 6 weeks now, we are going to deal with the Lynch nomination right after we finish trafficking.

I am optimistic that we will be able to do trafficking in 1 day. There is not a huge demand for amendments. As I have assured my friend the Democratic leader and our colleagues, then we will move forward on the nominee for Attorney General.

Therefore, I object to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, continuing my reservation, as the majority leader is well aware, procedurally, the Senate provides many opportunities for delay. We are not going to treat the current majority the way the Republican minority treated us when we were in the majority. I am not going to object to the majority leader's consent today. However, I want everyone to know—I

am going to serve notice right now—that Ms. Lynch's nomination will not remain in purgatory forever.

So I withdraw my objection.

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.

## HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks to the American Council on Education.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

I am here today to read you a letter and ask for your help. I'm going to be very specific. First, I want to thank Chancellors Kirwan and Zeppos for the work they've done with others at the request of four United States senators: two Democrats and two Republicans, Senator Mikulski and Senator Bennett on the Democratic side and Senator Burr and myself on the Republican side.

We asked them to not give us a sermon but to give us specific recommendations for exactly what to do about the problem of overregulation of higher education, and they've done that. The English professors on your campuses would be very pleased with it because it's actually recommended in plain English with mostly declarative sentences. It's an unusual report. It's very well done. And the way things work in Washington, it reminds me a lot of the report called ''Rise Above Gathering Storm'' that the National Academy of Sciences sponsored about ten years ago, and Norm Augustine headed it. We basically said, ''Just give us ten specific things to do, and if you do, we'll probably do most of them.'' They gave us 20 recommendations, and we've done most of them.

So this is really a blueprint or an agenda for the United States Congress and the United States Secretary of Education to act on the problem. I want to thank Molly Broad for her work at ACE on this and for organizing it and Terry Hartle and Anne Hickey, who are staff members there. There's Christina West at Vanderbilt University, who worked hard on the report. At the University System of Maryland, there's PJ Hogan, and Andrew LaCasse on our staff in the Senate. They did a terrific job.

Now, what I'm supposed to do here is take 10 or 12 minutes and then sit down and see what questions or suggestions you have with the chancellors. So, I thought the best way to do that was to read you a letter and come close to telling you a story. One of my friends was the late Alex Haley, the author of Roots. After I made a speech one time, he came up after and said, ''May I make a suggestion?'' I said, ''Well of course.'' He said, ''If before you make a speech, you say, 'Instead of making a speech let me tell you story,' people may actually listen to what you have to say.'' So, let me begin with a short story.

I got this over the weekend from someone I don't know. It's from a president from a University in Missouri, handwritten, and says, among other things, ''I've been in higher education administration for over 40 years, the last 20 as a university president, and I've never experienced the amount of regulatory pressure that our institution currently faces.''

I hear that in lots of different ways, and this report is an expression of what to do about that. For example, this isn't just a sermon, as I mentioned. There are 59 specific suggestions about what to do. In testimony before our committee, almost everyone who testified said that requiring students to fill out the FAFSA form in their senior year and providing tax information before they file their taxes makes no sense. It would make a lot more sense to do it the year before. Almost everybody said that we should do that.

So, in this report are 59 recommendations, and what I want to ask you to do is organize yourselves in your own state and make an appointment with your member of the United States Congress. And get six or seven members of the university and sit down and talk about this report, and say, ''Now we worked two years on this. This is serious business. It costs a lot of money. It discourages a lot of students from coming to our colleges, and we'd like for you to support the legislation Senator Alexander and Senator Mikulski and Senator Burr and Senator Bennett are introducing in order to implement the report.'' You might add Senator Murray of Washington who is the ranking Democrat on the committee as she will be deeply involved in this as well.

Sometimes university presidents come to Washington to meet with members of Congress. That's the biggest waste of time I can think of. We're all running around here with 15-minute schedules trying to keep up with things and have many more requests for appointments than we have time to see or pay attention to. But almost every single senator who is on the committee that is going to deal with this is home every weekend, and the senator from Tennessee, with all due respect, doesn't really want to see the president of the University of Maryland. He would like to see the president of the University of Tennessee or of Vanderbilt or of Milligan College or Maryville College or Rhodes College. If five or six or eight of those presidents say, ''Senator Alexander, may we have a 30-minute appointment with you while you're home next month?'', I'll do it in a minute. So will every other senator. And you have the credibility to go to that member of Congress and say, ''Will you please vote for this? Will you cosponsor the legislation? Will you support it? Will you encourage the president to sign it?'' Odds are, if you do that they will. It's about that simple.

There are a lot of things we work on up here about which we have big partisan differences. There is no reason to have any big partisan differences over this. There are a few things in it that get haggles up on the left and the right, but most things aren't like that at all. There is just the accumulation of eight reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act beginning in 1965, and you know exactly what happens. A well-meaning group of senators, congressmen, education secretaries, regulators come up with an idea and said, ''Let's do this, or here's a good idea let's make everybody do that.'' And they just keep doing that until pretty soon you get a stack of regulations that's twice as tall as I am. You're looking at the Higher Education Act, and that's how tall it actually is. Nobody's weeded the garden. Well, this is an effort to weed the garden. So, I read a letter. I've asked for your help, and your help is very specific.

Will you please make an appointment in your home state, starting with the 22 members of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee and say to us, ''We hope you'll vote for and support that.''

Now, you'll all recognize this. This is what 20 million parents fill out every single year. And lots of colleges have said, ''Well we like this information.'' You have to think about how much you like it. Does it really work? Asking 20 million families to fill out 108 questions like this every year just to get a grant or loan to go to college? A testimony before our committee said we could get it down to two questions: what's your family income, and what's the size of your family? Maybe it's two, maybe it's four, maybe it's 10, maybe it's 12. President Obama in his budget advocated for removing about thirty of those questions, so that takes it down from 108 to about 78.

What's the importance of that? The importance of it is pretty obvious. The importance of it is that it saves money, it saves time, and the president of the community college in Memphis, Southwest Tennessee Community College, told me he thinks he loses 1,500 students every semester because of the complexity of the form that impair students that would like to go to college.

The second story you'd like to know is Chancellor Zeppos's story about how much it costs at Vanderbilt every year to comply with federal regulations on higher education: $150 million for one institution, $11,000 or $12,000 for everyone to add onto their tuition. That's just ridiculous. That's absolutely absurd.

Now, another fact is that the National Academy of Sciences says, and they've done two reports to verify this, that investigators of federally-sponsored research at colleges and universities spend 42 percent of their time on administrative matters. Now we spend $30 billion, we taxpayers at colleges and universities on research. How much of that money is spent on administrative? Well, Chancellor Zeppos said that at Vanderbilt—and I think I've got my figures right—that about $136 million of the $146 was allocated for research. So, the way I figured it, about 25 percent of all the research money he gets at Vanderbilt, which is probably $500 million, goes to administrative tasks. Forty-two percent of the time we're researching. If we can move from 42 to 35 to 33 to 30, we could save $1 billion or $2 billion and take the dollars to fund hundreds, maybe thousands, of multiyear research grants, which we hear so much about declining.

And then the fact that we've been trying to reduce these for a long time. One of my first acts as a senator was to pass legislation requiring the U.S. Department of Education to make a calendar of all of the things that you are supposed to comply with if you are in one of the 6000-plus colleges and universities in America. They have had seven years, and they haven't been able to do it. Well, if they can't do that, how can a small Catholic college in Wisconsin hire somebody to figure it out? And according to this report, there is a new guidance or regulation coming out on average every workday in the U.S. Department of Education. So, you just have that combination of 108-question FAFSA; $150 million at one university to comply; the National Academy saying 42 percent of time is spent by investigators is spent on administration; and the department itself unable to make a list of all of the rules that it expects you to comply with—that's a pretty good case to make for the people you talk to.

And then I would suggest that a delegation—and again I have discussed this with the chancellors—go see Arne Duncan at the U.S. Department of Education. I meant this isn't all his fault; it's all of our faults among

all of us who have been Secretary of Education, all of us who have been in the Congress since 1965. We haven't done our job, and of the 59 recommendations, probably a dozen are recommendations that the U.S. Secretary of Education could do himself. They could be done by an administrator. So, go to Secretary Duncan and say, ''Look, we'd like to make a hero out of you. We're here to say, we've identified the 12 areas that you can change that would make a big difference in increasing innovation and reducing cost of colleges all across America.'' And I've talked with him about that, and I think he'd be willing to hear about that.

We'll be reauthorizing the Higher Education Act later this year after we get through fixing ''No Child Left Behind,'' which is the first order of business. And the first thing we want to do is make it easier for students to go to college. That's the ''FAST Act,'' aimed at simplifying the student aid form. That includes saying that you can apply your junior year of high school, so you can know what your award will be before you are admitted to college. And, you will know what your tax information is before you have to turn in your form.

We want to simplify the number of grants and loans. We want to make it possible for there to be year-round Pell for your students to be able to follow their own rate and use their Pell grants and student aid progressively at their own rate in college. We'd like to discourage over-borrowing by changing some rules that exist, permit you to do more counseling of students, change the rule that allows a part-time student to borrow a full-time amount of money. We'd like to simplify the repayment plans. Now, all those things don't have much to do with being a Republican or a Democrat. They have a lot to do with an important system.

We'd like to take as many of these fifty-nine recommendations and put them in a bill and pass them as we can. A lot of that will depend upon your business at home to the men and women who run the universities in your state. We want to take a look at the accreditation and make sure it's focused on the right thing. As a former university president, I didn't like a lot about accreditation. The only thing I would like less would be having the U.S. Department of Education take the place of the accreditor. So, let's work together and fix the accreditation system and have focus on academic quality instead of all that random other stuff that accreditors often get themselves involved in.

We want to make it harder to over-borrow. I mentioned a couple of ideas about this. There are a few more in this report. Finally, we want to do our best to make sure that the consumer information that you're asked for really is needed and is presented in a useful way to students. Typically, it's just a big pile of stuff that has the disadvantage of by the time you go all the way through you haven't learned anything. It's like a mortgage application or a car loan. You just sign at the bottom and have no clue about what you just signed. We need simpler, plain English, clear sentences—pieces of information that are valuable to students and that are valuable to parents, and that we can weed our way through the system more confidently.

So, that's what we're trying to do, and we need your help. One thing that I would say to you is that this is a train that is likely to move down track in out of the station by the end of year. Why do I say that? Well, because it has bipartisan support in a town that's not noted for that. This report has been active interest of four senators who will a lot more. The FAST Act, as we call it, which will simplify student aid has the support of six: Senator Booker and Senator King and Senator Burr and Senator Isakson and me, equally divided by party. Senator Murray and I, she's from Washington state, will work together to reauthorize it. I've talked to the president about it. He did a very good job of working with us on some forms on student loans two years ago. There's no reason he can't work with us in that way and this year finish the job.

So, I hope you'll keep in mind the letter that I read. I suspect that you have made the same feelings, and I am here to thank you for the tremendous work that ACE and the chancellors and their team and staff did on the report. It's been one of the most consequential reports made to the Congress during this year. Will you please make an appointment in the next thirty days in your home state, first with the members of the Senate education committee? Bring along a few colleagues and say, ''We spent a lot of time on this. This is wasting a lot of money. This is discouraging a lot of students. This is taking a lot of time. Will you please support this bipartisan effort to bring some common sense to the jungle of red tape that is the current federal regulation of higher education?'' Thank you.

## NATIONAL HEALTHCARE DECISIONS DAY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am pleased to recognize that today, April 16, 2015, is National Healthcare Decisions Day.

National Healthcare Decisions Day exists to inspire, educate and empower the public and providers about the importance of advance care planning. Started by a Richmond attorney as a local, grassroots initiative in Virginia, NHDD became an annual event in 2008 and today is recognized across all 50 States. Faith-based groups, doctors and nurses, hospitals, patients, and caregivers alike are engaged in these efforts.

It is critical that Virginians and all Americans—both patients and providers—engage in advance care planning, and that they have access to clear, consistent, and concise information on how to make these critical health care decisions. Today, on National Healthcare Decisions Day, it is important to discuss preferences and goals with family and friends—and this starts with filling out an advance directive. But advanced care planning is about much more than that, and in the last several years, there has been a growing awareness of the need to transform advanced care, both among providers and families.

First, broader transformations in health care, especially the movement towards paying for quality, not volume, of services offer opportunities to speed the adoption of effective advanced care programs. Our health care system does a great job paying for procedures: surgery, chemotherapy, hip replacements. It does a not so good job paying for health care providers to spend face-to-face time with patients, helping them to choose among many options with uncertain outcomes. Improvements to care planning would give individuals and their families the ability to make smarter decisions. It would provide additional information and support so they can make informed choices based upon those values and goals.

Meanwhile, across the country, people are innovating and creating new models of care to provide patients with the tools and support to make their own advanced care decisions. For example, in my own State of Virginia, a Richmond Academy of Medicine initiative called Honoring Choices Virginia promises to fill a critical hole. This innovative partnership involves the academy and three independent health care systems working to adopt nationally-recognized best practices, and adapting them to the needs of patients, families, doctors, and hospitals of the local community in Central Virginia. This commitment to patients and families in our region sets an example for the rest of the Commonwealth and the country.

It is similarly essential that we consider how Federal policies impact patients and their families during times of serious illness. For example, the vast majority of these patients receive care funded by Medicaid and Medicare, and many of them are elderly or disabled. Medicare, however, does not adequately reimburse physicians or other important members of the care planning team, such as nurses or social workers, for systems to support patients and their families. Likewise, faced with an uneven patchwork of advance directive laws across States, providers too often base their actions on the technicalities of forms or on fear of being sued. Such hurdles make it difficult for health care providers to focus on what the patient really wants.

In the 111th and 112th Congress, I introduced the Senior Navigation and Planning Act, to help people grapple with the challenges of caring for those with advanced illness. And in the 113th Congress, Senator ISAKSON and I introduced the Care Planning Act. The purpose of the Care Planning Act is to align the care people want with the level of care they get. It does not limit choices—it works to make sure people are made fully aware of the broad range of choices they have. I hope to reintroduce the Care Planning Act in the coming weeks.

I believe this effort is critical, not just from my time serving as a Governor and as a Senator, but also through the eyes of a loved one who struggled with these issues. My mother suffered from Alzheimer's disease for 10 years, and for 9 of those years, she couldn't speak. My father, sister and I found grappling with the challenges of caring for her difficult. The difficulty was greater because, when she was first diagnosed, my family didn't take the opportunity to talk in an honest and fully informed way with her and her health care providers about the full array of health care options available, or about what her priorities would be during the final years of her life.

It is not easy, and this is a subject that most people do their best to avoid.

But it is critical. National Healthcare Decisions Day reminds us of the importance of discussing ways to improve advanced care planning at all levels—Federal, State, local—and above all, amongst Americans and their loved ones.

## TRIBUTE TO JIM SCOTT

● Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the retirement of Jim Scott after nearly 50 years as Cincinnati's familiar voice of morning radio.

Jim Scott began his Cincinnati radio career in 1968 as morning show host for the iconic pop radio station 1360 WSAI-AM in Price Hill. He joined 700 WLW in 1984 and for 45 years, Jim has been the familiar voice of morning radio.

During his morning time slot from 5am to 9am, Jim interviewed countless dignitaries and celebrity newsmakers from Presidents and civic leaders to top movie stars and sports figures. He routinely talked with news correspondents from around the globe, including those reporting at the White House and from posts in London to Baghdad.

Jim is a true public servant and an inspiration to us all. He has been a long-time volunteer leader of the Greater Cincinnati United Way and has served on many boards, including the Wellness Community, Cincinnati Playhouse in the Park, the March of Dimes, and Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

A stalwart volunteer, Jim is Cincinnati's voice of volunteerism; whether he's hosting Marty & Joe night at the Great American Ballpark, serving as emcee for your favorite animal shelter or welcoming Presidents and foreign dignitaries to the Queen City.

Jim has been recognized with many awards, including the Silver Medal of the Cincinnati Ad Club, and the Neil H. McElroy Award from the United Way. In 1996 and 2000, the U.S. Olympic Committee named Jim ''A Community Hero'' and he was thrilled to be a torchbearer in the Olympic Torch Relay.

Jim Scott has dominated morning show ratings in every decade since the 1970s and was the winner of the 2002 Marconi Award for Large Market Radio Personality of the Year. In 2013, the Cincinnati Enquirer named Jim the No. 1 radio personality of the past 40 years.

Jim Scott will remain on air until his ''favorite day of the year,'' Cincinnati Reds Opening Day on April 6, 2015, when he'll walk in the Findlay Market Opening Day Parade to say thank you to his fans who have supported him throughout his career.

Thank you, Jim Scott. Your daily ''good morning and thanks for listening'' greeting will be missed.●

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### RECOGNIZING ORA ESTUARIES

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, due to their unique perspective, American entrepreneurs are often at the forefront of innovative solutions to local problems. This is especially true with environmental initiatives, and down in Louisiana where the ecosystems are diverse and delicate, the locals are best equipped to protect them. That is why ORA Estuaries of New Orleans, LA is the Small Business of the Week.

Civil engineer and New Orleans native Tyler Ortego was a student at Louisiana State University when he and a friend discovered a way to fight coastal erosion using oysters. In 2005, Ortego patented the OysterBreak system, which essentially allows oysters to fuse together on a man-made rock-like material in order to create a living coastal reef. Now holding two patents, Ortego and ORA Estuaries are focused on rebuilding and revitalizing coastal regions. ORA Estuaries recently claimed the top prize of the New Orleans Entrepreneurial Week's ''Big Idea Pitch,'' and with the prize money hopes to move into food production and new versions of the OysterBreak system.

Our coast and wetlands provide some of Louisiana's most important resources and beautiful habitats, and because our geography makes us vulnerable to natural disasters, it is absolutely vital that we protect them. Innovative technologies like ORA's OysterBreak system play a significant role in restoring our coasts and wetlands, which protect Louisianians and gulf coast residents from storms and flooding. Currently, ORA's natural reefs systems are deployed in four different areas along the Louisiana coast, including an oyster habitat restoration project run by the Nature Conservatory of Louisiana. ORA is looking toward expanding to all five of the Gulf States, as well as the Chesapeake Bay area and even North Carolina. Not only is ORA's breakthrough system protecting vulnerable shorelines, but the growth and retention of oyster colonies that naturally process and filter water interests scientists and environmentalists, as well.

Congratulations to ORA Estuaries for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your commitment to restoring and protecting our precious ecosystems and coastlines in Louisiana and the Gulf Coast.●

## MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:19 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 12:39 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 709. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes.

H.R. 1026. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the release of information regarding the status of certain investigations.

H.R. 1058. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights.

H.R. 1104. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction from the gift tax for gifts made to certain exempt organizations.

H.R. 1152. An act to prohibit officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service from using personal email accounts to conduct official business.

H.R. 1295. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under 501(c)(4) of such Code.

H.R. 1314. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organization.

H.R. 1562. An act to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 529. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 709. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1026. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the release of information regarding the status of certain investigations; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1058. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1104. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction from the gift tax for gifts made to certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1152. An act to prohibit officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service from using personal email accounts to conduct official business; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1562. An act to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in

writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 636. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 644. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

H.R. 1295. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code.

H.R. 1314. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

S. 984. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–8. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing the United States Congress to reinstate funding for the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 21

Whereas, Over the past four decades, nuclear power has been a significant source for the nation's electricity production. There are 104 operating nuclear power reactors in the United States, providing about one-fifth of the nation's electricity generation. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, Michigan's three nuclear power plants provided 28 percent of the electricity generated in Michigan in 2013; and

Whereas, Nuclear power can provide large amounts of reliable, emission-free electricity at stable prices. Many electricity markets across the nation are, or will soon be, in need of new baseload generating capacity. However, the construction of new nuclear power plants is being hampered by the unresolved issue of spent nuclear fuel; and

Whereas, Since the earliest days of nuclear power, the great dilemma is how to deal with used nuclear fuel. Currently, more than 70,000 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel are stored in pools or casks at temporary, and potentially vulnerable, sites around the country, including in Michigan. More nuclear waste is generated every day. This high-level radioactive waste demands exceptional care in all facets of its storage and disposal, including transportation; and

Whereas, The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 requires the federal government, through the Department of Energy (DOE), to build a repository for the permanent storage of high-level radioactive waste from nuclear power plants. This act includes a specific timetable to identify a suitable location and to establish the waste repository; and

Whereas, The establishment of a federal nuclear waste repository is more than fifteen years overdue. Under the Act, the DOE was supposed to begin accepting and storing the nation's nuclear waste by January 31, 1998. In 2002, Congress and President Bush approved Yucca Mountain in Nevada as the site of the repository, and in 2008, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) accepted an application by the DOE to construct and operate the repository. However, in 2010, at the urging of President Obama, the DOE chose to unilaterally and irrevocably terminate the Yucca Mountain repository process; and

Whereas, The NRC released a report in October 2014 that found Yucca Mountain would be a safe and acceptable repository for the permanent storage of used nuclear fuel. The repository would meet all NRC standards for protecting people and the environment from radioactivity. Clearly, it is time to re-open the Yucca Mountain process, as it will provide the best long-term solution to our nation's used nuclear fuel problem; and

Whereas, The Yucca Mountain process cannot move forward without the U.S. Congress appropriating additional funds. Electric ratepayers in Michigan and across the country have paid billions into the federal Nuclear Waste Fund specifically to support development of a long-term repository. Since 1983, in accordance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, customers of Michigan electric utilities have paid $812 million into the federal fund. While fee collection has been suspended as of May 16, 2014, the fund still contains a total balance of over $31 billion: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives*, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to reinstate funding for the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

---

POM–9. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President of the United States and Congress of the United States to support the reform of the Social Security offsets of the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE PAPER 382

Whereas, under current federal law, individuals who receive a Social Security benefit and a public retirement benefit derived from employment not covered under Social Security are subject to a reduction in the Social Security benefits; and

Whereas, these laws. contained in the federal Social Security Act, 42 United States Code, Chapter 7, Subchapter II, Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Benefits, and known as the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision, greatly affect public employees, particularly women; and

Whereas, the Windfall Elimination Provision reduces by a formula the Social Security benefit of a person who is also receiving a pension from a public employer that does not participate in Social Security; and

Whereas, the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision are particularly burdensome on the finances of low-income and moderate-income public service workers, such as school teachers, clerical workers and school cafeteria employees, whose wages are low to start; and

Whereas, the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision both unfairly reduce benefits for those public employees and their spouses whose careers cross the line between the private and public sectors; and

Whereas, since many lower-paying public service jobs are held by women, both the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision have a disproportionately adverse effect on women; and

Whereas, in some cases, additional support in the form of income, housing, heating and prescription drug and other safety net assistance from state and local governments is needed to make up for the reductions imposed at the federal level; and

Whereas, other participants in Social Security do not have their benefits reduced in this manner; and

Whereas, to participate or not to participate in Social Security in public sector employment is a decision of employers even though both the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision directly punish employees and their spouses; and

Whereas, although the Government Pension Offset was enacted in 1977 and the Windfall Elimination Provision was enacted in 1983, many of the benefits in dispute were paid into Social Security prior to that time: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That We, your Memorialists, request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress work together to support reform proposals that include the following protections for low-income and moderate-income government retirees:

1. Protections permitting retention of a combined public pension and Social Security benefit with no applied reductions;

2. Protections permanently ensuring that level of benefit by indexing it to inflation; and

3. Protections ensuring that no current recipient's benefit is reduced by the reform legislation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

---

POM–10. A resolution adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts condemning all forms of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, there is clear evidence of increasing incidents and expressions of anti-Semitism throughout the world; and

Whereas, in April 2014, the United States Department of State released the International Religious Freedom report recognizing that anti-Semitism continues to be prevalent internationally; and

Whereas, anti-Semitic acts committed and recorded in 2014 include murders, violent attacks and death threats against Jews, arson, graffiti and property desecration and murders at Jewish cemeteries, places of worship, schools and community events; and

Whereas, such anti-Semitic acts also extend to soccer stadiums, the Internet, editorial cartoons and the use of Nazi salutes, leading many Jewish individuals to conceal their religious identity; and

Whereas, the recent terror attack at a kosher supermarket in Paris, France, and a mounting sense of insecurity among France's Jews reminds us of the urgent need for a commitment to address and confront anti-Semitism; and

Whereas, the Governments in France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, the 4 countries where the majority of anti-Semitic incidents have occurred in Western Europe, have strongly condemned anti-Semitism as unacceptable in European society and have all made clear statements that such attacks on their Jewish communities are intolerable; and

Whereas, anti-Semitic imagery and comparisons of Jews and Israel to Nazis have been on display at demonstrations against Israel's actions in Gaza, throughout the United States, Europe, the Middle East and Latin America; and

Whereas, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has a rich history of tolerance to all faiths and religions; and

Whereas, the United States Government has played an essential role in counteracting the resurgence of anti-Semitism worldwide and has consistently supported efforts to address the rise in anti-Semitism through its bilateral relationships and participation in international organizations such as the United Nations, the organization for security and cooperation in Europe, and the organization of American states; and

Whereas, the Massachusetts General Court joins with people everywhere in unequivocally condemning all forms of anti-Semitism and rejecting attempts to justify anti-Jewish hatred or violent attacks as an acceptable expression of disapproval or frustration over political events in the Middle East or elsewhere; and

Whereas, the Massachusetts General Court applauds the United States and those foreign leaders who have condemned anti-Semitic acts and calls on those who have yet to take firm action against anti-Semitism in their countries to do so; and

Whereas, the very recent killings of a Danish film director and a Jewish guard in Copenhagen, along with the vandalism of a Jewish cemetery in Eastern France, have given rise to concerns about a rise of terrorism and anti-Semitism across the continent: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts General Court supports expanded anti-bias and Holocaust education programs to increase awareness, counter prejudice and enhance efforts to teach the universal lessons of the Holocaust; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Massachusetts Senate to the President of the United States, the United States Secretary of State, the Governor of the Commonwealth and to each member of Congress elected from this State.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Ericka M. Miller, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

*Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 968. A bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from the tax on early distributions for certain Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers who retire before age 55, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 970. A bill to allow more small insured depository institutions to qualify for the 18-month on-site examination cycle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BURR):

S. 971. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the limit on the length of an agreement under the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 972. A bill to clarify the effect of designating a National Monument on certain land in Chafee County, Colorado; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for equity investments by angel investors; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 974. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 975. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 976. 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 Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 977. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to secure the rights of visual artists to copyright, to provide for resale royalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. KING):

S. 978. A bill to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 979. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. LEE):

S. 980. A bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 981. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a repatriation holiday, to increase funding to the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 982. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and to require the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to develop water planning instruments consistent with State law; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 983. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate high priority corridors on the National Highway System in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. KING, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 984. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices; read the first time.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 985. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 986. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow deductions and credits relating to expenditures in connection with marijuana sales conducted in compliance with State law; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 988. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COATS (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 989. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to exempt from duty residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic previously exported from the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 990. A bill to improve the process by which the Librarian of Congress considers requests for exemptions to section 1201(a)(1)(A) of title 17, United States Code, and to ease restrictions on the use of certain statutory exemptions to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 991. A bill to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

S. 992. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act of facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 993. A bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 994. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 995. A bill to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 996. A bill to facilitate nationwide availability of volunteer income tax assistance for low-income and underserved populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 997. A bill to extend the authorization for the major medical facility project to replace the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Aurora, Colorado, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into an agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers to manage the construction of such project, to transfer the authority to carry out future major medical facility projects of the Department from the Secretary to the Army Corps of Engineers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 998. A bill to establish a process for the consideration of temporary duty suspensions and reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 999. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1000. A bill to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1001. A bill to establish authorization levels for general business loans for fiscal years 2015 and 2016; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1002. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1003. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1004. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to encourage the nationwide observance of two minutes of silence each Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for health insurance costs of certain eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1006. A bill to incentivize early adoption of positive train control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. Res. 136. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2015, as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 137. A resolution congratulating the administration, staff, students, and alumni of Roosevelt University on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the University; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 138. A resolution congratulating the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team for winning the 2015 NCAA Division I National Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 139. A resolution commemorating the 20th anniversary of the attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Con. Res. 12. A concurrent resolution recognizing the need to improve physical access to many federally funded facilities for all people of the United States, particularly people with disabilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 197

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 197, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes.

S. 230

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 230, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 471

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 471, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 606

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri

(Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 606, a bill to extend the right of appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board to certain employees of the United States Postal Service.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 665

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 665, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 743, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 747

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 747, a bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in basic science research.

S. 753

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases.

S. 854

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 854, a bill to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, and for other purposes.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 884

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 884, a bill to improve access to emergency medical services, and for other purposes.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 950

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 950, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. CON. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 10, a concurrent resolution supporting the designation of the year of 2015 as the ''International Year of Soils'' and supporting locally led soil conservation.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 974. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the important issue of child labor in tobacco fields. I want to tell you about Calvin, a 17-year-old boy just over five feet tall, who migrated to the United States by himself at age 13, leaving his family behind in Mexico. Calvin never enrolled in school.

Instead, he joined a migrant crew that travels between several states to work in different crops. He migrates to Kentucky in August to work in the tobacco fields. Calvin has worked in tobacco farms since he was 16, and he experiences headaches and nausea from nicotine poisoning.

Calvin said he got sick while working in a curing barn. ''I got a headache and nausea. I was vomiting,'' he said. ''It happened when I was hanging the tobacco in the barn.''

I wish that Calvin's experience was unusual. But in May of last year, the Human Rights Watch published a report based on interviews with over 140 children who worked on U.S. tobacco farms in 2012 or 2013. The majority of those children were working for hire, and not on a family farm. Some of the findings are staggering and show that Calvin is not along.

Human Rights Watch found that child tobacco workers began working on tobacco farms at age 11 or 12. During peak harvest periods, children can work as many as 50–60 hours a week. The majority of these children experience symptoms like nausea, vomiting, loss of appetite, dizziness, lightheadedness, headaches, and sleeplessness while working on tobacco farms. These symptoms are consistent with acute nicotine poisoning, which happens when you absorb nicotine through their skin.

Furthermore, in these conditions, children work in high heat and humidity and in some instances, they use dangerous tools that include sharp spikes to spear tobacco plants and climb to dangerous heights to hang tobacco in curing barns. These children are exposed to pesticides that are known toxins. Long-term effects of this exposure include cancer, neurological deficits, and reproductive health problems.

In his first summer in the field, 12-year-old Miguel was topping tobacco plants on a farm in North Carolina wearing shorts and a short-sleeved shirt, his torso draped with a black plastic garbage bag to cover himself from the summer's heavy rainstorms. Miguel wore only socks—because he did

not have shoes that could withstand the thick mud from the heavy rain.

Miguel lives with his mother, 13-year-old brother, and 5-year-old sister in a rural town in North Carolina. He attends a public school full-time, and works in the fields during his summer break to help cover the costs of food, clothes, and school supplies for the family.

Miguel was hired by a farm labor contractor to work on different farms planting sweet potatoes one day, topping tobacco the next. When asked which crop was harder work, Miguel said, ''tobacco, because you have to walk, and you have to use your hands all the time. It's really tiring.''

It is tiring. By the time Miguel got home, he would have trouble walking because his legs and feet were so sore from working all day. Not only was 12-year Miguel physically overworked, he, like Calvin, also had to deal with frequent headaches, caused by nicotine poisoning, from working in the tobacco fields. He said, ''It was horrible. It felt like there was something in my head trying to eat it.''

I am introducing legislation today, with Senator REED of Rhode Island, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BROWN to take children like Calvin and Miguel out of the tobacco fields. Our bill would make it illegal to allow children under the age of 18 to handle tobacco plants or dried tobacco leaves.

Currently, U.S. law prohibits children under the age of 18 from buying cigarettes . . . but allows children as young as 12 to work in tobacco fields. In most other jobs in the U.S., children are not allowed to work before the age of 15.

Today, there are no specific restrictions protecting children from nicotine poisoning or other risks associated with tobacco farming in this country. The United States is the 4th leading tobacco producer in the world, behind China, Brazil, and India. Even Brazil and India prohibit children under 18 from working in tobacco production.

It's time for the United States to adopt similar restrictions. Our children shouldn't be working long hours with a plant that makes them sick. I encourage my colleagues to work with me to pass S. 974, the Children Don't Belong on Tobacco Farms Act.

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. 974

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

**SECTION 1. TOBACCO-RELATED AGRICULTURE EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN.**

Section 3(l) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(l)) is amended—

(1) in this first sentence—

(A) by striking ''in any occupation, or (2)'' and inserting ''in any occupation, (2)''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', or (3) any employee under the age of eighteen years has direct contact with tobacco plants or dried tobacco leaves''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''other than manufacturing and mining'' and inserting '', other than manufacturing, mining, and tobacco-related agriculture as described in paragraph (3) of the first sentence of this subsection,''.

---

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 975. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. 975

*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 ''American Business for American Companies Act of 2015''.

**SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON AWARDING CONTRACTS TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.**

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**''§ 4713. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations**

''(a) PROHIBITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

''(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

''(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is held by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

''(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of $10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

''(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

''(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

''(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

''(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

''(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

''(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes before, on, or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

''(B) after the acquisition, either—

''(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

''(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

''(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on May 8, 2014.

''(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

''(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

''(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

''(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

''(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

''(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary of the

Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

''(c) WAIVER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is—

''(A) required in the interest of national security; or

''(B) necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or Federally-funded—

''(i) programs that provide health benefits to individuals; or

''(ii) public health programs.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an executive agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

''(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

''(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'expanded affiliated group', 'foreign incorporated entity', 'person', 'domestic', and 'foreign' have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

''(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4712 the following new item:

''4713. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.''.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**''§ 2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations**

''(a) PROHIBITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

''(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

''(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is owned by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

''(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of $10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

''(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

''(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

''(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

''(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

''(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

''(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes before, on, or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

''(B) after the acquisition, either—

''(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

''(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

''(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on May 8, 2014.

''(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

''(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

''(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

''(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

''(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

''(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

''(c) WAIVER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security or is necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or Federally-funded programs that provide health benefits to individuals.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

''(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

''(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'expanded affiliated group', 'foreign incorporated entity', 'person', 'domestic', and 'foreign' have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

''(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

''2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.''

(c) REGULATIONS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall,

for purposes of section 4713(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 41, United States Code, and section 2338(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsections (a) and (b), respectively, prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(2) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

---

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 983. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate high priority corridors on the National Highway System in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I am introducing the Military Corridor Transportation Improvement Act of 2015, which would amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, ISTEA, of 1991 to begin the process toward eventually making the US–70 Corridor in North Carolina part of the Interstate system, and to help fully upgrade the corridor to interstate standards. My colleague, Senator RICHARD BURR has agreed to cosponsor the bill. In addition, Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD will be introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The Military Corridor Transportation Improvement Act of 2015 would designate the following as high priority: U.S. Route 117/Interstate Route 795 from U.S. Route 70 in Goldsboro, NC, to Interstate Route 40 west of Faison, North Carolina; U.S. Route 70 from its intersection with Interstate Route 40 in Garner, NC, to the Port at Morehead City, NC.

If the U.S. 70 corridor becomes part of the Interstate system, it would improve access to military bases in eastern North Carolina and the Port at Morehead City, as well as ease traffic congestion between Raleigh and eastern North Carolina.

This bill helps advance the North Carolina Department of Transportation's Strategic Transportation Corridors Vision, which aims to provide North Carolina with a network of high priority corridors to promote economic development and enhance interstate commerce. Federal High Priority Corridors are eligible for federal funds to assist states in the coordination, planning, design and construction of nationally significant transportation corridors for the purposes of economic growth and international and interregional growth.

In midst of a sluggish national economy, North Carolina has been a bright spot for growth and innovation, and one of the keys to sustaining that economic success is through continued investment in transportation, infrastructure, and our military. The Military Corridor Transportation Improvement Act is a true bipartisan effort to support North Carolina's military installations and complement the State's 25 year transportation improvement plan, which in turn will generate economic development, provide a boost for local communities and create good-paying jobs.

---

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow deductions and credits relating to expenditures in connection with marijuana sales conducted in compliance with State law; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am here today standing up for the people of Oregon and recognizing their decision to legalize and regulate marijuana for recreational use in the State.

Together with Senators MERKLEY and BENNET, I am introducing the Small Business Tax Equity Act, which will provide more equitable Federal tax treatment for small marijuana businesses who comply with State law. This comes after more than 56 percent of Oregonians voted for marijuana legalization. Congressman BLUMENAUER is introducing a companion bill in the House.

Unlike its treatment of all other legal businesses, the tax code currently denies these marijuana businesses, legitimate businesses, the ability to deduct ordinary expenses. Expenses, such as employee pay and rent, that are essential to operating any successful small business.

This is one piece of the equation as Federal tax inequalities for marijuana businesses extend beyond deductions. For example, other businesses are also eligible for the Work Opportunity Tax Credit for hiring veterans. Therefore the inability to make deductions, combined with other lost credits, often leads to these businesses paying an effective tax rate ranging from 65–75 percent; compared with other businesses who pay between 15–30 percent.

This issue is not unique to Oregon. Oregon is one of four States, along with the District of Columbia, where voters have passed measures that permit the legal adult use and retail sale of marijuana. Oregon is one of 23 States, along with the District of Columbia, have passed laws allowing for the legal use of medical marijuana.

Unfortunately, Federal law has not caught up with changing State laws, creating contradictions, and leaving these legal businesses in a tough position.

Today, I am introducing a bill to fix this problem. Marijuana businesses operating legally under state law should be able to deduct ordinary business expenses just like any other businesses. Voters have legalized their product, now let's help create a more level playing field that recognizes their business operations.

It is the right thing to do. It is only fair that Federal tax law respect the decision Oregonians, and citizens from other States and the District of Columbia, made at the polls.

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. 987

*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 ''Small Business Tax Equity Act of 2015''.

**SEC. 2. ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTIONS AND CREDITS RELATING TO EXPENDITURES IN CONNECTION WITH MARIJUANA SALES CONDUCTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH STATE LAW.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 280E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', unless such trade or business consists of marijuana sales conducted in compliance with State law''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

---

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 988. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in Illinois and all over the country thousands of high school students are participating in spring sports, including the national pastime: baseball and softball.

As with any sports team, these students are training their growing bodies to compete in a worthy endeavor, but with that comes some risk. They put on helmets, they put on pads, but unfortunately some of them will still get hurt.

Injuries are a part of all sports, but as we learn more about the long term effects of concussions and how frequently they are ignored, it is clear we have to step up our game to confront this health risk.

The National Federation of State High School Associations estimates about 140,000 students who play high school sports have concussions every year. Sports are second only to motor

vehicle crashes as the leading cause of traumatic brain injury among people aged 15 to 24 years.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, the number of children age 19 and younger being treated in ERs for traumatic brain injuries went from 153,373 in 2001 to 248,418 in 2009—a 60 percent increase.

Some students stay in the game not recognizing the risks of playing hurt—especially when they have had a concussion. Many athletes do not know the signs and symptoms of concussion, which may cause many concussions to go undetected.

A 2010 Government Accountability Office study found many sports-related concussions go unreported. Athletes who continue to play while concussed are at risk for catastrophic injury if they sustain another concussion before recovering from the first one. This second injury can cause symptoms that can last for months and can even be fatal. Youth athletes are at the greatest risk from sports-related concussions because their brains are still developing and are more susceptible to injury.

According to the American Academy of Neurology, athletes of high school age and younger with a concussion should be managed more conservatively when it comes to returning to play because they take longer to recover than college athletes.

Since 2009, states have started implementing legislation guiding return to play procedures for student athletes who have sustained a concussion.

With a push from the National Football League, NFL, all 50 States and the District of Columbia have successfully passed some form of legislation with varying concussion safety measures.

Illinois has been a leader on this issue and passed legislation in 2011, recognizing the dangers associated with concussion. In Illinois, a student athlete who is suspected of sustaining a concussion or head injury in a practice or game is immediately removed from the game until he or she is cleared by a health care professional.

This is a great step forward for Illinois, and I commend the Illinois High School Association and its support of this legislation for its work protecting student athletes.

I would like to introduce the Protecting Student Athletes from Concussions Act, which would support the progress made by states like Illinois. The bill would, for the first time, set minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions.

The legislation requires schools to post information about concussions on school grounds and on school websites and adopt a ''when in doubt, sit it out'' policy.

This policy requires that a student suspected of sustaining a concussion be removed from participation in the activity and prohibited from returning to play that day. They can return to play in future events after being evaluated and cleared by a qualified health care professional.

The ''when in doubt, sit it out'' policy is recommended by the American College of Sports Medicine and the American Academy of Neurology, which recommends that an athlete suspected of a concussion should not return to play the day of their injury—under any circumstance.

According to the Center for Injury Research and Policy in Columbus, Ohio, more than 40 percent of young athletes return to play before they are fully recovered.

Concussions are not always easily diagnosed, and symptoms that might indicate concussion don't always manifest themselves immediately. Athletes don't want to let down the team or the coach and are often eager to return to the game.

So helping athletes, school officials, coaches and parents recognize the signs and symptoms of concussion can make all the difference in putting a player's safety above winning.

This legislation will ensure that school districts have concussion management plans that educate students, parents, and school personnel about how to recognize and respond to concussions.

It asks schools to adopt the ''when in doubt, sit it out'' policy to be sure athletes are not put back in the game before they have recovered from an initial concussion.

I am pleased that a variety of organizations are supporting this bill, including the NFL, NCAA, NHL, NBA, American College of Sports Medicine, American Academy of Neurology, among others.

I look forward to working with the schools, athletic programs and others to build on the progress already made in protecting student athletes from concussions.

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. 988

*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 Student Athletes from Concussions Act of 2015''.

**SEC. 2. MINIMUM STATE REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—Each State that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) and does not meet the requirements described in this section, as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall, not later than the last day of the fifth full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act (referred to in this Act as the ''compliance deadline''), enact legislation or issue regulations establishing the following minimum requirements:

(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY CONCUSSION SAFETY AND MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Each local educational agency in the State, in consultation with members of the community in which such agency is located, shall develop and implement a standard plan for concussion safety and management that—

(A) educates students, parents, and school personnel about concussions, through activities such as—

(i) training school personnel, including coaches, teachers, athletic trainers, related services personnel, and school nurses, on concussion safety and management, including training on the prevention, recognition, and academic consequences of concussions and response to concussions; and

(ii) using, maintaining, and disseminating to students and parents—

(I) release forms and other appropriate forms for reporting and record keeping;

(II) treatment plans; and

(III) prevention and post-injury observation and monitoring fact sheets about concussion;

(B) encourages supports, where feasible, for a student recovering from a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity), such as—

(i) guiding the student in resuming participation in athletic activity and academic activities with the help of a multi-disciplinary concussion management team, which may include—

(I) a health care professional, the parents of such student, a school nurse, relevant related services personnel, and other relevant school personnel; and

(II) an individual who is assigned by a public school to oversee and manage the recovery of such student; and

(ii) providing appropriate academic accommodations aimed at progressively reintroducing cognitive demands on the student; and

(C) encourages the use of best practices designed to ensure, with respect to concussions, the uniformity of safety standards, treatment, and management, such as—

(i) disseminating information on concussion safety and management to the public; and

(ii) applying uniform best practice standards for concussion safety and management to all students enrolled in public schools.

(2) POSTING OF INFORMATION ON CONCUSSIONS.—Each public elementary school and each public secondary school shall post on school grounds, in a manner that is visible to students and school personnel, and make publicly available on the school website, information on concussions that—

(A) is based on peer-reviewed scientific evidence (such as information made available by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention);

(B) shall include information on—

(i) the risks posed by sustaining a concussion;

(ii) the actions a student should take in response to sustaining a concussion, including the notification of school personnel; and

(iii) the signs and symptoms of a concussion; and

(C) may include information on—

(i) the definition of a concussion;

(ii) the means available to the student to reduce the incidence or recurrence of a concussion; and

(iii) the effects of a concussion on academic learning and performance.

(3) RESPONSE TO CONCUSSION.—If an individual designated from among school personnel for purposes of this Act suspects that a student has sustained a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity)—

(A) the student shall be—

(i) immediately removed from participation in a school-sponsored athletic activity; and

(ii) prohibited from returning to participate in a school-sponsored athletic activity—

(I) on the day such student is removed from such participation; and

(II) until such student submits a written release from a health care professional stating that the student is capable of resuming participation in school-sponsored athletic activities; and

(B) the designated individual shall report to the parent or guardian of such student—

(i) any information that the designated school employee is aware of regarding the date, time, and type of the injury suffered by such student (regardless of where, when, or how a concussion may have occurred); and

(ii) any actions taken to treat such student.

(4) RETURN TO ATHLETICS.—If a student has sustained a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity), before such student resumes participation in school-sponsored athletic activities, the school shall receive a written release from a health care professional, that—

(A) states that the student is capable of resuming participation in such activities; and

(B) may require the student to follow a plan designed to aid the student in recovering and resuming participation in such activities in a manner that—

(i) is coordinated, as appropriate, with periods of cognitive and physical rest while symptoms of a concussion persist; and

(ii) reintroduces cognitive and physical demands on such student on a progressive basis only as such increases in exertion do not cause the reemergence or worsening of symptoms of a concussion.

(b) NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) FIRST YEAR.—If a State described in subsection (a) fails to comply with subsection (a) by the compliance deadline, the Secretary of Education shall reduce by 5 percent the amount of funds the State receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) for the first fiscal year following the compliance deadline.

(2) SUCCEEDING YEARS.—If the State fails to so comply by the last day of any fiscal year following the compliance deadline, the Secretary of Education shall reduce by 10 percent the amount of funds the State receives under that Act for the following fiscal year.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—Prior to reducing any funds that a State receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) in accordance with this subsection, the Secretary of Education shall provide a written notification of the intended reduction of funds to the State and to the appropriate committees of Congress.

**SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect civil or criminal liability under Federal or State law.

**SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) CONCUSSION.—The term ''concussion'' means a type of mild traumatic brain injury that—

(A) is caused by a blow, jolt, or motion to the head or body that causes the brain to move rapidly in the skull;

(B) disrupts normal brain functioning and alters the mental state of the individual, causing the individual to experience—

(i) any period of observed or self-reported—

(I) transient confusion, disorientation, or impaired consciousness;

(II) dysfunction of memory around the time of injury; or

(III) loss of consciousness lasting less than 30 minutes; or

(ii) any 1 of 4 types of symptoms, including—

(I) physical symptoms, such as headache, fatigue, or dizziness;

(II) cognitive symptoms, such as memory disturbance or slowed thinking;

(III) emotional symptoms, such as irritability or sadness; or

(IV) difficulty sleeping; and

(C) can occur—

(i) with or without the loss of consciousness; and

(ii) during participation in any organized sport or recreational activity.

(2) HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL.—The term ''health care professional''—

(A) means an individual who has been trained in diagnosis and management of traumatic brain injury in a pediatric population; and

(B) includes a physician (M.D. or D.O.) or certified athletic trainer who is registered, licensed, certified, or otherwise statutorily recognized by the State to provide such diagnosis and management.

(3) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY; STATE.—The terms ''local educational agency'' and ''State'' have the meanings given such terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(4) RELATED SERVICES PERSONNEL.—The term ''related services personnel'' means individuals who provide related services, as defined under section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401).

(5) SCHOOL-SPONSORED ATHLETIC ACTIVITY.—The term ''school-sponsored athletic activity'' means—

(A) any physical education class or program of a school;

(B) any athletic activity authorized during the school day on school grounds that is not an instructional activity;

(C) any extra-curricular sports team, club, or league organized by a school on or off school grounds; and

(D) any recess activity.

---

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 993. A bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act, a bill I am introducing today with a number of my Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle and with Representative DOUG COLLINS, who is introducing this legislation in the House. This bipartisan, bicameral bill will improve outcomes for people with mental illness when they interact with the criminal justice system. The Judiciary Committee unanimously approved this bill by voice vote in the last Congress, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the committee to move this legislation forward to consideration by the full Senate.

The Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act is meant to address a very serious problem: The United States has 5 percent of the world's population but has 25 percent of the world's prison population—in large part because we have effectively criminalized mental illness. People with mental health conditions disproportionately are arrested and incarcerated, but instead of providing people with adequate access to mental health treatment, we let them fall through the cracks and languish in prison. As my home county—Hennepin County—Sheriff Rich Stanek put it, ''Local jails are the largest mental health facilities in the state of Minnesota,'' and this holds true across our Nation.

Let's be clear. Using our criminal justice system as a substitute for a fully functioning mental health system doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense for law enforcement officers who often put their lives at risk when they are called upon to intervene in a mental health crisis. It doesn't make sense for courts which are inundated with cases involving people with mental illness. It doesn't make sense for people who have mental health conditions who often would benefit from treatment and intensive supervision than from traditional incarceration. It certainly doesn't make sense for taxpayers who foot the bill for high incarceration costs and overcrowded correction facilities and who must pay again when these untreated mentally ill prisoners are released back into society often in much worse shape than when they were locked up.

We can improve access to mental health services for people who come into contact with the criminal justice system, and we can give law enforcement officers the tools they need to identify and respond to mental health issues in the communities and the situations they confront.

In 2004, Congress passed and President Bush signed into law the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act—or MIOTCRA—which supports innovative programs that bring together mental health and criminal justice agencies to address the unique needs of people with mental health conditions. Former Ohio Republican Senator Mike DeWine, who now serves as that State's Attorney General, was the original sponsor of MIOTCRA.

The Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act reauthorizes and improves MIOTCRA. Let me talk a little bit about how the programs supported by this legislation protect law enforcement officers and save lives. I will give one example.

In 2013, I visited the police station in Columbia Heights, MN, a suburb of the Twin Cities. I talked with some of the officers who had been given crisis

intervention training for law enforcement officers to recognize when they are confronted or are entering a situation that involves someone who has a mental illness. The sheriff wasn't there that day, but the county attorney who was there on behalf of the sheriff said that the day after the sheriff had his training, he did not kill a guy he would otherwise have killed because he recognized what was going on. That was pretty dramatic.

So I turned to the other officers there who had also had this crisis intervention training and said to a policewoman: Can you give me a more garden-variety example?

She said: OK. About 3 months ago, I was on the street and I heard a woman screaming. I thought it was some domestic violence thing or something. I went to see what was going on, and she went over to a railing that if she had let go, she would have dropped to a playground below. She might not have killed herself, but she would have gotten very badly hurt. From my training, I realized I was in a situation with someone who was mentally ill, and I used my training to talk her back up. I spoke to the woman. She said she had been sexually abused as a child; that the perpetrator had left town and had left her life, but recently that man had come back.

She said: I think I know where I can get help for you. And she got her access to some treatment.

She said: A couple months later, I was working a street fair when this same woman came up to me, very calm, and said: You saved my life.

I said: OK. This is your garden-variety story?

She said: Yes, I use this training all the time. I will holster my gun maybe once in my career, but I use this all the time.

Now, the grants currently available that would be reauthorized through the Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act—which fund programs such as local crisis intervention training—are the only ones offered by the Justice Department that address mental health issues in the criminal justice system. So passing this legislation is critically important, and the bill would improve and expand upon the law.

Here are some of the important things the bill does: It continues support for mental health courts and crisis intervention teams, both of which save lives and money. It includes new grant accountability measures and emphasizes the use of evidence-based practices that have been proven effective through empirical evidence. Our Presiding Officer is a physician, therefore a scientist, and therefore relies on empirical evidence. It authorizes investments in veterans treatment courts, which serve arrested veterans who have been arrested because they suffer from PTSD, substance addiction, which may be used to medicate their mental health or behavioral and other mental health conditions, other sometimes invisible wounds. It supports the development of programs, such as crisis intervention training, to train local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers how to recognize and respond appropriately to mental health crises. One of the new things the bill does is to support State and local efforts to identify people with mental health conditions at each point in the criminal justice system in order to appropriately direct them to mental health services.

Our bill also increases the focus on corrections-based programs.

I went to a prison in St. Cloud, MN, where they do intake in our State system. They said this crisis intervention training is incredibly important to them. They said: Do you watch TV on the weekends where they show prisoners, show the prison system, where you put on all the gear because some prisoner has gotten out of control and you have to go into the cell and tackle them? That could be avoided very often by understanding what is going on here. There is a lot of wear and tear when they have to go in like that. It is better to recognize what is going on and know how to deal with it.

The bill also increases the focus on things such as transitional services that reduce recidivism rates and screening practices that identify inmates with mental health conditions.

Finally, the bill gives local officials greater control over program participation eligibility. This again is for a program that already exists.

The current system is broken. It doesn't serve the interests of people with mental illness, and it doesn't protect the safety of law enforcement personnel. As one Minnesota judge wrote:

> While [inmates with mental illness] are sitting in jail, they often recede further into the depths of their illness. They present a danger to themselves; they present a danger to fellow inmates; and they present a danger to the . . . men and women who run the jails.

We have an obligation to ensure that people with mental illness receive the treatment and supervision they need and that the officers who put their lives on the line when they are called on to intervene in mental health crises are trained to respond in a way that protects their safety and that of their fellow officers and of the person with mental illness. This bill helps us better meet that obligation.

I am very pleased to introduce this bill with a bipartisan group of lawmakers who are committed to improving the ways in which people with mental health conditions interact with the criminal justice system—in particular, my fellow lead sponsor, Senator JOHN CORNYN, and Representative DOUG COLLINS, who is leading this effort in the House.

This legislation has always enjoyed bipartisan support. In 2004, it was introduced by Michael DeWine, Republican from Ohio, in the Senate. In the last Congress, the predecessor of this bill had 39 Senate cosponsors, including 25 Democrats and 14 Republicans. The House companion bill had 55 cosponsors, including 24 Democrats and 31 Republicans.

As you can see, this has always been a bipartisan effort, and I am pleased to continue that tradition in this Congress. I would like to thank Senators CORNYN, AYOTTE, BLUNT, and PORTMAN, as well as Senators LEAHY, DURBIN, WHITEHOUSE, KLOBUCHAR, COONS, BLUMENTHAL, BOXER, BROWN, WARREN, and BOOKER, for serving as original cosponsors of the Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act. I look forward to adding more cosponsors in the days to come.

I would also like to recognize the many law enforcement, civil rights veterans, and mental health advocacy organizations—most notably the Council of State Governments—for standing in strong support of this legislation or its predecessor bill and advocating tirelessly for its enactment. More than 250 organizations endorsed this legislation in the previous Congress, including the American Legion, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Major County Sheriffs' Association, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the National Association of Counties, and the Wounded Warrior Project, just to name a few.

I look forward to working together with advocates and with my colleagues to get this bill enacted into law so that we can ease the burden of mental health problems on our criminal justice system and help a lot of people.

---

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1006. A bill to incentivize early adoption of positive train control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about Positive Train Control, a crash-avoidance rail safety system that can automatically stop trains in order to prevent impending collisions.

The Senate Commerce Committee recently voted to advance a bill that would give railroads a 5-to-7 year extension of the deadline to implement this life-saving technology.

In my view, a blanket extension is disastrous policy.

Fortunately, the members of the Commerce Committee have signaled their willingness to consider improvements to this bill, and today I rise to offer such an improvement.

This legislation, the Positive Train Control Safety Act, would provide a reasonable extension for the implementation of positive train control until 2018, on a case-by-case, year-by-year basis, for any railroad whose implementation plans were delayed by factors outside of their control.

This provision mirrors language that already passed the Senate in 2012 as

part of the transportation reauthorization bill with overwhelming support. It is a measured, realistic response to the delayed implementation we have witnessed. Overall, this bill strives to hold the railroads to their safety commitments.

To understand the importance of PTC, we must revisit a terrible tragedy in my State of California, near Chatsworth.

In 2008, a Los Angeles Metrolink commuter train collided head-on with a Union Pacific freight train, killing 25 people and injuring 135 more.

Testimony from the victims who survived the crash paint a gruesome picture of the aftermath. ''Severed limbs were strewn all about and blood was pooled everywhere.'' Victims' bodies, many torn to pieces, had to be extracted from heaps of steel and wreckage.

One passenger described coming across a man who had been crushed by an air vent: ''His mangled legs were all I could see, but his cries for help were very loud. Eventually he must have died, as he was calling out for his mother and then no more sounds. [. . .] I was trying to decide if I would die by fire or suffocation of smoke.''

Many victims suffered traumatic brain injuries and those sitting at tables suffered ''horrible abdominal injuries that cannot be medically resolved.'' As the National Transportation Safety Board found in its investigation, this terrible tragedy could have been prevented if the Positive Train Control technology had been in place.

Positive Train Control is a system for automatic train safety, which was originally recommended by the National Transportation Safety Board in 1970.

Using GPS and wireless technology, Positive Train Control can automatically put the brakes on trains about to collide or derail. Positive Train Control can monitor trains and stop them if they enter the wrong track or are about to run red lights.

In the Metrolink crash, it was later determined that the engineer was texting, causing him to miss a red signal and cause the deadly collision.

PTC could have prevented this, as it could have forced the train to stop before running onto the same track as the oncoming freight train.

This horrific accident became a rallying cry for Congress, which responded by passing the Rail Safety Improvement Act in 2008.

This legislation mandated the widespread installation of PTC by the end of 2015.

The railroad industry has fought PTC from start. Now, as the deadline rapidly approaches, railroads are again lobbying hard to delay installation. Many have not even begun installing PTC in any form—something that is particularly disturbing to me.

After its terrible accident, Metrolink in California has shown great leadership and plans to be the first railroad to be fully certified. Metrolink is on track do so by the federally-mandated deadline of December 31, 2015.

Several other railroad companies in California are also on track to begin using PTC this year, in demonstration mode, on the path to final certification. These include the North County Transit District in San Diego and Caltrain in the Bay Area.

In addition, new passenger rail services in California plan to operate with PTC from the first moment that they come on-line, including the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit line in 2016 and the first High Speed Rail segment in 2022.

California is committed to safe and efficient rail. I believe my State demonstrates that railroads around the country can and should be expected to implement Positive Train Control as soon as is feasible, without unnecessary delay.

The bill that the Senate Commerce Committee recently voted to advance is a no-strings-attached bill that would extend by 5 years the deadline by which PTC must be implemented.

On top of that, it offers railroads an optional extension of an additional 2 years on a case-by-case basis. Extending the deadline through until the outset of 2023.

Effectively, this is just kicking the can down road once more.

I am deeply concerned about this blanket extension. First, it rewards those that have chosen delay over action. More troubling, it could have deadly consequences for Americans across the country.

It has been 7 years since the collision at Chatsworth claimed 25 lives, and 45 years since the National Transportation Safety Board first recommended a system like Positive Train Control.

Unnecessary delay is simply not acceptable.

This is why I am introducing this bill today. I believe it will incentivize railroads to install PTC as quickly as possible.

My bill allows case-by-case, single-year extensions through 2018 for railroads that have demonstrated good faith efforts to implement PTC. It also instructs the Department of Transportation to only grant extensions if the Secretary determines that a railroad's efforts to implement PTC were delayed due to circumstances beyond their control.

In addition, the bill offers a number of other common-sense provisions relating to Positive Train Control requirements and railroad safety. These provisions reflect the lessons we have learned since the Rail Safety Improvement Act first required the implementation of PTC 6½ years ago.

These provisions include bolstering the transparency of railroads' implementation efforts, by requiring regular status reports; and ensuring trains carrying crude oil or ethanol run on tracks with PTC.

The provision requires better coordination between the Federal Railroad Administration and the Federal Communications Commission to ensure adequate wireless communications availability.

Requiring the Department of Transportation to evaluate the effectiveness of PTC at grade crossings.

Improving opportunities for railroad employees to report safety deficiencies.

Protecting employees in rail work zones.

Improving inspection practices on commuter railroads.

Riding our rails should not be a dangerous activity. It doesn't have to be. If we have the technology to prevent collisions, we must use it.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider this proposal.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 136—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 1, 2015, AS ''SILVER STAR SERVICE BANNER DAY''

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 136

Whereas the Senate has always honored the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas the Silver Star Service Banner has come to represent the members of the Armed Forces and veterans who were wounded or became ill in combat in the wars fought by the United States;

Whereas the Silver Star Families of America was formed to help the people of the United States remember the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces by designing and manufacturing Silver Star Service Banners and Silver Star Flags for that purpose;

Whereas the sole mission of the Silver Star Families of America is to evoke memories of the sacrifices of members of the Armed Forces and veterans on behalf of the United States through the presence of a Silver Star Service Banner in a window or a Silver Star Flag flying;

Whereas the sacrifices of members of the Armed Forces and veterans on behalf of the United States should never be forgotten; and

Whereas May 1, 2015, is an appropriate date to designate as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day'': Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate supports the designation of May 1, 2015, as ''Silver Star Service Banner Day'' and calls upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 137—CONGRATULATING THE ADMINISTRATION, STAFF, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI OF ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY ON THE OCCASION OF THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 137

Whereas on April 17, 2015, Roosevelt University, located in Chicago, Illinois, will celebrate the 70th anniversary of the founding of the University on April 17, 1945;

Whereas Roosevelt University has graduated more than 95,000 students who have become leaders in their professions and careers, including the first African-American mayor of Chicago, Harold Washington;

Whereas Roosevelt University was founded at a time when most institutions of higher education in the United States did not enroll large numbers of minority or immigrant students;

Whereas Roosevelt University became 1 of the first colleges in the United States to admit all qualified students, regardless of race, religion, or national origin;

Whereas throughout its history, Roosevelt University has always remained true to the values of inclusiveness, opportunity, and social justice; and

Whereas today, Roosevelt remains 1 of the most diverse universities in the Midwest: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the administration, staff, students, and alumni of Roosevelt University on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the University; and

(2) wishes the entire Roosevelt community many years of continued success in the future.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 138—CONGRATULATING THE PROVIDENCE COLLEGE MEN'S ICE HOCKEY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2015 NCAA DIVISION I NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. REED of Rhode Island (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 138

Whereas on Saturday, April 11, 2015, the Providence College Friars won the 2015 NCAA Division I Men's Ice Hockey National Championship by defeating the Boston University Terriers by a score of 4 to 3 at TD Garden in Boston, Massachusetts;

Whereas numbers 16, 10, and 6 scored the first three goals for the Friars to keep the game close;

Whereas the extraordinary goal by number 22 in the third period put Providence College in the lead for good;

Whereas the superb goaltending of number 32 held back Boston University's scoring attacks and sealed the victory for the Friars, earning him Most Outstanding Player honors of the NCAA Division I Men's Ice Hockey Tournament;

Whereas the season-long contributions and dedication of all players and coaches of the Friars' hockey team contributed to this National Championship season;

Whereas this is the first NCAA Championship for the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team;

Whereas the Providence College Friars finished the season with 26 wins and outscored its opponents 19 to 10 in the NCAA Division I Men's Ice Hockey Tournament; and

Whereas the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team became the latest Rhode Island college team to win a National Championship and earn the pride of the State: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team for winning the 2015 NCAA Division I National Championship;

(2) commends the players, coaches, and staff of the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team for their hard work and dedication in making this the most successful season in team history; and

(3) recognizes the Providence College students, alumni, and fans who supported the Men's Ice Hockey team in its pursuit of a National Championship.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 139—COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ATTACK ON THE ALFRED P. MURRAH FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 139

Whereas on April 19, 1995, at 9:02 a.m. central daylight time, in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, the United States was attacked in 1 of the worst terrorist attacks on United States soil, which killed 168 people and injured more than 850 others;

Whereas this dishonorable act of domestic terrorism affected thousands of families and horrified millions of people across the State of Oklahoma and the United States;

Whereas the people of Oklahoma and the United States responded to this tragedy through the remarkable efforts of local, State, and Federal law enforcement, firefighters, and emergency services, search and rescue teams from across the United States, public and private medical personnel, and thousands of volunteers from the community who saved lives, assisted the injured and wounded, comforted the bereaved, and provided meals and support to those who came to Oklahoma City to help the those endangered and affected by that terrorist act;

Whereas the people of Oklahoma and the United States pledged themselves to build and maintain a permanent national memorial to remember those who were killed, those who survived, and those changed forever;

Whereas that pledge was fulfilled by creating the Oklahoma City National Memorial, which draws hundreds of thousands of visitors from around the world every year to the site of that tragic event in United States history;

Whereas the Oklahoma City National Memorial brings comfort, strength, peace, hope, and serenity to the many visitors who come to the memorial and the museum of the memorial each year to remember and to learn; and

Whereas the 20th anniversary of the terrorist bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, is on April 19, 2015: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) joins with the people of the United States in sending best wishes and prayers to the families, friends, and neighbors of the 168 people killed in the terrorist bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma;

(2) sends the best wishes and thoughts of Congress to those injured in the bombing;

(3) expresses the gratitude of Congress for the recovery of those injured;

(4) thanks the thousands of first responders, rescue workers, medical personnel, and volunteers from the Oklahoma City community and across the United States who answered the call for help that April morning and in the days and weeks that followed;

(5) resolves to work with the people of the United States to promote the goals and mission established by the Oklahoma City National Memorial on the 20th anniversary of that fateful day;

(6) supports the resolve for the future, written on the wall of the memorial, ''We come here to remember those who were killed, those who survived, and those changed forever. May all who leave here know the impact of violence. May this memorial offer comfort, strength, peace, hope, and serenity.'';

(7) congratulates the people of Oklahoma City for making tremendous progress over the past 2 decades and demonstrating their steadfast commitment to the ability of hope to triumph over violence;

(8) applauds the people of Oklahoma City as they continue to persevere and to stand as a beacon to the rest of the United States and the world attesting to the strength of goodness in overcoming evil wherever it arises in our midst; and

(9) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Memorial Foundation, as an expression of appreciation.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12—RECOGNIZING THE NEED TO IMPROVE PHYSICAL ACCESS TO MANY FEDERALLY FUNDED FACILITIES FOR ALL PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, PARTICULARLY PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. CON. RES. 12

Whereas, in 2012, nearly 20 percent of the civilian population in the United States reported having a disability;

Whereas, in 2012, 16 percent of veterans, amounting to more than 3,500,000 people, received service-related disability benefits;

Whereas, in 2011, the percentage of working-age people in the United States who reported having a work limitation due to a disability was 7 percent, which is a 20-year high;

Whereas the Act entitled ''An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped'', approved August 12, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as the ''Architectural Barriers Act of 1968''), was enacted to ensure that certain federally funded facilities are designed and constructed to be accessible to people with disabilities and requires that physically handicapped people have ready access to, and use of, post offices and other Federal facilities;

Whereas automatic doors, though not mandated by either the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 or the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), provide a greater degree of self-sufficiency and dignity for people with disabilities and the elderly, who may have limited strength to open a manually operated door;

Whereas a report commissioned by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (referred to in this preamble as the ''Access Board''), an independent Federal agency created to ensure access to federally funded facilities for people with disabilities, recommends that all new buildings for use by the public should have at least one automated door at an accessible

entrance, except for small buildings where adding such doors may be a financial hardship for the owners of the buildings;

Whereas States and municipalities have begun to recognize the importance of automatic doors in improving accessibility;

Whereas the laws of the State of Connecticut require automatic doors in certain shopping malls and retail businesses, the laws of the State of Delaware require automatic doors or calling devices for newly constructed places of accommodation, and the laws of the District of Columbia have a similar requirement;

Whereas the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service, published by the General Services Administration, requires automation of at least one exterior door for all newly constructed or renovated facilities managed by the General Services Administration, including post offices;

Whereas from 2006 to 2011, 71 percent of the complaints received by the Access Board regarding the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 concerned a post office or other facility of the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the United States Postal Service employs approximately 522,000 people, making it the second-largest civilian employer in the United States;

Whereas approximately 3,200,000 people visit 1 of the 31,857 post offices in the United States each day; and

Whereas the United States was founded on principles of equality and freedom, and these principles require that all people, including people with disabilities, are able to engage as equal members of society: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes the immense hardships that people with disabilities in the United States must overcome every day;

(2) reaffirms its support of the Act entitled ''An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped'', approved August 12, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.), commonly known as the ''Architectural Barriers Act of 1968'', and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), and encourages full compliance with such Acts;

(3) recommends that the United States Postal Service and Federal agencies install power-assisted doors at post offices and other federally funded facilities, respectively, to ensure equal access for all people of the United States; and

(4) pledges to continue to work to identify and remove the barriers that prevent all people of the United States from having equal access to the services provided by the Federal Government.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON. 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 April 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Regulatory Burdens to Obtaining Mortgage Credit.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSON. 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 April 16, 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. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Congress and U.S. Tariff Policy.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 12:30 p.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 20, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 24; that there be 30 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination, and that following disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CONGRATULATING THE ADMINISTRATION, STAFF, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI OF ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY ON THE OCCASION OF THE UNIVERSITY'S 70TH ANNIVERSARY

## CONGRATULATING THE PROVIDENCE COLLEGE MEN'S ICE HOCKEY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2015 NCAA DIVISION I NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 137, Roosevelt University; and S. Res. 138, Providence College.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolutions by title en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 137) congratulating the administration, staff, students, and alumni of Roosevelt University on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the University.

A resolution (S. Res. 138) congratulating the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team for winning the 2015 NCAA Division I National Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 137) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

The resolution (S. Res. 138) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME EN BLOC—H.R. 636, H.R. 644, H.R. 1295, H.R. 1314, AND S. 984

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are five bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 636) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

A bill (H.R. 1295) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code.

A bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

A bill (S. 984) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The measures will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

## ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 20, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, April 20; 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; and that following leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators SULLIVAN and LEE for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the nuclear agreement that is being negotiated with Iran. I will start by commending the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, particularly Senator CORKER, the chairman of that committee. They moved the Corker-Menendez bill through the committee a few days ago with a unanimous vote. It was very important work. It is a good start to a critically important topic for the American people. I know it was a struggle. We read about what happened in the press. But it is important to recognize that it was a struggle that should not have been.

The Obama administration put tremendous pressure on Members of this body—Democratic Members of this body—not to allow the U.S. Senate to have any say on this issue, one of the most important foreign policy issues facing the country right now. They did not want the American people to have a voice. In fact, last month when the bill was released, the President vowed to veto it. He backed off only when it was clear that members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats, stood firm against the President and with the American people. Then the President knew he would fail and his veto threat would likely be overridden.

So the President, under pressure, dispatched Secretary of State John Kerry, a former Member of this body, to give me and my colleagues here in the Senate a closed-door preview of these negotiations in this framework agreement. I sat through the meeting and had some discussions with the Secretary. It was useful, but think about it—it was a closed-door briefing. Why not involve the American people?

This is not an issue which is about the Senate or the Congress per se, as we often read in the paper. This is an issue about the American people, who have a voice through us, their representatives in Congress, and should have a say on one of the most critical foreign policy issues facing the United States right now. And, remember, we know this. We were sent here. The people are wise. The citizens of this country are wise. They understand national security. Many of them are in the military. Many of them have sons and daughters in the military. Many of them are veterans. They know what sacrifice is. They know what national security is. They sent us here so their voices could be heard, particularly on issues of national security and on issues of the security of the country they love.

Make no mistake, Americans are overwhelmingly interested in making sure that they, through their representatives in Congress, have a say in this important deal. A recent USA TODAY-Suffolk University poll showed that a whopping 72 percent of Americans think Congress should have a role in approving the nuclear negotiations with Iran.

What is very interesting about this is that once upon a time, even President Obama, Secretary of State John Kerry, and former Senator Clinton all believed this body should have a role in such important agreements. They said Congress should approve any sweeping deals. In 2007 and 2008, they cosponsored a bill that required congressional approval of any long-term security commitment President Bush made to Iraq.

Vice President BIDEN—then-Senator BIDEN—put it then:

> The president cannot make such a sweeping commitment on his own authority. Congress must grant approval.

Those were wise words then, and I believe they are wise words today. Why is that? One reason is that when the executive branch and the Congress work together, we are stronger on issues of foreign policy and national security. Think about all of the different times in which this body, through treaties and other agreements, worked with Presidents of both parties—bipartisan—to make sure we were speaking strongly together on critical issues of national security. I served under Condoleezza Rice as an Assistant Secretary of State and worked on these kinds of issues—sanctions on Iran and terrorist finance issues—and I saw that when the executive branch worked with the Congress, we were stronger.

As I mentioned, when then-Senator BIDEN mentioned these words about congressional approval, they were wise words. Yet, now the Vice President, Secretary Kerry, and President Obama—all former Members of this body—are ignoring their own previous advice and previous wisdom, and they are ignoring the American people in the process through their representatives in Congress.

Where does that leave us today? My own view is that the President should have reached out to the Congress from the very beginning and said that he wanted to work with us and have our approval on this important agreement so we could be stronger as a country, the executive branch and the Congress working together, unified, to enhance America's national security.

The President should have looked to the Congress and the Constitution when considering this potential agreement—whether the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world should get a nuclear weapon and when—and realized this was an important enough national security issue and said: I am going to submit this as a treaty. He should have been willing to make the case to the American people and convince two-thirds of the Senate to vote for this agreement, as required by the Constitution. But he chose another path. He chose the ''go it alone'' path where even just a few weeks ago the administration signaled that it was not going to show the agreement—the key annexes of this agreement—to the Congress and that any attempts to force him to do so would be vetoed. That was a mistake. That is a mistake, and we are starting to change that.

In these kinds of matters, the U.S. State Department urges any administration—Republican or Democratic—to

use the utmost caution when deciding how to deal with international treaties on key foreign policy issues and the Congress.

I have a quote from the State Department guidelines:

> In determining whether any international agreement should be brought into force as a treaty or as an international agreement other than a treaty, the utmost care is to be exercised to avoid any invasion or compromise of the constitutional powers of the President, the Senate, and the Congress as a whole.

That is the State Department—''the utmost care.'' But the Obama administration did not take the utmost care in this matter. In fact, their goal has been to shut out the American people on this deal.

So what are we doing? The Congress is having to force the President to let the American people be heard. That is what we are doing, and I believe in many ways that is sad. The President is clearly not abiding by the advice he gave when he was a Senator on these kinds of issues, and neither is the Vice President, so the Congress acted.

The Corker-Menendez bill that passed the Foreign Relations Committee, which will be debated soon on this floor, at least gives us an up-or-down vote, and it will enable us to actually see some of the classified annexes that are part of this agreement. Again, it is not us, it is the American people. It is the people we represent.

I urge my colleagues to practice what the State Department has said is the utmost care on these kinds of issues. We need to look hard at whatever agreement is finalized and brought to this body, and we need to work hard to cut through the clutter and opaque language, unclear language, and conflicting views of this agreement—the way in which this administration is describing this deal right now.

I will give one example. Let's take the phrase ''snapped back.'' Right now, the American people are being told that if Iran violates the terms of this agreement, the sanctions, which have been key to this entire agreement and imposed on Iran by this body four different times, can quickly and automatically be snapped back. That is a fantasy. President Obama knows that sanctions—particularly international sanctions—cannot just be snapped back. But it is a great phrase. It sounds good, but it is a fantasy.

As I mentioned, as a former Assistant Secretary of State, I worked with the Congress and other members of the executive branch to go around to different countries in the world and strongly encourage them to divest out of Iran, out of the Iranian oil and gas sector. In many ways, we said: If you don't take action and divest out of Iran, it is very likely that the Congress will sanction you. We worked with the Congress. This was executive branch and congressional branch cooperation, making us stronger as a nation because it worked.

Many of these companies started to divest. It weakened Iran, but this took years. There was no snap involved. This was a slog, but it was successful. It was successful because this body was very intimately involved. The President knows this. Secretary Kerry knows this. But the fact that they are willing to say ''Don't worry, sanctions will be snapped back in an instant'' should otherwise make us all nervous.

The administration needs to explain to the American people how this snapback will work. Think about it. If sanctions are lifted, millions, probably billions of dollars are going to flow from European companies, countries; Asian companies, countries; Russian; Chinese. They are going to flow into Iran. They are going to invest in businesses. They are going to invest in the oil and gas sector. They are going to invest in banks. And then we are going to snap that back if there is a violation, automatically, in a couple of days? It is not going to happen. It is a catchy phrase with no substance.

The administration needs to explain it. The American people need to know what is at stake. The Secretary and the President need to be clear with the American people on exactly what is in this agreement. They need to level with the American people. As we move forward, as we think about how we are going to analyze, look at, vote on this agreement, they must tell the American people the truth.

We must start to think about some of these issues. Let's start with a couple of things that are very important for the American people to know, and the American people do know them.

Let's start by recognizing that Iran is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism.

Let's recognize that Iran has consistently lied and cheated with regard to its nuclear weapons program, including even recently, during these negotiations.

Let's recognize that Iran will not—will not—stand down from its stated goal that many of its leaders still state today, which is that they want to wipe Israel off the map.

Let's recognize that Iran is responsible—and this is very important to recognize and understand—for the maiming and killing of likely thousands of U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in Iraq by supplying Shia militias there with the most sophisticated, the most lethal IED on the battlefield, called an EFP, an explosively formed projectile. If a person was in Iraq as a U.S. military member and that person was in a vehicle that hit one of these IEDs, that person was either going to be killed or seriously maimed. This is something I witnessed during my time as a staff officer to the commanding general of the U.S. Central Command when I was in Iraq as a marine.

Let's recognize that from what we know right now in terms of this deal, Iran doesn't appear to have given up much at all. They will keep thousands of nuclear centrifuges. They will keep their missile development programs. They will keep their nuclear infrastructure. They will continue to support and sponsor terrorism around the world—the largest state sponsor of terrorism.

The American people need to know that if we do lift sanctions—and it is not clear when we are going to lift them; the Iranians are saying we are going to lift them right away—if we do lift sanctions, Iran will very likely use the millions of dollars that will flood into their economy to pump up their terror machine around the world and likely target our citizens. The American people need to understand all of this as we go forward.

Maybe the administration disagrees on some of these points. Maybe they don't think these points are the aspects of the deal. And if none of this is true, then let Secretary Kerry and his team come forward to the Congress and make the case in public to the American people that this isn't the case, that this is a deal which will keep us safe, that this is a deal with a regime that is trustworthy. Let them make that case.

The Congress needs to be very involved, and we are involved because of the respect for the people we represent.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Utah.

## COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ATTACK ON THE ALFRED P. MURRAH FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 139, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

> A resolution (S. Res. 139) commemorating the 20th anniversary of the attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LEE. 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. 139) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

## REMEMBERING NORM BANGERTER

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Gov. Norm Bangerter, who

served as Utah's 13th Governor from 1985 to 1993. He was truly an extraordinary man and an exceptional leader. He passed away this past Tuesday, April 14, at the age of 82.

He loved Utah, and he loved this great Nation. As a veteran, a business owner, an elected official, a father, and a man of faith, he led a life of service to his community, to his church, and to his country.

Norm Bangerter once described himself as ''just an old farmer and carpenter.'' And he was those things. While the qualities of a farmer and a carpenter may seem far removed from business and political leadership, his farmer's grit and determination saw him through many tough political battles, and his eye as a master craftsman ensured every step along the way he could not only start a project, but he knew how to put a fine finish on that project and see it through all the way to completion. His willingness to get his hands a ''little dirty'' enabled him to tackle difficult issues, the kinds of issues that required hard work and heavy lifting far from the spotlight and limelight of public praise. And he was, indeed, a builder. He was a builder of business, a builder of the great State of Utah, and, as I personally experienced, a builder of people.

I, like so many others throughout my great State and elsewhere, have been blessed by Governor Bangerter's vision for building other leaders. He stood with me as a young candidate and as a new Senator and provided priceless insight, wisdom, and perspective. He taught me that it was never about me but always about the State, about the Nation, and about future generations. He proved his commitment to this principle when he described his decision not to seek a third term as Governor. When he made that announcement, he said:

> We have not concentrated on image or on protecting our popularity in the polls. We have taken the problems as they came, head on, and we have proposed the best solution we knew regardless of political consequences. . . . I want to go down in history as the Governor who didn't spend eight years worrying about how he would go down in history.

All of us in Congress could benefit from this kind of approach. All of us in Congress could learn a great deal from this man's extraordinary example.

Governor Bangerter was one of the most unassuming, kind, honest, genuinely decent people I have ever met. He was the kind of man and was the kind of great Governor who, like a great farmer and a great carpenter, left the world much better than he found it.

Like the farmer planting oak trees for the next generation or the carpenter finishing a finely crafted masterpiece that becomes a treasured heirloom for generations to enjoy, Governor Bangerter spent his life planting the seeds for the extraordinary State of Utah and crafted a legacy of leadership that will be remembered and will be followed for many decades to come. Governor Norm Bangerter's leadership will be missed, and his friendship will be cherished forever.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 20, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 2 p.m., Monday, April 20.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:48 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 20, 2015, at 2 p.m.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 16, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

RUSSELL C. DEYO, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

JONODEV OSCEOLA CHAUDHURI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF THREE YEARS.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## BRINGING ATTENTION TO ILLEGAL POACHING AND TRAFFICKING OF AFRICAN RHINO HORNS AND ELEPHANT IVORY

### HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the issue of poaching and illegal trafficking of African rhino horn and elephant ivory. The barbaric slaughter of tens of thousands of these animals appears to be growing worse, currently occurring at its highest level in 25 years. More than $19 billion move through illicit wildlife crime syndicates, and ivory's value on the street is sometimes greater than gold or cocaine.

Around the world, rhino horns can cost as much as $60,000 per pound. To meet this demand, roughly three rhinos are killed on a daily basis. At the same time, more than 20,000 elephants were killed in 2013. If this killing trend continues, the extinction of the African Elephant will occur in our lifetimes. In addition to its profitability, many criminals choose to engage in poaching because it is viewed as a low-risk endeavor compared to other illegal activities, despite the attempts of African nations to crack down on animal trafficking.

Park rangers face tremendous challenges in their efforts to protect these animals, including injury, torture and death as they confront poachers and illegal traders. It is reported that at least two rangers die worldwide each week while fighting to protect wildlife from poachers. Although park rangers have a heavy burden of responsibility, they are too often given little to no support or pay. In contrast, poachers are armed with weaponry such as heat-seeking telescopes, automatic weapons, GPS satellite receivers, and even helicopters. The lack of adequate funding and equipment for park rangers is evident in the brutal massacres of both humans and animals left in the wake of night-time raids, silent ambushes, and communities in poaching areas that are often paid-off or threatened with destruction by poachers.

The illegal trade of animal parts is fueling conflict throughout Africa, providing cash and support for international criminal organizations and terrorist groups. Following the drug and weapons trade, animal poaching is the 3rd most prominent and lucrative source of funding for conflict around the world. With the presence and spread of terrorist groups like Boko Haram in many African nations, the urgency to prevent any contributions to these violent organizations is clear. Ending poaching and illegal trafficking of African rhino horns and elephant ivory is in the interest of our national security, peace in poaching regions and preservation of these majestic animals.

## IN HONOR OF LEGAL SERVICES FOR SENIORS

### HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Legal Services for Seniors on the occasion of its 30th anniversary. Founded in 1985, Legal Services for Seniors provides comprehensive legal services to all Monterey County senior citizens at no cost, regardless of their ability to pay.

It opened its first office that year on the Monterey Peninsula with a staff of just three. Since then Legal Services for Seniors has continuously expanded its ability to provide legal services, especially to the underserved low-income seniors of Salinas and its neighboring rural areas. It now employs a full time staff of eight and serves seniors in their Salinas and Monterey Peninsula offices as well as ten weekly outreach sites throughout Monterey County.

Legal Services for Seniors has served an astounding 80,000 clients in the past thirty years and continues to make the lives of those they serve the most important part of their practice. It is particularly noted for its financial elder abuse prevention program which serves as a model for other such efforts throughout California. Indeed, Legal Services for Seniors has been called upon to help train other nonprofit legal aid organizations throughout the State of California on financial elder abuse prevention so that not only Monterey County seniors, but seniors throughout the State are benefitting from their expertise.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Legal Services for Seniors will continue to meet the needs of Monterey County seniors with quality care, integrity, professionalism, mutual respect, innovation and accountability for many years to come. I am proud to know an organization with such integrity and compassion exists for Monterey County seniors. I know that I speak for the whole House in congratulating Legal Services for Seniors for 30 years of exemplary service and in wishing it many more years of success.

## 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PRYTANIA THEATER

### HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the The Prytania Theater, the crown jewel of the New Orleans' art scene and the only single- screen motion picture theater in the state of Louisiana.

The Prytania Theater first opened its doors on December 20, 1914 and has witnessed the evolution of cinema from silent pictures, to talkies, to the current digital landscape. The owners of the land and building, John and Gayle Gish, placed the Prytania in a protected trust so that future generations could benefit from its historical value. It is currently operated by the Brunet family, who has continuously operated theaters in the New Orleans area for over 100 years.

For the Brunet family, the Prytania is arguably the most important venture they have pursued to date. Rene Brunet Sr. operated several neighborhood theaters beginning in 1907. And after his death in 1946, his son, Rene Brunet Jr., took over the family business and operated as many as six neighborhood theaters at one time. Although the movie industry has changed enormously over the last century, Rene Jr. and his son Robert continue to carry the torch. Currently, Robert oversees the daily operations of the theater alongside his daughter Paige, while Rene Jr. remains an important part of the Prytania operation. On several days of the week, one may find all three generations of the Brunet family at work inside the Prytania, and the Brunets intend to run the theater for as long as possible.

Like all movie theaters, the Prytania brings communities together for the unparalleled and magical experience of collectively viewing a movie on the silver screen. The Prytania is also an anchor for the surrounding community. After the devastation of Hurricane Katrina in 2005, the Prytania was the first theater to reopen after the Hurricane in October 2005; and upon re-opening, Rene Brunet Jr. extended his hand in generosity and offered free admission to the first responders.

The Prytania is a centerpiece of New Orleans' vibrant arts scene. It has hosted movie stars like Sandra Bullock, Brad Pitt, Nicholas Cage and Quentin Tarantino; New Orleans Saints players; the New Orleans Film Festival; the French Film Festival; the Irish Film Festival and numerous premieres and film community events.

The Prytania's history of hosting world-famous movie industry figures and smaller, independent filmmakers shows that the Prytania is a unique institution that continues the tradition of old Hollywood glitz and glamour while also serving as a bastion of the independent film community. I would like to congratulate the Brunet family on this historic milestone, and I wish them many more years of providing New Orleans residents and visitors a positive movie experience.

## RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF DEPUTY U.S. FIRE ADMINISTRATOR GLENN GAINES

### HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to inform my colleagues of the passing of Deputy U.S. Fire

Administrator Glenn Gaines, a consummate fire professional and friend whose legacy can be seen today in firehouses across our nation.

I first came to know Glenn Gaines during his tenure as fire chief in Fairfax County, Va., where I served on the local Board of Supervisors. He was a strong leader, who led with character and a gentle touch. He instilled a sense of pride and camaraderie in his firefighters and paramedics that reflected his own love and admiration for the fire service and those who bravely answer the call day in and day out.

Chief Gaines began his illustrious career as a volunteer firefighter with the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department. His passion for the fire service was evident in his work, and he quickly rose through the ranks of leadership, serving as Fire Marshal, Chief Training Officer, and Chief of Operations. He played a key role in the formation of Fairfax County's elite Urban Search and Rescue Team, which, in partnership with FEMA and USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, has provided lifesaving support to communities here at home and across the globe following natural disasters. He capped his 35-years in Fairfax by serving seven years as Fire Chief, mentoring a generation of Fairfax firefighters and paramedics, who helped mold the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department into one of the best in the nation.

He went on to work for FEMA, where he helped initiate the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program for the Department of Homeland Security. He was instrumental in the creation of the Agency's primary firefighter grant programs, particularly the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (or SAFER) Grant Program, which is utilized by career and volunteer fire departments across the country to increase staffing to meet community needs.

It was more than a commitment to the job for Chief Gaines. He was committed to the people who served alongside him and those that would follow in their footsteps. He held a degree in Fire Administration and authored a fire service text book and contributed to several other publications that are still considered mandatory reading for recruits. He was an educator who shared his knowledge and expertise widely. He served on the faculty of the National Fire Academy and oversaw training programs at the National Emergency Training Center.

As one publication put it, he was a firefighter's firefighter. Whether it was in Fairfax or on the national stage, Chief Gaines garnered respect and promoted positive change. He was recognized by his peers with the International Association of Fire Chiefs Metropolitan Fire Chiefs President's Award of Distinction, and he later was honored with the Metropolitan Fire Chiefs Lifetime Achievement Award. He also received the International Association of Fire Chiefs President's Award for Meritorious Service to the Fire Service.

His colleagues will also recall his outgoing, gregarious nature, particularly his competitive streak when it came to participating in the World Police and Fire Games. He was a gold medal winner in the games, competing in power lifting, running, and other sports. In fact, he was actively preparing to be the Sports Coordinator for Softball at this summer's Games, which will be held in Fairfax County.

Chief Gaines was not the retiring type, and, at the age of 72, his commitment to the fire service community was unparalleled. He died unexpectedly at his home in Leesburg, Va., last Sunday, April 12. He is survived by his wife of 51 years, Linda, their daughter Christy Stuart, her husband, Sean, and their twin children, Heather and Evan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our sincere condolences to the family and friends of Chief Gaines. His life's work will always be remembered in his native Fairfax and across the nation's fire service, and his legacy of character and service will endure through the generations of firefighters he helped prepare to answer the call.

## SMALL BUSINESS TAX EQUITY ACT OF 2015

### HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, since California first passed a medical marijuana initiative in 1996, 23 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam have approved medical marijuana programs. An additional 13 states have passed laws allowing for the use of low-THC forms of marijuana to treat certain medical conditions. In addition, voters in Colorado, Washington, Oregon, and Alaska have voted to allow the retail sale and adult use of marijuana.

Any business associated with these expanding industries, however, face a legal gray area between federal and state law. While states have expanded legal economic opportunities, federal drug, tax, and banking laws continue to limit these emerging small businesses.

It has long been recognized that marijuana has therapeutic values. People use it to deal with chronic and paralyzing pain, the nausea associated with chemotherapy, and the symptoms of Multiple Sclerosis. More of our veterans now use it to help with PTSD. At least one million people now receive legal medical marijuana treatment.

What remains illegal, however, is for the thousands of legitimate businesses providing a legal product to treat their business expenses like every other business and deduct them from their operating income.

The federal tax code prohibits anyone who sells Schedule I or Schedule II substances from deducting their business expenses from their taxes. Congress added this prohibition in 1982 after a drug dealer claimed his yacht and weapon purchases as legitimate business expenses. As marijuana is listed as a Schedule I substance, even businesses operating in compliance with state law are not allowed to deduct the common expenses of running a small business, like rent, utilities and payroll.

This is why I am introducing the Small Business Tax Equity Act, bipartisan legislation to allow marijuana businesses operating in compliance with state law to deduct their legitimate expenses. It will only have effect in states which have legalized aspects of marijuana use.

Legal businesses in America are taxed on their income, not on their gross revenues, except for the otherwise legal operation of marijuana businesses. Our failure to update federal tax law forces these businesses to discontinue important services or to drive them underground, which encourages evasion. This bill adapts federal tax law to state law and ensures the fair treatment of a legal industry.

It is time for the federal government to catch up with the states. We must level the playing field for small businesses that create jobs and boost local economies. The Small Business Tax Equity Act would do just that.

## RICHARD SPONZILLI

### HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Richard Sponzilli who, after 30 years of support and service to his local community will be honored as the recipient of the prestigious Dean McNulty Award this Sunday, April 19, 2015 at the 15th Annual Dean McNulty Dinner in Paterson, NJ.

Born and raised in the Stony Road neighborhood of Paterson, Mr. Sponzilli attended St. Bonaventure High School. At the young age of eighteen, he was drafted to Vietnam. During his military service he demonstrated remarkable courage and dedication to serving his country.

Upon his return, he enrolled at Pace University for two years, and then transferred to William Paterson to complete his degree in elementary education. While attending college, Mr. Sponzilli worked part-time cutting grass and during his senior year decided to start a landscaping business of his own. Not expecting his small business to grow, Mr. Sponzilli decided to enroll in a Master's Degree program at William Paterson University to pursue a career as a school guidance counselor.

After completing his Master's Degree, Mr. Sponzilli was unsure about leaving his business to pursue a career as a guidance counselor. After compliments from clients and advice from a friend, he decided to focus on his landscaping business. At the age of 28, Mr. Sponzilli had finally saved enough money to purchase his first office building in Totowa, NJ and since then he has expanded his business to what is now one of the industry's premier landscape design firms.

In addition to being a successful businessman, Mr. Sponzilli has coached and been involved with many sports programs, beginning with the Hillcrest Boys Club, serving as Head Coach of the Manchester Regional High School boys' basketball team, and football programs at the Totowa Police Athletic League.

Mr. Sponzilli continues to dedicate his efforts towards bettering his community and exhibits the qualities of an individual we all strive to be. He currently works with many organizations including Landscape Initiative, Morris Catholic High School, Sisters of the Poor Charity, and also finds time to operate basketball camps for children.

Mr. Sponzilli has been recognized for his philanthropic efforts both within his community and outside. Because of these efforts, he was named the Italian American Man of the Year, National Kid Construction Club Man of the Year, was inducted into the Totowa Police Athletic League Wall of Fame, and was most recently awarded the William Paterson University Legacy Award. The Dean McNulty Award

is yet another prestigious recognition of the outstanding work of Mr. Sponzilli.

I have known Richard for many years now as well as have attended the Dean McNulty Dinner for many years and know that this is a well-deserved honor. His story has not only inspired me but has inspired many of those around him. I value Rich's friendship and, as his friend, am happy to see him acknowledged in so many ways.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating the achievements of individuals such as Mr. Richard Sponzilli.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Mr. Sponzilli's coworkers, family and friends, all those whose lives he has touched, and me, in recognizing the work of Mr. Richard Sponzilli.

## TRIBUTE TO MRS. EMELIA ROSE YANKAH

### HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Fifth Congressional District of Florida, I am pleased and honored to join the chorus of family, friends, loved ones and many well-wishers who join in praise and give thanks to Mrs. Emelia Rose Yankah.

As you reflect on the numerous memories and triumphs you have been blessed to experience over the last eight plus decades your professional, community leadership, and membership with numerous civic organizations have given you the opportunity to make an Indelible impact in the lives of many.

We are forever grateful to our Heavenly Father for having put Mrs. E.R. Yankah in our midst on April 16, 1930, and for filling her with grace, compassion and love. Today as your family, friends, community and congregation stand to celebrate your 85th Birthday, know that I am exceedingly honored to join this celebration and extend our humble gratitude. Countless lives have been made all the better and richer because of this kind spirit.

We ask:

May the Lord Bless you and Keep you.

May the Lord let his face shine upon you.

May the Lord look upon you kindly and give you peace.

As you look forward to the years ahead, know that I am praying for your continued health and happiness.

## COL. HENRY CYR

### HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY III

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Colonel Henry L. Cyr III, United States Air Force, for his exceptional service to the United States of America. After twenty-six years of service, Colonel Cyr will soon retire from his position as the Commander of the 461st Air Control Wing, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia.

Born in Hopedale, Massachusetts, Colonel Cyr was commissioned through the Reserve Officer Training Corps at Boston University in 1989, receiving his Second Lieutenant rank in historic Faneuil Hall. Throughout his career, Colonel Cyr has served with great distinction in prominent command and staff positions and operational flying units in the United States and around the world.

His staff tours include two assignments to the Pentagon; first, in 2002, as Air Force staff responsible for overseeing two U.S. and NATO Command and Control, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance aircraft acquisition programs, and again in 2009 as United States Strategic Command staff leading the Global Force Management Division, responsible for supporting the Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance requirements of our Combatant Commanders around the globe. In 2011 Col. Cyr returned to Robins Air Force Base to serve as the Vice Commander of the 461st Air Control Wing.

Colonel Cyr has been awarded the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Air Medal, and multiple campaign medals. His aviation career includes more than 4,700 flying hours, including more than 900 in combat and combat support missions. He has flown operations in Saudi Arabia, Bosnia, Haiti, Kosovo and Iraq, as well as worldwide Sensitive Reconnaissance Operations missions. Currently, he is the commander of the Air Combat Command's 461st Air Control Wing responsible for leading nearly fifteen hundred Airmen in achieving the worldwide E-8C Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System and Deployable Air Traffic Control and Landing System missions.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize Colonel Henry Cyr's successful and decorated career. I commend Colonel Cyr for his service, leadership, and example. I also wish to recognize the sacrifices and contributions made by Colonel Cyr's family including wife retired Lt. Col. Linda Bethke-Cyr, their children Alexandria and Marcus, and his parents Mrs. Geraldine Francis Cyr and retired Colonel Henry Leonard Cyr, Jr.

We are a nation grateful for the military service of the men, women, and families whose sacrifices secure our freedom. I wish Colonel Cyr and his family the best in his retirement and next steps.

## IN RECOGNITION OF THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

### HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and honor the accomplishments of Las Positas College in Livermore, California.

Las Positas has been serving residents of the Tri-Valley with quality educational and vocational training for the past forty years.

Las Positas serves 8,500 students from all walks of life. Their dedication to training and educating all those that seek to better themselves, from recent high school graduates to veterans to mid-career professionals, is second to none.

In the heart of one of America's fastest growing business and residential regions, Las Positas College has been a staple for higher education and skill development for decades. The college provides the local rapidly growing technological, science, and business industries with the trained personnel they need to be successful.

Las Positas' slogan is ''Students First,'' an ideal mantra that all institutions of higher education should follow. It exemplifies the goals of providing an excellent, equitable, and complete education.

On this day we recognize Las Positas College as being one of the premier educational institutions in the California Community College System for the past forty years and I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing them continued success in the future.

## THE LIFE OF ALEX MICHEL ODEH

### HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Alex Michel Odeh.

Alex was born on April 4, 1944 in Jifna, Palestine and immigrated to the United States in 1972.

He was married to Norma Odeh and settled in Orange County, CA where they had three daughters, Helena, Samya and Susan Odeh.

Throughout his professional career, Mr. Odeh dedicated his professional life to teaching and served as a lecturer of Arabic Language and Middle East History at Coastline Community College in Santa Ana, California.

He dedicated his life to the pursuit of combatting discrimination both at home and abroad as a civil and human rights activist.

He was tireless in working with community and religious organizations to build bridges and foster peace and understanding between diverse groups.

Unfortunately, his life was cut short and Alex was assassinated on October 11, 1985, when a bomb exploded as he entered the office of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) at 1905 East 17th Street in Santa Ana, California during his service as the Western Regional Director of ADC.

This year marks the 30th Anniversary of his murder and the community and his family has yet to gain closure and justice for his death.

In June of 2013, I sent the Department of Justice a letter asking for closure in the case of Alex Odeh and we have yet to get a concrete answer from them, even though the FBI has characterized Mr. Odeh's death as a domestic ''terrorist attack.''

I will continue to fight for answers to Alex's death and bring those that killed him to justice, but let us mark his death by remembering what he stood for and what he dedicated his life to: the pursuit to civil and human rights, as well as peace and mutual understanding between our diverse communities.

## RECOGNIZING MARCH 5 AS NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL DESIGN DAY

### HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize March 5, 2015, as the First Annual National Industrial Design Day. I also want to congratulate the Industrial Designers Society of America on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. This day is being used to recognize those in the profession of industrial design, which has enhanced people's lives, not only in the 11th District of Virginia, but also across the United States and the world.

The term ''industrial design'' was first recognized by the U.S. Patent Office in 1913, but the importance of this field was not fully recognized at that time. Originally comprised primarily of architects, package designers, and stage designers, the field expanded to include many diverse professionals including those in manufacturing, furniture design, graphic design, and automobile design, among others. The focus evolved to using design as a tool to make products more efficient, more cost effective, and more relevant.

Today, the contributions of industrial designers include advanced technology such as GPS, digital interfaces, environmental graphics, communication systems, surgical equipment, MP3 players, and countless others. The economic impact of this industry helps fuel our national economy. In the United States, product design and related services generate billions in sales and the number of U.S. awarded design patents has reached an all-time high.

Promotion of innovation and creativity has created a growing interest in industrial design. What was first hailed as a ''modern movement'' at the 1927 Exposition of Art in Trade in New York City is now taught at universities around the world.

The Industrial Designers Society of America, headquartered in Herndon, Virginia in the 11th Congressional District, which I am pleased to represent, should be commended for being an instrumental force in the growth and expansion of this profession. Its membership now includes thousands of industrial designers in 29 countries. In addition, it has hosted education symposiums and conferences to ensure the continued growth of this field.

I ask my colleagues to join me in proclaiming March 5 as National Industrial Design Day and in expressing our appreciation for the innovation and creativity of its members. Their designs and creations improve our lives in every way and are worthy of our recognition.

## THE CONTINUING THREAT OF NEGLECTED TROPICAL DISEASES

### HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Neglected Tropical Diseases (NTDs) are a group of 17 parasitic and bacterial diseases which blind, disable, disfigure, and sometimes kill sufferers among more than one billion of the world's poorest people, trapping the most marginalized communities in a cycle of poverty. The list ranges from chagas to rabies to leprosy to dengue fever. However, there are others not on this list of 17 diseases that also receive too little attention. These include such diseases as polio and smallpox, which have largely been eliminated from the planet, and often fatal, fortunately rare NTDs, such as kuru. Prior to last year, that list of rare diseases included Ebola.

Even though not immediately fatal, these diseases can keep children from attending school and their parents from working, as well as resulting in excessive loss of blood by mothers during birth and low birth weight babies. These conditions constitute a significant hurdle to achieving economic growth and dilute the impact of foreign assistance programs.

Last year, the world witnessed an Ebola disease pandemic that hit six African countries and spread to Spain, Scotland, and the United States. Furthermore, in recent years diseases such as dengue fever and chickugunya have spread into the United States. These and other tropical diseases most often victimize the poor who live in tropical climates—whether in Africa, Latin America or parts of the United States.

Even in the face of the worldwide challenge these tropical diseases pose, the administration has proposed cutting the budget in this area by 17%. Yesterday's hearing examined the problem of neglected tropical diseases and U.S. current and potential efforts to address this problem.

Eight NTDs account for almost all worldwide cases. Seven of them can be treated with low-cost medication that can be dispensed by non-health workers irrespective of disease status. Nearly 80% of all NTD cases are comprised of people carrying intestinal worms.

In our June 27, 2013, hearing on NTDs, we learned the catastrophic nature of these preventable intestinal worm infections. So many of the problems we struggle with, such as difficult births and malnourishment, cannot be remedied without dealing with the infections themselves. These intestinal worms not only steal nutrients from their hosts; they steal their very futures by denying them a healthy life.

We can no longer look at photos of happy young children standing in muddy water without shoes and not think of the possibility that they are losing their future even as we see them enjoy a break from the poverty in which they live. Yet we must understand that these are not merely diseases affecting people in faraway lands.

Current U.S. law favors research on those diseases threatening the American homeland, but in today's world, diseases can cross borders as easily as those affected by them or the products imported into the United States. For example, chagas is most prevalent in Latin America, but it has been identified in patients in Texas, and cases of dengue fever have recently been reported in Florida. We cannot afford to assume that what may seem to be exotic diseases only happen to people in other countries. (And of course, even if that were true, we have a moral obligation to aid and assist those who contract these diseases and mitigate transmittal to the greatest extent possible). Ten years ago, West Nile Virus, another rare disease, was not seen in the United States or anywhere else outside the east African nation of Uganda, but in less than a decade, it has spread across this country and much of the rest of the world.

More than 10,000 people have died of Ebola worldwide thus far. Although only one person died in this country due to that disease, we saw clearly how unprepared our medical services and the rest of the world were initially to deal with a rare disease that had previously been confined to isolated areas in Central Africa. There are other rare diseases—not to mention the recognized NTDs—that can cause havoc if they find their way to populated international transit areas as Ebola did last year.

Meanwhile, far too many people live lives of quiet suffering from diseases we must fight more effectively. This is why I have introduced H.R. 1797, the End Neglected Tropical Diseases Act. Among other provisions, H.R. 1797 calls on the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to modify its NTD programming with respect to rapid impact package treatments, school-based NTD programs and new approaches to reach the goals of eliminating NTDs. This bill also sets forth measures to expand the USAID program, including by establishment of a research and development program.

In our effort to achieve reachable goals to prevent and eliminate NTDs, the projected 17% cut in funding for such projects in the FY 2016 budget would pose a serious setback. I have appealed to the appropriators to maintain NTD spending at the most recent regular budget levels in FY 2014, and our hearing yesterday examined how our current NTD programs will be affected either by the planned budget cut or by maintaining the level of funding we saw before the Ebola response skewed the level of such funding.

## TRIBUTE TO COLONEL (RETIRED) JOSE GERARDO GARCIA, M.D.

### HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Colonel (Retired) Jose Gerardo Garcia, M.D. of Laredo, Texas.

Jose Gerardo Garcia was born on the 21st of November, 1935 to Gerardo and Anita Garcia in Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas, Mexico. He received a Bachelors in Biological Sciences at la Escuela Preparatoria Federal and his Medical Doctor degree from la Universidad de Nuevo Leon Medical School in Monterrey in 1957. Following graduation, he completed psychiatry internships at Warren State Hospital in Warren, Pennsylvania and Austin State Hospital in Austin, Texas.

IN 1965, Dr. Garcia became a naturalized citizen of the United States. His love of country compelled him to enlist in the United States Army in 1969. Dr. Garcia's 20 years of service allowed him to use his medical training, serve his country, and help others. Beginning as a major at Fort Dix in New Jersey and then as a surgeon in the Army National Guard, 36th Airborne division, he developed an expertise in aerospace medicine. With this knowledge, Dr. Garcia became a charter member of the U.S. Army Aviation branch upon its creation in 1983. Additionally, he was the first native

Mexican physician assigned to the Office of the U.S. Surgeon General at the Pentagon, a position that allowed him to work directly with the White House physician. Following his promotion to the rank of colonel, Medical Corps, Dr. Garcia served as dean of the U.S. Army School of Aviation at Fort Rucker in Alabama. Dr. Garcia has been the first and only Hispanic to occupy this post. Additionally, Dr. Garcia served as chief training supervisor for the VA hospital in Houston, Texas, certified NASA flight surgeon supporting Space Shuttle landings at two primary landing sites, and as a medical consultant to the Texas Department of Corrections for inmates on death row. Dr. Garcia was also integral to the U.S. Army's adoption of research and clinical hyperbaric medicine.

After 20 years of distinguished service, Dr. Garcia transferred to Reserve duty in 1989. In 1990 he married Yolanda Davila and settled in Laredo where he continued to practice medicine and be an active member of the community until his passing. Dr. Garcia served as medical director of Charter Hospital of Laredo, CEO and medical director of St. Joseph's Psychiatric Day Treatment Center and Laredo Drug Detection Services, medical director of Casa Amistad/San Antonio State Hospital, senior psychiatrist of Border Region MHMR, and clinical assistant professor at the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio. This beloved family man and talented doctor will be dearly missed and forever remembered for his faith, altruism, optimism, patriotism, and wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor the legacy of Colonel (Retired) Jose Gerardo Garcia, M.D. His exemplary service to this country and the people of Laredo will not be forgotten.

## IN RECOGNITION OF THOSE WHO MADE THE APPOMATTOX SESQUICENTENNIAL A SUCCESS

### HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Representative BOB GOODLATTE, I submit these remarks to recognize and thank those who worked tirelessly to make the week-long Appomattox Sesquicentennial commemoration such a major success.

After years of preparation, the National Park Service, with the support of Appomattox County leaders and hundreds of Central Virginia volunteers, did an outstanding job hosting the thousands of Americans who came to commemorate the Civil War Sesquicentennial this past week at Appomattox Court House National Historical Park. It was estimated that approximately 3,600 re-enactors took part and 25,000 individuals came to Appomattox Court House National Park throughout the week to commemorate the 150th Anniversary of the meeting of Generals Lee and Grant which put an end to the Civil War and the nearly ninety events that preceded it. The hard work, effort, and organization executed by Appomattox County local businesses, vendors, and volunteers was observed by all and made for an especially memorable event of this momentous turning point in our nation's history.

I was pleased to be able to attend the moving and dignified opening ceremony and was impressed at the manner in which the National Park Service went above and beyond to ensure that the American people had the opportunity to pay tribute to those who re-united our country 150 years ago. Please join me in thanking all those who worked tirelessly to make this remembrance possible.

## RECOGNIZING AIR ZOO

### HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the nationally renowned Air Zoo in Kalamazoo, Michigan, which is hosting the 2015 Science Innovation Hall of Fame Awards on April 18, 2015.

It is only fitting that the Air Zoo is the setting for this gala event to recognize the transformative work of top Southwest Michigan students and teachers in the fields of science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics as well as residents who have advanced the area of aviation. The Air Zoo was founded in 1977 as the Kalamazoo Aviation History Museum by Suzanne and Pete Parish, who wanted to share their enthusiasm for World War II airplanes and artifacts. Scientific affiliations grew to include the Smithsonian Institution and the Michigan Space Science Center, which allows visitors to experience some of the challenges astronauts face during their training. Full-motion flight simulators, 3–D and 4–D theaters, and interactive exhibits—including one about women in aviation and space—provided adventure little seen in regular museums.

Education is tucked inside a fun setting as evidenced by the Air Zoo being named as the ''Best Place to Spend a Day with Your Family'' and ''Best Place to Take out-of-Towners'' for the past three years by the more than 130,000 visitors it has touching down at its doors each year.

Mr. Speaker, many have wondered how the facility got its name. As the collection of airplanes grew, so did the number of animal names: Wildcat, Hellcat, Bearcat and Flying Tiger. Obviously, these flying critters can only be contained in an Air Zoo.

Recently the Air Zoo was recognized as one of the jewels in the crown of the state by receiving a grant from the Michigan Council for Arts and Cultural Affairs to keep this state-of-the-art air and space museum on its mission of preserving the legacy of flight. I am proud to recognize the many accomplishments of the Air Zoo by the people who work there and wish them much success in the future.

## HONORING ROBERT HILL YOUTH FOUNDATION, INC.

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Robert Hill Youth Foundation, Inc., Charleston, MS inside of Tallahatchie County, MS.

The Robert Hill Youth Foundation, Inc. began in the early 1980's by Mr. Robert Hill. It was initially conceived with the idea of simply being a sports organization for youth focusing on baseball. The organization eventually ceased being active after the death of Mr. Hill in 1991.

In the year 2000, Mr. Cedric Terry revived the organization because the youth in the community didn't have many options for constructive activities and adult mentoring. He took on the task of recruiting children and parent's involvement. Mr. Terry was successful by getting 9 boys excited about playing baseball for the summer and competing. Their team would travel and they would be role models for other youth. Everyone had to pledge to abide by the rules, get good grades in school, and participate in an award ceremony at the end of the season.

Mr. Terry's vision was just what the youth in the community needed to take the Robert Hill Youth Foundation to the next level. It was just what Mr. Hill always wanted the organization to be. The organization grew and became a huge success serving over 10,000 boys and girls. The effort was so well received that it attracted youth not just inside Charleston, but they came from miles outside the area. It now has extended its activities to include education, recreation and arts for youth in the area.

Through their education program they offer: Abstinence Education, After School Tutoring, and Fatherhood Preparation. Their recreation program offers: basketball, football, baseball and track. The arts program includes: praise dancing, dancing and acting classes. Since 2000 through 2015 the organization has been responsible for helping over 500 boys and girls in the area attend and receive a college education.

Their accolades are just as impressive. In fact, there are too many to name them all. A few of them include constructing the first park in Charleston in order to be home based for the youth. All they had to do was walk to the park and ''Play ball!'' Thanks to the Robert Hill Youth Foundation their work has reached all comers of youth life. In 2011 the Charleston High School Tigers Football Team won its 1st State Football Championship. Almost ninety percent of the players came from the Robert Hill Youth Foundation. In 2012 the Charleston High School Lady Tigers Basketball Team was the runner up in the Girls Basketball State Tournament. And over ninety-five percent of the girls played for the Robert Hill Youth Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today, in recognizing the Robert Hill Youth Foundation, an asset to Tallahatchie County in the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

## RECOGNIZING PETER AND MAUREEN JANELLE FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROVIDING MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND SERVICES

### HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, for the last 35 years both Peter & Maureen Janelle have

been staunch advocates and compassionate caregivers to the citizens of the Granite State living with mental illness. Working as counselors with The Mental Health Center of Greater Manchester, they have provided care to many individuals struggling with a variety of afflictions. After 20 years with the center Peter Janelle took the helm as President and CEO, helping to launch a number of programs focused on not only treatment, but vocational services, supportive living techniques, and illness management. These programs aim to promote wellness and independence for the center's patients, to empower them to manage their mental illness and be productive, contributing members of the community.

Peter has also worked tirelessly with other providers and organizations from across New Hampshire to offer care to those most in need and support the community of mental health professionals in the state. Whether working with patients and staff at NH Hospital, local law enforcement or with local schools he has helped to expand and develop the reach of the services offered by the center to give care to people of all ages from children to seniors, and addressing the need for treatment and care for small behavioral problems and mild depression, to treatment for Alzheimer's, psychosis and schizophrenia. The result of these efforts has enabled the center to provide care to almost 11,000 patients a year.

The work that both Peter and Maureen have done in the field of mental illness is not an easy job, and the success and accomplishments they have been able to achieve in their service to The Mental Health Center of Greater Manchester is truly remarkable. I applaud and thank them for devoting their life's work to this worthy and much needed field, and for all they have contributed to New Hampshire and especially the City of Manchester.

## HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

### HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this morning, Israelis—whether sitting at their desks, playing on the beach, or driving on a busy highway—came to a complete standstill as sirens rang out across the small country to commemorate the horrors of the Holocaust and the six million Jews systematically murdered by the Nazi regime.

I join the global Jewish community in remembering those we lost and honoring those who survived to carry on the proud traditions of the Jewish people. On this Yom Hashoa, Holocaust Remembrance Day, let us all recommit ourselves to preserving the memory of the past while working to build a better future. As the number of Holocaust survivors continues to diminish it becomes increasingly incumbent upon future generations to never forget.

## THE GOLDMAN ACT TO RETURN ABDUCTED AMERICAN CHILDREN: REVIEWING OBAMA ADMINISTRATION IMPLEMENTATION

### HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last month I held a hearing to continue and increase attention on international parental child abduction, whose victims include primarily children denied the love and attention of one of their parents, and parents cut off from the children they love.

Every year, approximately 1,000 American children are unlawfully removed from their homes by one of their parents and taken across international borders. Less than half of these children ever come home.

Most of the left-behind parents in the audience at last month's hearing have not seen their children in years and know all too well the financial, legal, cultural, and linguistic obstacles to bringing their children home from a foreign country. Many of them had already been through U.S. judicial proceedings prior to the abduction, and the courts had settled custody and visitation, only to have a kidnapping spouse defy a court order. Other parents were caught completely by surprise when a spouse's vacation turned into an abduction, a phone call in the middle of the night telling them that would never again see their child.

Their suffering is exponentially compounded by knowledge of the pain caused to their child by the separation. Child abduction is child abuse. Parentally-abducted children are at risk of serious emotional and psychological problems, and may experience anxiety, eating problems, nightmares, mood swings, sleep disturbances, aggressive behavior, resentment, guilt, and fearfulness.

These young victims, like their left-behind parents, are American citizens who need the help of their government when normal legal processes are unavailable or have failed.

In 1983, the United States ratified the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction to try to address abduction and access. This convention creates a civil framework for the quick return of abducted children and for rights of access for left-behind parents. Absent extenuating circumstances, the child, or children, are to be returned within 6 weeks to his or her country of habitual residence for the courts there to decide on custody, or to enforce any previous custody determinations.

The Convention has helped return some children but implementation has been unpredictable and spotty at best. Susceptible to abuse by taking parents or judges who either don't understand their obligations under the Convention or are unwilling to abide by them, the Convention has too often been stretched to provide cover for the abduction, rather than recovery of the child.

Some Hague Convention parties are simply not enforcing legitimate return orders. The State Department's 2014 Hague Convention Compliance Report highlights four countries—Brazil, Mexico, Romania, and Ukraine—that habitually fail to enforce return orders. Other countries—Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and the Bahamas—are non-compliant with the Convention.

In other words, abducted American children are not coming home from these countries and so many other countries where the Convention operates weakly, or with which the U.S. has no bilateral agreement of any kind.

To give one more example, Jeffery Morehouse a left behind parent testified that "there have been 400 cases of U.S. children kidnaped to Japan since 1994." We do not know of a single case, however, in which the Government of Japan has issued and enforced an order for the return of an abducted child to the United States.

And, I must emphasize, that since they have signed the Hague, Japan's efforts have been breathtakingly unresponsive especially for abductions that occurred prior to their ratification of the Hague Convention.

Mr. Morehouse testified that, "one year ago next week, at the very moment Japan acceded to the Hague Abduction Convention, parents joined us to hand-deliver 30 Article 21 Access applications (I joined those parents at the Japanese Embassy) . . . none of the BAC Home parents have received access to their kidnapped children. Japan's implementation of the Hague Abduction Convention is an abysmal failure. Sanctions under the Goldman Act will provide some of the necessary public pressures on Japan to create change to this ongoing human and family rights crisis."

The status quo is simply unacceptable.

Over the last 5 years, many of those at the hearing helped me write and pass through the Congress the Sean and David Goldman Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act. Last month's hearing occurs more than seven months after the Goldman Act became law and gave us an opportunity to hear from the State Department and parents whether the bill's key provisions are being implemented according to the law.

A brief refresher on Sean and David: David Goldman spent over 5 agonizing years trying to legally rescue his son, Sean, from an abduction to Brazil, which is a signatory nation, like the United States, to the Hague Abduction Convention.

Despite Mr. Goldman's airtight case that demonstrated an egregious example of both child abduction and wrongful retention, the Hague treaty was unavailing, and the outcomes in the Brazilian courts largely proved infuriating, infirm, and ineffective.

David Goldman waged his case by the book and won judgments in the New Jersey courts. Yet both Sean and David were made to suffer emotional pain for over half a decade as one delaying ploy after another was employed by the abducting party. In the end, because of the father's abiding love for his son and an indomitable will, the Goldmans today are united and happy.

To underscore: the Goldman Act was not intended to simply reform the system, but to bring about a fundamental sea change in U.S. diplomacy so that State Department officials would see themselves as advocates for the return of abducted American children.

Now under the Goldman Act, when a country fails to appropriately address an abduction case pending more than 12 months, the law requires the Secretary of State to take action. When a country has more than 30% of its U.S. cases pending for more than a year, the law requires the Secretary of State to designate the country as "Non-Compliant" in an annual report, and take action.

The Goldman Act specifically lists the increasingly escalating actions that Congress has in mind, from a demarche—or a protest through diplomatic channels—to a public condemnation to a delay or cancellation of one or more bilateral visits and even the withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of foreign assistance including non-humanitarian aid and including security assistance to the central government of a country. These are serious sanctions that must be seriously applied by a country that takes parental child abduction seriously.

We may also request extradition where appropriate.

If these measures sound pointed, it is because they are intended to focus the destination country on quick and accurate resolution of abduction and access cases.

The Goldman Act was written to cover countries that have signed the Hague Convention, such as Brazil; countries that have not signed the Convention, such as India; and countries that have a mix of open abduction cases from before and after signing the Hague Convention, such as Japan.

In 2013, India was the number three destination in the world for parents who abducted from the United States. Currently, there are 64 known open abduction and denial of access cases involving India. And yet the United States does not have any sort of resolution mechanism with India. Moms and dads left behind in the United States are forced to enter a labyrinthine foreign court system known for its incessant appeals and multi-year delays.

But now the Goldman Act applies. India will now face real penalties for any case that has been pending for more than one year, and will be ''named and shamed'' in the State Department's report. As with the State Department's annual trafficking report, there is morally suasive value in simply reporting what a country does, and some countries will I am sure respond to such moral pressure.

Thus we expect the State Department to apply these penalties zealously, and to work with India on establishing a bilateral agreement for the efficient and fair resolution of abduction and access cases. If the State Department faithfully applies the law as written, it will be in India's interest to come to the negotiating table.

The same holds true for Japan, even though Japan recently signed the Hague Convention. Among such cases is that of Michael Elias, who has not seen his children, Jade and Michael Jr., since 2008. Michael served as a Marine who saw combat in Iraq. His wife, who worked in the Japanese consulate, used documents fraudulently obtained with the apparent complicity of Japanese consulate personnel to kidnap their children, then aged 4 and 2, in defiance of a court order, telling Michael on a phone call that there was nothing that he could do, as ''my country will protect me.''

Her country will protect her, but what is our country doing to protect Michael and his children?

While the State Department has touted Japan's accession to the Hague Convention as an accomplishment, Japan has said the Convention would only apply in post-ratification cases. As Ambassador Jacobs knows, I and several others predicted that unless a MOU or other bilateral agreement was concluded with Japan, American children and their left behind parents will be left behind in perpetuity. I ask to my friends at the State Department, what then is to happen for parents already suffering from abductions prior to ratification? Would they be left-behind again—this time by their own government?

I know Ambassador Jacobs, who testified at last month's hearing, as recently as February 2014 in her testimony before the Senate, stated that she would continue to make ''progress with the Japanese government on resolving existing cases in the spirit of the Convention.''

The Goldman Act requires accountability for the Japanese government on the abduction cases open at the time Japan signed the Convention. Unless Japan resolves scores of American cases before the end of next month, nearly 100% of abduction cases in Japan will still be unresolved and Goldman Act penalties will apply.

The Goldman Act has given the State Department new and powerful tools to bring Japan, and other countries, to the resolution table. The goal is not to disrupt relations but to heal the painful rifts caused by international child abduction.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE EQUALITY FOR ALL RESOLUTION

### HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Equality for All Resolution—which declares that gay, lesbian, and transgender people should be protected from discrimination under the law.

Earlier this month, I watched as Indiana—my home state—enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, giving businesses the right to refuse service based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

Over the last few weeks, I've heard from businesses, religious organizations, community leaders, and countless concerned Americans.

It's clear that the vast majority of Americans oppose this kind of discrimination.

Yet, in 2015, it is still legal in over 30 states to discriminate in the workplace, to refuse to sell or rent a home, or to turn someone away from your business—just because they are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender.

As elected representatives, we have a responsibility to show that America is better than this. I would like to thank the 126 colleagues who join me today as original cosponsors of this resolution.

I encourage every Member of the House to join me in supporting the Equality for All resolution.

## CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY

### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark an important milestone in the history of my home state of Maryland. On April 15, 2015, the faculty, staff, students, and alumni of Bowie State University will celebrate the school's 150th anniversary at its annual Founders Day.

In the final months of the Civil War, the Baltimore Normal School began serving emancipated African-Americans by offering training for teachers. In 1910, it outgrew its facilities and moved to a 187-acre lot in Bowie, Maryland, and in 1914 it became the Maryland Normal and Industrial School at Bowie. Over the course of the twentieth century, the institution evolved into a four-year degree-granting college and eventually became a liberal arts college whose mission extended well beyond training educators. Renamed Bowie State College in 1963, it provided access to higher education for African American students, many of whom were barred from other institutions as a result of segregation.

In 1988, in recognition of the school's important role in higher education for Marylanders and its expansion into graduate studies, it was elevated to University status and welcomed into the University System of Maryland. Since then, Bowie State University has been one of Maryland's top institutions of higher education and has continued to rank as one of our nation's leading historically black colleges and universities, preparing not only some of the brightest young minds in Maryland but also training a new generation of leaders for our nation's African American community.

Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to represent Bowie State University in Congress and to help secure federal grants that help the school expand its cutting-edge programs, including in the high-demand areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—or ''STEM'' education. In recent years, Bowie State University has become a national leader in what many are calling ''STEAM'' education, which brings traditional ''STEM'' fields together with art and design in order to prepare students for careers in digital technologies. At the same time, Bowie State University has become a national center for training in cybersecurity, drawing on its proximity to Ft. Meade and defense institutions in the Greater Washington area. It continues to build on a groundbreaking $27 million award from NASA and the National Science Foundation in 1995 that recognized Bowie State University as a national Model Institution for Excellence in STEM education.

Last year, I joined President Obama in Prince George's County, Maryland, to highlight a $7 million Youth Career Connect grant that was made possible through an innovative partnership between the County's public schools, Lockheed Martin, and Bowie State University's Maryland Center to grow the pipeline of students pursuing college degrees and STEM-related careers. The University is playing a major role in growing Maryland's high-skill workforce for the twenty-first century, and I am excited for what the future holds.

I hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating Bowie State University's proud history as it marks its sesquicentennial. I look forward to continuing to work closely with President Mickey Burnim and the Administration to ensure that Bowie State University can continue to carry out its mission of providing high-quality higher education and research that supports learning and careers in Maryland and across the United States.

## TRIBUTE TO LEE P. EVANS, SR.

### HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Fifth Congressional District of Florida, I am pleased and honored to join the chorus of family, friends, loved ones and many well-wishers who join in praise and give thanks to Lee P. Evans, Sr., for his endearing legacy of love, kindness and generosity. Our lives have been made all the better and richer because of this kind spirit. We are forever grateful to our Heavenly Father for having put him in our midst on April 15, 1925, and for filling him with grace, compassion and love.

These 90 years are marked by many milestones in his life, none more representative of the breadth and depth of his character than that of his humanity. We celebrate the richness of his life. We honor his strength of faith and his unwavering belief in the goodness of all. We come now to honor the man, for in him, and through him, the love of God flows, and warms us in his rich embrace. On this day, we say Happy Birthday Lee P. Evans, Sr., we love you, and may God continue to shower his blessings upon you and all that you love.

## COMMEMORATING THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

### HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 36th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). The U.S.-Taiwan bilateral relationship has expanded and grown stronger since the TRA was signed into law in 1979. I recently returned from Taiwan where I experienced firsthand our shared values and close economic ties. Last year, Taiwan was the United States' 10th largest trading partner. My home state of Indiana has also benefited from these commercial partnerships and was the first state to establish a trade office in Taiwan. On April 9th, President Ma Ying-jeou shared his insight on our bilateral relations in his remarks at the AmCham's annual Hsieh Nien Fan gala which I have included below. Like President Ma, I look forward to continuing to promote policies that reaffirm our mutual commitment to democratic and economic development.

''I am very pleased to be here today for AmCham's annual Hsieh Nien Fan. This is a special occasion for me, because it marks the 13th time that I have been invited to attend. But there's also another reason why today is a very special day. It's because tomorrow is April the 10th, and that marks the 36th anniversary of the date the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) took effect.

''At the moment, U.S.-Taiwan relations are indeed the best they have been in the 36 years since the TRA became effective. Everyone in Taiwan, military and civilians, was shocked back on December 16, 1978 when President Carter announced on TV that the U.S. was breaking diplomatic relations with the Republic of China. But three months later, the U.S. Congress made significant amendments to the Carter administration's Taiwan Enabling Act. Congress not only changed the content of the Act, but also changed its name to the Taiwan Relations Act.

''As you all know, based on existing international law, an unrecognized country loses its status as a legal entity in the United States. It therefore cannot engage in any legal proceedings due to the lack of a judicial personality. But the TRA not only sees Taiwan as a foreign government for purposes of U.S. law, but also allows Taiwan to initiate and respond to judicial litigation. The TRA also allows the U.S. government to provide Taiwan with defensive weaponry. And the property rights attached to our embassy and Twin Oaks estate in Washington, DC also remained unaffected by the break in diplomatic relations or de-recognition.

''Since I took office nearly seven years ago, mutual trust between Taiwan and the United States at the highest levels of government has been restored. Taiwan military procurement from the U.S. has also exceeded U.S.$ 18.3 billion, the highest it has been in any period over the past 20 years, and twice what it was during my predecessor's term of office. And in March of 2013, our countries resumed negotiations under the 1994 Trade and Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA) as we prepare to take a step-by-step ''building block'' approach in promoting further trade liberalization.

''Last year, Taiwan and the U.S. forged even closer cooperation in several areas. U.S. Secretary of Commerce statistics show that last year, Taiwan-U.S. trade in goods reached U.S.$ 67.4 billion. That allowed Taiwan to surpass India and Saudi Arabia to become the United States' 10th largest trading partner. At the same time, the U.S. once again surpassed Japan to become Taiwan's second largest trading partner. Last month, Taiwan companies also flocked to the U.S. government's SelectUSA 2015 Investment Summit, and overall, the Taiwan contingent was the second largest group in attendance.

''In addition to our interaction in the economic and trade arenas, official contacts between Taiwan and the U.S. have also continued. In December of last year, President Obama signed the Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2014, agreeing to sell the ROC four Perry-class frigates. High-level U.S. officials also visited here, most notably U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Gina McCarthy, who came to Taiwan in April last year. She was the first U.S. Cabinet-level official to visit us in 14 years.

''This year, in February, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs Daniel Russel stated that over the past few years, developments in Taiwan-U.S. relations have been productive. He also said that those developments were closely related to the improvement in cross-strait relations. He also expressed that the U.S. hopes to see the continued positive development of cross-strait relations.

''So ever since the Cold War began, this was the first time that the United States did not have to choose sides when handling cross-strait relations. Nor did mainland China or Taiwan have to face that kind of predicament. This highlights our efforts in the realm of cross-strait relations over the past few years, as both ROC–U.S. and cross-strait relations have become more harmonious. As this kind of interaction has transformed Taiwan's cross-strait and international relations, the vicious cycle of the past is gone, and we're moving ahead under the virtuous cycle of today.

''In truth, the Republic of China and the U.S. have a long and storied relationship. Now, I would like to tell you two stories to illustrate our friendship.

''The first story I want to tell occurred at the very beginning of the 20th century. In 1901, one year after the so-called Boxer Rebellion, the Qing Empire and the United States signed the Boxer Protocol, which paid U.S.$ 24.4 million to the U.S.—known as the Boxer Indemnity. In his State of the Union Address in 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt stated that part of the Boxer Indemnity should be returned to China. In 1924, an executive order by U.S. President Coolidge returned the other portions of the Boxer Indemnity. So by that time, the U.S. had returned about 95% of the Indemnity to the Republic of China, making a tremendous contribution to cultivating human talent. The Boxer Indemnity Scholarship Program provided funds that helped many people who became the pillars of the Republic of China. And what the U.S. did also had an effect in Europe, where Holland used Boxer Indemnity funds to set up a China Research Program at Leiden University. That made Leiden University a strategic center for research on China, and fostered several generations of talented individuals. That soon became the norm, and the United Kingdom, France, Russia, and Japan all followed suit.

''The second story took place 75 years ago. This year is the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II, and the Republic of China's victory in the War of Resistance against Japan. During the course of World War II, the U.S. government and citizens not only gave the Republic of China substantive assistance, but also proved to be staunch friends. That hard-fought War of Resistance between the Republic of China and Japanese forces lasted for eight long years. For the first four years, our soldiers fought virtually alone, without any assistance from outside sources. During that period, however, the U.S. provided indirect assistance. And the most inspiring example of that assistance came from the American Volunteer Group—the AVG—which was later absorbed by the Fourteenth Army Air Force in China. That unit became known far and wide by their nickname: The Flying Tigers. They came to represent Chinese-American cooperation. When the Flying Tigers had been in China for less than a year, they had already downed at least 200 Japanese war planes. That allowed the Chinese Air Force, which was on its last legs, to slowly recover its fighting capabilities. So in November of 1943, at the Battle of Changde in Hunan Province, the U.S. Fourteenth Army Air Force in China joined forces with our own air force to form the Chinese-American Composite Wing. Working together, they brought down 25 Japanese planes, with another 14 planes listed as possibly shot down, and 19 additional Japanese planes damaged. The Japanese Air Force didn't dare return to challenge them again. And just when the forces defending Changde were in dire straits, the composite air forces air-dropped ammunition, rice, and pork for those ground troops. They also dispatched operatives to the battlefields who filed hourly intelligence reports to General Claire Lee Chennault. That allowed the General to direct the Flying Tigers to attack Japanese forces that mounted offensives, and also leverage victories by bombing defeated Japanese troops even as they retreated.

''So this year, we will be commemorating the 70th anniversary of victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan with various activities. We have decided to invite General Chennault's granddaughter, and descendants

of General James Doolittle, who was famous for his bombing raid on Tokyo. We want to invite those descendants to participate in some activities, and also take advantage of this face-to-face meeting to thank their forbearers for their contributions to the Republic of China.

''For the Republic of China, from the beginning of the last century and up into the 1930s, 1940s, and even all the historical periods I didn't mention here today, there has been one constant: Our history, the history of the Republic of China, has been intimately linked with that of the United States. So my fondest hope is that we can build on the foundation of friendship that we've forged over more than a century, continue our cooperation, and strengthen our relationship. And that we can continue to make progress—in politics and economics, and in terms of our social, educational, and cultural interaction. As partners in progress, we can create a more beautiful future, and continue to write the history of tomorrow.''

## HONORING MELVIN LEE LOPER

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a self-motivated leader and innovator of the community, Mr. Melvin Lee Loper, who was born on March 16, 1920 in Finkbine, Mississippi, which is no longer on the map. It was a logging camp for the loggers which was his father's occupation. His parents, the late Marshall and Mamie Loper, later moved to Raymond, Mississippi where they worked as sharecroppers. His only sibling was a younger brother, Otis Loper, who is now deceased.

In those days, rural schools did not go further than 8th grade. He lived with a cousin in Jackson, Mississippi to attend high school, and graduated from Lanier High School in 1939. He entered Tougaloo College but was drafted in the United States Army in World War II. He served for four years with a tour of duty in Europe. He returned to Tougaloo College and completed his studies in 1948 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics.

In 1973, he received a Master's Degree in Administration from Jackson College, after many years of attending summer school and taking classes on Saturdays. That was the way of life to further your education back in the day.

He began his teaching career in Smith county; later Sumner Hill High School and Jackson Public Schools. After thirty-three years of teaching he retired in 1985. He continued teaching several years after retirement because Mathematics teachers were always in demand.

He has been an active member of Farish Street Baptist Church for 55 years. He served as: Sunday School teacher, a Member of the Boy Scout Committee, and attended Wednesday night Bible Study faithfully until his recent illness. He has been in the choir for fifty years, and served as Church Treasurer for thirty-three years.

He was an original member of the Jackson Tougaloo Alumni Club, organized by the late Mrs. Thelma Sanders forty-four years ago. He was serving as President when the club sponsored the Broadway play, ''Ain't Misbehavin'' which was a great success. He worked for years with the committee sponsoring the Ebony Fashion Show. He is a loyal supporter of Tougaloo College with his funds and presence, when able.

He is married to Gwendolyn Nero Loper and they have three children: Rodney, Larry and Gerrilyn; ten grandchildren and eleven great-grandchildren.

His secret to longevity is hard work, attending to your business, being an avid sports fan, and marrying a good cook.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Melvin Lee Loper.

## AFTER PARIS AND COPENHAGEN: RESPONDING TO THE RISING TIDE OF ANTI-SEMITISM

### HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last month I chaired a Congressional hearing where we welcomed as witnesses Ambassador Ronald Lauder, the President of the World Jewish Congress; Mr. Roger Cukierman, President of the Representative Council of Jewish Institutions of France; and Mr. Dan Asmusssen, Chairperson of the Danish Jewish Community.

In 1982, during my first term in Congress, I traveled with the National Conference on Soviet Jewry (NCSJ) to Moscow and Leningrad to meet Jewish refuseniks in their homes and to engage Soviet leaders.

Mark Levin invited me to be on that trip and has been a friend and mentor ever since.

For hours on end, Mark and I, and a delegation that included Sam Gejdenson, heard stories of Soviet physical and mental abuse, systemic harassment, gulags and psychiatric prisons and an array of seemingly wanton brutal acts of anti-Semitism.

To apply for an exit visa—a universally recognized human right, which on paper at least, the Soviet Union had acceded to—was to invite the cruelty and wrath of the KGB and other small minded, morally-stunted communist thugs.

To courageously seek freedom rendered you ineligible for employment in Lenin's farcical ''workers paradise.''

The Soviet system, militantly atheistic and morally incoherent, wouldn't let you leave, but didn't want you to stay either—a bizarre paradox.

To a new 27 year old Congressman, it was bewildering and deeply troubling—why do they hate Jews? Why the anti-Semitic obsession?

I have now chaired nine hearings on combatting anti-Semitism. Never in modern times however, has the need to defend Jews everywhere been greater. My next hearings will be on the explosion of anti-Semitic hate on the college campus and Jewish community security.

For the first time since the Holocaust, the physical security of Jewish communities in Europe has become a top-level concern. The hearing I held last month examined the horrifying state of affairs facing Jewish communities in Europe at this time.

At a Congressional hearing I chaired in 2002, Dr. Shimon Samuels of the Wiesenthal Center in Paris testified that, ''The Holocaust for 30 years after the war acted as a protective teflon against blatant anti-Semitic expression (especially in Europe). That teflon has eroded, and what was considered distasteful and politically incorrect is becoming simply an opinion. But cocktail chatter at fine English dinners can end as Molotov cocktails against synagogues.''

That's exactly where we are now, thirteen years later—what was anti-Semitic ''cocktail chatter'' then has led us now to two people shot and killed at a synagogue and a Jewish cultural center in Copenhagen, and four killed in a terrorist attack on a kosher supermarket in Paris.

These are only the most recent outrages in a terrifying increase in extreme anti-Semitic violence—let's not forget the May 2014 murder of four people at the Jewish Museum in Brussels, and the March 2012 murder of three Jewish children and a rabbi at a Jewish school in the French city of Toulouse.

Each of these four attacks was perpetrated by a killer with links to the jihadist movement. For too long, far too government officials, many of them mired in what Natan Sharansky summarized as the application of double standards and demonization of Israel, have reacted weakly to this danger.

Meanwhile, the threat has grown exponentially. Today, at least 3,000 and perhaps more than 5,000 EU citizens, have left to join ISIS in Syria, Iraq and other conflict zones. This is the recent estimate of Europol, the EU's joint criminal intelligence body. It would be criminally irresponsible not to take this number as a warning of much worse to come, and to make every effort to prepare accordingly.

In 2002, in response to what appeared to be a sudden, frightening spike in anti-Semitism in several countries, including here in the United States, I first proposed the idea for a conference on combating anti-Semitism under the auspices of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Convinced we had escalating crisis on our hands, I teamed with several OSCE partners to push for action and reform. Many of the people and NGOs present in this room played leading roles. Those efforts directly led to the creation of the OSCE's Personal Representative on Combating Anti-Semitism, which has been filled by Rabbi Andy Baker since 2009. Rabbi Baker has done outstanding work. Dogged and energetic, he has been the driver behind everything the OSCE has accomplished in fighting anti-Semitism in recent years.

My efforts with partners to put anti-Semitism on the OSCE agenda also led to important OSCE conferences on combating anti-Semitism in Vienna, Berlin, Cordoba, Bucharest—and last fall in Berlin. In each of these, participating states have made solemn, tangible commitments to put our words into action. In some countries, progress has indeed been made—institutions to fight anti-Semitism have been created, and they have done excellent work.

But it has not been enough to reverse the new anti-Semitism in Europe, and failed miserably to anticipate and prevent the arrival of jihadist anti-Semitism in Europe.

That is why I convened the hearing, to review, re-commit, and re-energize efforts to stop the evil anti-Semitic violence that is threatening the Jewish communities of Europe.

We need to learn more about what must be done to ensure community security—how the communities see the threats they face, what they are doing about them, what the European governments are doing about them—and how everyone can and must do more.

We also need to learn how the U.S. Government can be more effective especially in light of World Jewish Congress President Lauder's all important question: "where is the United States?" Ambassador Lauder testified: "once again, like the 1930s, European Jews live in fear . . . In my travels to all of these communities, I am asked the same question around Europe and the world: 'where is the United States? Why isn't the United States leading the world in this crisis?' "

## RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATION AND SERVICE OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S JUDY BENTON

### HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate Mrs. Judy Benton upon being awarded the Navy-Marine Corps Relief Society's Mrs. Grace Glenwood Higginson Lifetime Achievement Award. Mrs. Benton has dedicated her life to serving others, and I am proud to honor her service and commitment to the Northwest Florida community and to the Navy-Marine Corps Relief Society.

Mrs. Benton found her lifelong calling and demonstrated her dedication to others when she first joined the Navy-Marine Corps Relief Society in 1968, serving as a caseworker and Layette Items Contributor at Barstow and then Quantico. In 2003, Mrs. Benton joined the Pensacola office. Throughout her distinguished career, Mrs. Benton has proven to be an indispensable member of the team with an unwavering support for our Nation's Sailors, Marines, and their families.

Since Mrs. Benton has been with the Navy-Marine Corps Relief Society, she has left an indelible mark on both the Navy-Marine Corps Relief Society and the individuals she has served. From handling over 2,000 cases as a Certified Society Caseworker to completing 18,000 service hours completed, Mrs. Benton has never wavered in her compassion and commitment to others. However, Mrs. Benton always goes above and beyond to serve those who protect and defend our Nation. After Hurricane Ivan devastated the Gulf Coast in 2004, Mrs. Benton volunteered for three straight weeks, including weekends, to help impacted families recover, and she also helped facilitate emergency travel for a former service member to quickly reach his sister and provide a kidney transplant needed to save her life.

Mrs. Benton's immense dedication and selflessness has not gone unnoticed, and prior to receiving the Mrs. Grace Glenwood Higginson Lifetime Achievement Award, she received the Presidential Points of Light Lifetime Volunteer Award.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to congratulate Mrs. Judy Benton and thank her for her service to the people of Northwest Florida and to the countless Sailors and Marines that she has assisted during her long tenure at the Navy-Marine Corps Relief Society. My wife Vicki and I wish her and her husband, Rod; children, Deborah, Angie, Perian, and Robert; grandchildren, Matthew, Jessie, and Ben, and the entire Benton family all the best.

## HONORING PAUL TORGERSEN

### HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks to commemorate the life of Paul Torgersen of Blacksburg, Virginia, who passed away on March 29, 2015, and to pay tribute to his tremendous legacy at Virginia Tech.

Paul was born on October 13, 1931 in Staten Island, New York. In 1953, he graduated from Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania with a B.S. in industrial engineering, and went on to earn his M.S. and Ph.D. from the Ohio State University in 1956 and 1959, respectively. Paul joined the faculty of Oklahoma State University in 1959, and served until 1966 first as an assistant professor and later as an associate professor.

In 1967, Paul began his long and distinguished career at Virginia Tech. He served as professor and head of the Department of Engineering from 1967 through 1970, Dean of Engineering from 1970 through 1990, President of the research park from 1990 through 1994, and President of the University from 1994 through 2000.

While serving as President, Paul helped grow Virginia Tech's influence in the nation in both academics and athletics. Under his leadership, U.S. News & World Report ranked its engineering and business colleges among nation's top 50. Furthermore, the university's endowment nearly doubled.

Importantly, even while serving in senior leadership posts, Paul never forgot his roots, teaching at least one course each year for 58 years (which began before he arrived at Virginia Tech). Accordingly, Paul referred to himself as "a professor who is also serving as President."

Paul's numerous professional accomplishments include his appointment to the National Academy of Engineering and the National Research Council. He also authored several books, and served on the editorial boards of the Journal of Engineering Education, the Journal of Industrial Engineering, and AIIE Transactions. Additionally, Paul served on the Virginia Governor's Task Force on Science and Technology, received the 1992 Virginia Engineering Educator of the Year Award, and was a Fellow in the Institute of Industrial Engineers and the American Society for Engineering Education.

Outside of his professional success, Paul was an avid tennis player. At 55, he was ranked 8th in the nation in doubles for his age group by the United States Tennis Association. He was even able to spend a week at Wimbledon at Centre Court, courtesy of Tech engineering alumni.

Paul is predeceased by his wife of 60 years, Dorothea Torgersen. He is survived by two daughters Karen Torgersen (Mike Boyd), of Blacksburg, VA, Janis Torgersen, of Oxford, NC; and a son James Torgersen (Lynda), of Claytor Lake, VA; six grandchildren, Lindsay Nalevanko, Bryan Reisch, Erin Reisch, Michael Reisch, Paul Torgersen, Samantha McElwee; and two great-grandchildren, Isabelle and Collin Nalevanko.

Paul's impact on Virginia Tech is immeasurable. I have no doubt his legacy will continue on in the work of the many people he taught, mentored, and influenced throughout his lifetime. My thoughts and prayers go out to Paul's family and loved ones.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE YOUNG AMERICANS FINANCIAL LITERACY ACT

### HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to re-introduce the Young Americans Financial Literacy Act. Financial literacy is critical to ensuring future financial responsibility. A recent report entitled "Money Matters on Campus", conducted by Higher One and EVERFI, highlights that the state of financial literacy among young adults is not improving. Only seventeen states require some form of high school financial training, even though studies show students who receive financial literacy are considerably more fiscally responsible. Such students are more accountable with credit, more financially cautious and more averse to incurring debt. When students participated in a purely financial knowledge-based survey, only 12% answered correctly about what things to consider if one has too many credit cards.

Young adults are consistently exhibiting deficient understanding of financial literacy and how to plan for future economic goals. Just over half of the students in the survey knew the formula for calculating net worth; while only 12% knew the general rule for how many months financial planners recommend to have set aside in case of an emergency.

Young adults consistently exhibit deficient understanding of financial literacy and how to plan for future economic goals. Last year, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development released a global report of financial literacy which ranked the United States in the middle of eighteen countries surveyed.

I believe America should be leading the world with the best-educated students who will drive our economic innovation and success, so please join me in cosponsoring the Young Americans Financial Literacy Act. This act:

Establishes a grant program in the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to develop and implement financial literacy programs for young people ages eight to twenty-four;

Incentivizes the development of partnerships between institutions of higher education, local educational agencies, non-profit organizations, and financial institutions to develop programs aimed at young Americans in different phases of their life;

Ensures the development of evidence-based instructional material that is geared towards targeted groups and addresses unique life situations, including bankruptcy, foreclosure, student loans, credit card misuse; and

Conducts ongoing assessment and accountability of the program over the short- and long-

term to ensure that grant money achieves the greatest impact.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the Young Americans Financial Literacy Act.

## EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sugar Land Marriott Town Square for providing exceptional service to visitors of my home town. It recently received top honors from the Marriott brand, and earned a ranking as the top full-service Marriott hotel in Texas, third in the United States, and fifth among Marriot's 358 hotels all around the world for overall guest satisfaction. What an accomplishment.

In addition to these awards, the hotel also won a 2014 Excellence in Quality Award from Remington Hotels. These accolades are thanks in part to seven of the hotel's associates, who were honored for their exceptional service by receiving the 2014 Marriott Spirit to Serve Awards. Thousands of Marriott guests have expressed their satisfaction upon receiving the Sugar Land Marriott Town Square's exemplary customer service and hospitality.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Sugar Land Marriott Town Square for being selected as an outstanding hotel.

## HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

### HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to add my voice in commemoration of Holocaust Remembrance Day, or Yom HaShoah. The Holocaust claimed the lives of 11 million people, including six million Jews, and with each passing year it becomes increasingly important to keep alive the memory of those who perished. We must ensure that "never again" is a reality. It is also important that we remember those who fought back for humanity, such as the brave men and women who rose up against the Nazis in the Warsaw ghetto in 1943.

Seven decades later, the scourge of anti-Semitism still exists throughout the world. This is evidenced by the recent attacks against Jewish establishments and religious sites in Paris and Copenhagen, as well as anti-Semitic attacks inside the United States. A recent Anti-Defamation League survey found 24% of Western Europeans harbor anti-Semitic views. The survey also reported that anti-Semitic incidents in the United States rose 21 percent in 2014. Many of us have spoken out about this unacceptable situation for years, but we must reinforce our words with actions. There is no room for such bigotry and violent intolerance in today's society.

Let this day of remembrance, Yom HaShoah, strengthen our resolve to fight anti-Semitism worldwide. We cannot allow ourselves to become complacent, and we must continue to raise our voice against anti-Semitism, wherever it might arise. Sadly, every year there are fewer and fewer Holocaust survivors among us. We must take up their mantle, educate our youth, and tell their stories. Otherwise, there is a far greater risk of history repeating itself. Today, I remember the victims of the Holocaust, and I say "never again."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Votes # 145, 146 and 147, I am not recorded because I was absent from the U.S. House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner.

On Roll Call # 145. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA. On Roll Call # 146. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA. On Roll Call # 147. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

## HONORING WILLIE HARRIS

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Willie Harris.

A Holmes County native, Willie Harris, who stands 6-foot-8 and spent a year playing basketball at Alcorn State University, was one of the first black stuntmen in Hollywood.

Harris landed in California while serving in the military. He and two others entered into the stunt business through acquaintances. Harris' story is perhaps the most bizarre; a friend introduced Harris to Calvin Brown. This was the first time Harris had heard of a stunt man. Not long after that, he was driving a friend to north Hollywood, got lost and stopped to ask for directions. Harris had no idea he had walked onto the set where the 1969 blockbuster "Bob & Carol, Ted & Alice" was being filmed. The person volunteering directions was actor Elliott Gould, who was poised for stardom.

Gould noticed Harris' tall stature and asked if he'd ever considered stunt work. Harris was open to the idea. Gould met with him the next day and gave him a letter of recommendation by producer Robert Altman to help him gain membership into the Screen Actors Guild.

He had the chance to personally thank Gould last October when they were brought together to film a documentary segment about the Black Stuntmen's Association.

Harris is now the president of the Black Stuntman's Association in Jackson, Mississippi. Harris is accompanied in the organization by two other Mississippians: Henry Graddy and Dewitt Fondren. The group has been honored by former California governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and the Nevada legislature. The Smithsonian Institution is also planning to acknowledge the group through an exhibit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing stuntman that has been instrumental in magnifying the strides of African Americans in film.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. BRUCE POLIQUIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 154, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, due to an oversight, I voted incorrectly on H.R. 685, the Mortgage Choice Act of 2015, on April 14, 2015. I had intended to vote yea on Roll Call vote 152, on passage of the Mortgage Choice Act of 2015.

## RECOGNIZING THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE FOR ITS EFFORTS IN SUPPORT OF THE HOUSE

### HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of the United States Capitol Police. Congress is a very unique place that presents special challenges for a law enforcement agency, yet every day, the men and women of the Capitol Police work tirelessly to protect this institution. Their coordination, guidance, and support ensures that Members and Staff can fulfill the legislative responsibilities of Congress, all while securing the Capitol Hill campus so our constituents can visit and see first-hand how the legislative branch functions.

Specifically, I also want to note the excellent job done by the Capitol Police during the New Member Orientation program held last November for the incoming Members of Congress. The Orientation program is a significant effort that requires extensive coordination and communication, but the Capitol Police's work in providing security at the hotel and for all of the events was critical to the success and productivity of the week. I am very grateful for all they did to help with the program.

The officers and civilians within the force continually display professionalism and excellence in carrying out their duties, and I thank them for all their hard work.

## HONORING MASTER SERGEANT NORMA GARCIA FULLER

### HON. CARLOS CURBELO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Master Sergeant Norma Garcia Fuller, an American patriot, who will be receiving the Living Hero Award. I have the immense privilege of representing so many courageous former service members and their families in Florida's 26th Congressional District, and Master Sergeant Garcia Fuller exemplifies the greatness of our military. Born and raised in Homestead, Florida, Master Sergeant Garcia Fuller enlisted in the United States Army in 1989 and attended Fort Jackson, South Carolina for the majority of her training. Serving in several different roles in the United States Military, Master Sergeant Garcia Fuller was placed on orders in support of Operation Enduring Freedom at United States Southern Command in March of 2010. During this assignment she held numerous positions such as Assistant to the Inspector General, Human Resources Sergeant for the Resources and Assessments Directorate, and Executive Assistant to the Senior Enlisted Leader, where she was promoted to Sergeant First Class. In April 2013, she was mobilized to Guantanamo Bay where she served as the Joint Personnel Center Noncommissioned Officer and the Manpower and Personnel Noncommissioned Officer, where she was promoted to her current rank of Master Sergeant for her service to our country. Brave men and women like Master Sergeant Norma Garcia Fuller protect and preserve the integrity of our nation and the freedom that we enjoy. I offer my sincerest recognition of her service to our community and our nation, and highest accolades for receiving the Living Hero Award.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE REFORM ACT OF 2015

### HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce a bill to reform the Federal Protective Service. On the twentieth anniversary of the April 19, 1995 bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building (Murrah Building) in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, I believe it is long overdue to improve the Federal Protective Service (FPS). In the aftermath of the 1995 Murrah Building bombing, the Department of Justice (DOJ) assessed the vulnerability of Federal office buildings in the United States, particularly to acts of terrorism and other forms of violence. The DOJ report made several recommendations, including upgrading the Federal Protective Service (FPS) and bringing each Federal facility up to minimum standards suggested for its security level. When the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City was attacked, it was after careful planning that focused on gaps in the federal building security at the site to allow the massive destruction and the loss of life that touched all Americans.

The DOJ report noted that the FPS has the experience and historical character to provide security services in Federal buildings for much of the Federal workforce. But, the report also noted that FPS has limited resources to determine building security requirements to address terrorist threats. FPS, according to the report, needs to re-establish its role and take the lead in emphasizing the need for security.

Unfortunately years later, many of the reforms that DOJ found necessary have not taken place. Since the bombing of the Murrah Building, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General have both issued numerous reports indicating where FPS needs to improve in order to prevent another tragedy and improve security in Federal buildings. The GAO has made very clear that FPS must increase its oversight of its contract guard force, improve screening practices, and be more nimble in responding to threats to Federal buildings.

The Federal Protective Service is a part of the frontline defense for thousands of Federal buildings, which include Federal courthouses, Social Security Administration buildings, Agency headquarters, and other buildings. FPS has approximately 1,300 employees, including approximately 1,000 Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs) or ''inspectors'' and 15,000 contract guards, also known as Protective Security Officers (PSOs). After the Oklahoma City bombings in 1995, FPS' authorized staffing level was 1,450. FPS maintained about the same level of staffing until it dropped to 1,100 in 2007. After concerns about the decrease and its effect on security, Congress, through the appropriations process, began mandating a minimum staffing level. The FY 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act requires 1,371 full-time-equivalent staff, including 1,007 law enforcement officers. Ultimately, this means that the FPS has fewer employees than it had in 1996, in the immediate aftermath of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, while GSA has expanded its real estate holdings since 1996 by nearly 33%.

FPS spends about $1.3 billion in executing its mission while delivering security and law enforcement services for the 8,700 assets that the General Services Administration (GSA) owns, controls, or leases. FPS services include providing a visible uniformed presence in major Federal buildings; responding to criminal incidents and other emergencies; installing and monitoring security devices and systems; investigating criminal incidents; conducting physical security assessments; coordinating a comprehensive program for occupants' emergency plans; presenting formal crime prevention and security awareness programs; and providing police emergency and special security services during natural disasters, such as earthquakes, hurricanes, and major civil disturbances, including man-made disasters, such as bomb explosions and riots.

As the Federal inventory of buildings has steadily increased over the last 30 years, the quality and implementation of security standards have varied greatly. The Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management has unfortunately found that security in Federal buildings is not uniform and is often set by non-security personnel employed by tenant agencies through a Building Security Committee for each individual public building. This approach to security makes it difficult to gauge properly the actual risk at Federal facilities and then allocate FPS resources appropriately.

My bill, the FPS Reform Act of 2015, addresses some of the long standing issues identified by the original DOJ report in the aftermath of the bombing of Alfred P. Murrah Building and subsequent reports by the GAO. It creates a minimum level of training for Protective Service Officers (PSOs) while increasing the authority of PSOs to carry firearms and detain suspects accused of a felony. The bill also improves the training and procedures for federal agencies participating in the Building Security Committees to ensure that there are uniform and appropriate security standards for individual buildings occupied by federal agencies. Finally, the bill requires the Secretary of DHS to study and report back to Congress on several areas of concern with respect to securing federal buildings including the level of personnel needed to secure federal buildings, the best model for funding FPS, the feasibility of federalizing FPS contract officers, and best practices in preventing explosives from entering Federal buildings.

Nearly 20 years after the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building it is readily apparent that although FPS has made some strides in improving the protection of Federal buildings there is more progress that needs to be made. In my role as Ranking Member of the Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management Subcommittee and a former law enforcement official, I believe it is imperative that I do everything possible to protect the millions of federal workers and daily visitors, and to keep federal buildings safe. With increased oversight and additional legislative authority I believe the Federal Protective Service can thrive in its mission of protecting Federal Facilities, their occupants, and visitors by providing superior law enforcement and protective security services.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to consider this legislation and pass it as soon as possible.

## HONORING W.C. GORDEN

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkably talented individual, W.C. Gorden, has brought tremendous honor to one of Mississippi's premier education institutions, Jackson State University (JSU). Coach Gorden's legacy at Jackson State remains unmatched, and he has truly cemented his place in college football history.

A native of Nashville, Tennessee and a graduate of Tennessee State University, Gorden came to Jackson State first as its head baseball coach in 1971, he then became interim head football coach in 1976 and then head football coach in 1977. From then on, he led the Tigers to eight conference championship titles in the Southwestern Athletic Conference (SWAC) in the fifteen years he coached. In 1982, Gorden had 21 players drafted to the NFL, ranking JSU among the top 5 colleges in the nation for NFL draft picks. Also, during his tenure, JSU was the

only school in the SWAC to defeat Coach Eddie Robinson's formidable Grambling University's teams. Under Coach Gorden, JSU won 28 straight SWAC football games, and his teams led the nation in attendance among 1–AA schools 11 of the 15 years he coached. By the end of his career, Gordens' teams won more than 70% of their games. But one of the most amazing victories for Gorden was having the highest SWAC graduation rate among football players in the entire state of Mississippi from 1980 to 1981.

Coach Gorden's feats have been honored and recognized by many; he was inducted into the SWAC Hall of Fame in 1994; the Mississippi Sports Hall of Fame in 1997; the College Hall of Fame in 2008; and the Black College Hall of Fame in 2015. Coach Gorden's legacy falls in line with Mississippi's tradition of athletic exceptionalism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing W.C. Gorden for his exceptional strides in college football and his passion for producing excellence in the state of Mississippi.

## HONORING COLONEL BILL BADGER

### HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Colonel Bill Badger, who passed away on March 11, 2015 at the age of seventy-eight.

Originally from South Dakota, Colonel Badger joined the National Guard as a high school junior and went on to enjoy a long, distinguished career as a United States Army pilot for thirty-seven years. A true patriot who served his country with honor and dignity, he served as Chief of the National Guard Bureau's Aviation Division at the Pentagon. Among his many professional accomplishments, he established the only two United States-based attack helicopter training sites: the Eastern Army Aviation Training Site in Pennsylvania and the Western Army Aviation Training Site in Marana, Arizona. Colonel Badger and his wife, Sallie, moved to Arizona in 1985 when Colonel Badger established the Marana site.

On the morning of January 8, 2011, Colonel Badger attended a Congress on your Corner event at a shopping center north of Tucson to meet then-Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords. That fateful morning a gunman opened fire on the innocent attendees, brutally murdering six and seriously wounding thirteen, including Colonel Badger and Congresswoman Giffords. As the gunman was reloading his weapon, Colonel Badger, who was injured and bleeding from the head, ran toward the gunman and put him into a chokehold until the authorities arrived, thus stopping the deadly rampage. But for the valiant actions of Colonel Badger, the toll of those killed and wounded would have been much higher. ''I don't consider myself a hero,'' he would later say, ''I did what anybody would do.'' Colonel Badger was a beloved friend to the January 8, 2011 survivors. After this devastating event, this humble hero focused his efforts on keeping guns out of the hands of people like the January 8, 2011 gunman so as to prevent future similar tragedies. Colonel Badger and his wife embarked on a three-year journey across the country to promote his mission.

Colonel Badger was a hero to many long before he became one in the eyes of our nation on January 8, 2011. He was a caring and devoted husband to his wife, Sallie, a nurturing and loving father to his son, Christian, the beloved Scout master of Troop 007, a guide and counselor to numerous young people, many of whom attribute their current success to Colonel Badger's mentoring, and a friend to countless others, including the members of the Southern Arizona Jaguar Car Club, which he served as President for a time.

On March 11, 2015, the citizens of Arizona lost a friend who placed the safety and well-being of others above his own and who truly represented the best traits of humanity, heroism and sacrifice and the spirit of service to others. The citizens of Arizona owe Colonel Badger an extraordinary debt of gratitude for his tremendous service to our country and state.

Dedicated to his family, Colonel Badger will be greatly missed by his beloved wife, Sallie Badger, and his son, Christian Badger.

## HONORING DAVID ARMSTRONG WEST

### HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks to commemorate the life of David Armstrong West of Blacksburg, Virginia, who passed away on April 2, 2015 at the age of 81.

David was born in Beirut, Lebanon, where he spent much of his childhood. His father and grandfather both taught at the American University of Beirut, and his grandmother (who was born and raised in Damascus, Syria) also worked in Beirut.

In New York City in 1958, David married Lindsay Lattimore Butte, with whom I later worked while I was in the Virginia House of Delegates and she was with the Montgomery County Board of Supervisors. David attended Cornell University and studied ornithology, graduating in 1959 with a PhD.

David spent two years doing postdoctoral genetics research at Liverpool University in England before he began teaching in 1962 at Virginia Tech (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University) in Blacksburg. At Tech, David taught biology and genetics until he retired in 1998. He, Lindsay, and their family restored and lived in an 1840 brick house in town, and placed an historic and open space easement on their entire three-acre property in an effort to ensure it is preserved.

After he retired, David pursued interests in music, reading, travel, and the local mountains. Additionally, although we never went birding together, he and I shared an avid love for bird watching. David has written two books on 19th Century German naturalist Fritz Müller. The first is a biography entitled ''A Naturalist in Brazil,'' and the second (recently completed) traces the development of Müller's ideas as well as his connections with other scientists such as Charles Darwin.

David is survived by his wife, Lindsay; sister, Elisabeth FitzHugh; brother, Allen; his son, Peter and wife, Katherine Hood, of Brooklyn, New York; his son, Roger and wife, Deborah, of Silver Spring, Maryland; and his daughter, Susan West Marmagas and husband, William, of Blacksburg, Virginia. He is also survived by five grandchildren, Nicholas, Daniel and Tyler West and Anastasia and Elektra Marmagas.

David's contributions and his love for his family, neighbors, and community will long be remembered and cherished. My thoughts and prayers go out to David's family and loved ones. May God give them comfort during this time.

## HONORING CAMBER CORPORATION

### HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor Camber Corporation for twenty-five years of business, and for their service to the community of Huntsville, Alabama and to many other areas both in our great state and across the United States. I am pleased to recognize this company for its many accomplishments.

Camber Corporation, which is headquartered in Huntsville, Alabama, was established on April 2, 1990 with just three employees, including the company founder, Walter Batson. Today it has grown to over thirty offices, with personnel in many other locations across America and around the world. Over the years, the company has done widely varied work for a number of organizations, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Department of Transportation, the Department of Defense, the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Postal Service, U.S. Courts, the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and the Center for Civil and Military Affairs.

I know that no matter the company, this level of success is possible only with the efforts of many skilled professionals working together to achieve the organization's goals, and Camber Corporation is the first to recognize that its staff of over 2,000 employees is its greatest asset. These staff members can claim expertise in many vital areas including Engineering, Software Development, Information Technology, Training, Modeling and Simulation, Acquisition Management and Decision Support, and Operations. Due in great part to the service of these dedicated workers, Camber Corporation's products and projects now support both government and commercial customers throughout the world.

Camber Corporation has been selected for numerous professional organization and Chamber of Commerce awards, including Best Places to Work in both Huntsville and Northern Virginia. I am honored to add my commendations to those already received. As an Alabamian and as an American, I am pleased to congratulate this company on the service it has rendered to the United States over the past 25 years, and on the contributions it has made to its home state of Alabama. I wish them many, many more years of success in the future.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE ''INNOVATION PROTECTION ACT''

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the ''Innovation Protection Act'' responds to the single most important problem facing our patent system today—the diversion of patent fees. One of the most effective steps we can take in responding to abusive patent litigation is making sure poor quality patents are not issued to begin with. To do that we need to give our examiners the resources they need to review and analyze the hundreds of thousands of complex and interrelated patent applications they receive every year.

The current finding mechanism has failed the patent system. It did not prevent the diversion of nearly $150 million in collected user fees in fiscal year 2013 due to the sequester. And this loss is on top of the estimated $1 billion in fees diverted over the last two decades. In essence, there is a tax on innovation in this country, and this legislation would repeal it.

That is why I along with Representatives COLLINS, NADLER, FRANKS, LOFGREN, SENSENBRENNER, DEUTCH, ROHRABACHER, and JEFFRIES introduced today the ''Innovation Protection Act.'' This critical bill will ensure that the USPTO retains all of the user fees it collects.

Significant patent stakeholders, including the American Intellectual Property Law Association, BSA—The Software Alliance, the Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform, the Intellectual Property Owners Association, and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers—USA, among others, support the legislation.

This bill would create a permanent, reliable mechanism to protect the USPTO from the unpredictability of the annual appropriations cycle, which severely hinders USPTO's ability to engage in the kind of multi-year, business-like planning that is needed to manage our patent system. It would eliminate the tax on innovation.

Therefore, a permanent funding mechanism is essential to encourage innovation and to ensure that our patent system remains the envy of the world.

## THANKING THE CAPITOL POLICE FOR SERVICE DURING NEW MEMBER ORIENTATION

### HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in November of last year, the newly elected members of the House of Representatives came to Washington, D.C. for New Member Orientation. This weeklong event, organized by the Committee on House Administration, is designed to orient our new colleagues and their staffs to the various responsibilities they assume in the upcoming congress, as well as to educate the members and their staffs on the resources they have here to help them in their new roles. It is a comprehensive undertaking, but fortunately safety was never a concern during the event due to the hard work and professionalism of the Capitol Police.

The Capitol Police did excellent work protecting our visitors, allowing them safe travel between destinations and providing a sense of security as they visited their new offices on Capitol Hill for the first time. I would like to extend my thanks and gratitude to the Capitol Police for their fine work in keeping our grounds secure and for their essential guidance, information and support.

## HONORING DUKE MEN'S BASKETBALL

### HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to rise today to congratulate the Duke men's basketball team on winning the 2015 NCAA Division I National Championship! I say this as a Member who, depending on the vagaries of redistricting, has represented the campus, but also as a proud on-leave faculty member and the father of two Duke alumni.

This Duke team's combined talent, tenacity, and teamwork helped them to overcome a tough conference schedule and make one of the most memorable runs in recent NCAA tournament history. Both Duke and the University of Wisconsin Badgers deserve recognition for their excellent play in the tournament and throughout the year. But Duke's thrilling victory over Wisconsin to clinch the national title was a fitting finish to an historic season that also saw its legendary head coach, Mike Krzyzewski, ''Coach K'', notch his record 1,000th win.

The Duke Blue Devils have a long history of success in men's basketball, and I am proud that this year's team was able to add a fifth national men's basketball title to its collection. Congratulations to the players, staff, and coaches, who will be remembered as one of the greatest Duke teams of all time. Blue Devil fans everywhere are proud of your remarkable season, the latest chapter in our storied basketball tradition!

## INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE PARITY ACT OF 2015

### HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce a bill to offer law enforcement retirement to Federal Protective Service (FPS) law enforcement officers. This bill provides retirement parity to FPS law enforcement officers with all other law enforcement officers within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

The lack of law enforcement retirement for FPS law enforcement officers has hurt morale and has contributed to a high rate of attrition of FPS law enforcement officers when compared to attrition rates of other law enforcement agencies within DHS. By providing these enhanced retirement provisions to new hires within the Federal Protective Service, and crediting the service of current FPS law enforcement officers after enactment of the bill with the new provisions, we can begin to strengthen the morale and resolve of the Federal Protective Service.

FPS is responsible for delivering security and law enforcement services for the 8,700 assets that the General Services Administration (GSA) owns, controls, or leases across the country. The Federal Protective Service is part of the frontline defense for these Federal buildings, which include Federal courthouses, Social Security Administration buildings, Agency headquarters, and other buildings. FPS law enforcement officers are authorized to carry firearms and empowered to make arrests related to the protection of buildings, grounds, and property owned by the Federal government and persons on the property. Like other law enforcement officers within DHS, FPS officers receive the same training at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and often risk their lives in protection of the nearly 1 million Federal employees and visitors to Federal buildings.

As a former law enforcement officer I have a deep appreciation for their service and the sacrifices that FPS law enforcement officers make on a regular basis. By providing this retirement provision I believe it will help the Federal Protective Service thrive in its mission of protecting Federal facilities, their occupants, and visitors with superior law enforcement and protective security services.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to consider this legislation and pass it as soon as possible.

## HONORING ERNIE PYLE

### HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the greatest Hoosiers history has seen, who gave his life 70 years ago.

Ernie Pyle, a Hoosier journalist, became a household name as he told of the everyday lives—the trials and tribulations, the honor and dignity—of our soldiers in WWII.

Through his Pulitzer Prize winning column, Ernie Pyle brought the hard realities of war into the homes of families worldwide.

And he was an advocate for the common soldier—the guys he rightfully argued wars can't be won without.

Generations of young journalists—especially those who've studied in his shadow at the Indiana University School of Journalism—have greatly benefited from his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be grateful for the sacrifice and service of great men like Ernest Taylor Pyle.

## IN RECOGNITION OF BISHOP VICTOR L. POWELL

### HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding Man of God,

Bishop Victor L. Powell, who will celebrate his 25th anniversary as the distinguished pastor of Rhema Word Cathedral. An anniversary worship service will be held on Sunday, April 19, 2015 at 11:00 a.m. at Rhema Word Cathedral in Albany, Georgia.

A native of Chicago, Illinois, Bishop Powell was born to be a leader. He served our nation honorably in the United States Marine Corps for nine years. He completed Non-Commissioned Officer Leadership School and Defense Mapping School, and attained the rank of Staff Sergeant. Bishop Powell also is a certified trainer with the Georgia Department of Corrections and has trained hundreds of law enforcement officers for the State of Georgia.

Since 1990, Bishop Powell has led Rhema Word Cathedral, formerly known as Williams Spring Baptist Church. His God-given vision has taken the church to greater heights than ever before. Bishop Powell pastors one church in two locations—one in downtown Albany and one in Dawson, Georgia. He also founded Stand Up Again, Inc., a subsidiary of Rhema Word Cathedral and outreach ministry that serves local, regional, and even international communities, including Ghana, Guatemala, and Haiti. The Stand Up Again television broadcast reaches people throughout the region on a weekly basis.

Not one to rest on his laurels, Bishop Powell serves as pastor to other pastors all over the world through Covenant Network Ministries. He is also the President and CEO of VLP, Inc., which provides training and motivational speaking to corporations and agencies.

In October 2002, Bishop Powell was consecrated to the office of Bishop by Archbishop Earl Paulk of the International Charismatic Communion of Churches in Decatur, Georgia. Bishop Powell has served on the College of Bishops for the International Charismatic Communion of Churches; the Foundation Board for Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital; and Stop the Violence Project. He has also served on the Executive Board of Directors for the Albany Chamber of Commerce; Capitol City Bank; Albany-Dougherty Governmental Study Commission; and Lily Pad of Albany.

Using Bishop Powell as a vessel, God has reached into the hearts of many so that Rhema Word Cathedral has welcomed thousands of souls to this prolific ministry. A dynamic and ever faithful pastor, his ministry has stretched across the globe. As one of the premier preachers of our generation, Bishop Powell is well-known and sought after for his anointed, sound and understandable proclamation of God's Word. He is motivated by his love for people, his love for preaching, and his belief that no one is beyond God's reach. On a personal note, I have been truly blessed by Bishop Powell's sage counsel and enduring friendship over the many years I have known him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in thanking Bishop Victor L. Powell for twenty-five wonderful years of changing Southwest Georgia for the better, over thirty remarkable years of ministry, and a lifetime of selfless service to God, the church and to humankind.

## IN HONOR OF SAN BERNARDINO POLICE OFFICER GABRIEL GARCIA

### HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor San Bernardino Police Officer Gabriel Garcia for his outstanding service to the community and for his dedication to the San Bernardino Police Department.

Officer Garcia joined the police force in March 2008 and has since served as a Patrol Officer. His work throughout the years has been described as exemplary by colleagues on account of his extreme professionalism and compassionate nature. Among Officer Garcia's many accomplishments include his highly commended involvement in the San Bernardino Graffiti Task Force. Throughout his tenure, he has received widespread commendation for his assistance with various crimes such as armed robberies and car theft.

At about 2 a.m. on August 22, 2014, Officer Garcia was shot in the head and critically injured while showing his young officer trainee how to conduct a pedestrian check in San Bernardino. Officer Garcia's injuries were so severe that he spent several months hospitalized in critical condition. Due to his life-threatening brain injuries, Officer Garcia was put in a medically induced coma, which he later emerged from in September.

Now, after a triumphant recovery, Officer Garcia is back at the side of his loving family. His recovery is currently being aided by his father, retired San Bernardino Police Captain Ron Garcia, and his mother, Lydia Garcia. They provide full care and support for their son as he takes part in a day therapy program.

Officer Garcia is a testament to the sacrifices that our public safety officials make in order to protect and serve our communities. He is a reminder to all of us that every day, men and women in law enforcement put themselves in harm's way to maintain order throughout the United States. His perseverance through this traumatic event is inspirational, and I wish him a continued recovery.

For his heroic contributions to the community, and for his many other achievements, I would like to honor Officer Garcia and his family.

## HONORING CALLAWAY HIGH SCHOOL

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Callaway High School that is located at 601 Beasley Road in Jackson, Mississippi. Callaway is one of seven high schools in the Jackson Public School District, the largest school district in the state of Mississippi.

Built in 1966, Callaway was named after the late Robert M. Callaway, a Lafayette County native. He began his career teaching Choctaw Indians in the mountains of McCurtain County, Oklahoma. Before assuming duties as principal of Liberty Grove School, later H. V. Watkins Elementary in Jackson, he taught at Darling in Quitman County and Pocahontas in Hinds County. He was principal at Watkins from 1936–1956.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Callaway High School.

## CONGRATULATING HONDA MANUFACTURING OF INDIANA

### HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, Honda Manufacturing of Indiana, located in my district in Greensburg, Indiana, reached a significant milestone by celebrating the production of its 1 millionth vehicle on April 8, 2015.

Honda began manufacturing Civic Sedans at the plant in October of 2008 and is the sole U.S. plant producing these vehicles. While most of the production is slated for the U.S. market, the Indiana facility exports to a number of locations around the world. The facility's annual production capacity is currently 250,000 vehicles.

Honda, a Japanese company, exemplifies how strong trade ties can benefit Indiana's economy. Honda purchases parts and materials from 49 suppliers from around the state of Indiana and has spent more than $16 billion with suppliers in North America since 2008. Additionally, since Honda opened its doors, it has had a strong presence in Greensburg and the surrounding communities, providing thousands of jobs to Hoosiers.

Please join me in congratulating Honda and the more than 2,000 associates at the facility for this major manufacturing achievement.

## INSTRUMENTAL LEADERSHIP

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate two of Alvin Community College's (ACC) outstanding faculty members, Dr. Lynda Vern and Ms. Karen Downey, who were recently named recipients of the John and Suanne Roueche Excellence Award during the League for Innovation in the Community College Conference in Boston. This award recognizes outstanding contributions and leadership by community college faculty and staff.

Dr. Vern and Ms. Downey are among more than 60 recipients to be recognized from the great State of Texas. The award recognizes exemplary faculty and staff for their contributions and leadership. Dr. Vern has worked at ACC for almost 40 years and teaches developmental education students while directing ACC's Learning Lab. Ms. Downey has worked with the college for 30 years and teaches in the Court Reporting program. Community colleges play a critical role in shaping and developing the workforce needed to keep our economy strong. The leadership of Dr. Vern and Ms. Downey are instrumental in maintaining excellence in education for our community.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Dr. Vern and Ms. Downey for receiving the John and Suanne Roueche Excellence Award.

## TRIBUTE TO DR. SAMIR SALIBA

### HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks in order to extend my sincere congratulations and gratitude to Dr. Samir Saliba on his remarkable 51 years as a full-time faculty member at the College. He has had many titles and jobs in his 51 years at Emory, but from my time as a student I fondly remember him as 'Dean Saliba.'

More importantly, I recall the positive influence Dean Saliba had on me. I am confident he has similarly impacted countless people he came across over the years, whether in Virginia or wherever he has been.

Dean Saliba's influence at Emory and Henry, of course, is immeasurable, as he established the Political Science Department and implemented additional, remarkable visions as chair of the Division of Social Sciences, Dean of Faculty, advisor for the pre-law program, and director of the Center for International Studies. I commend him on these accomplishments, and on his numerous awards and accolades, including the 2014 William and Martha DeFriece Award.

Dean Saliba will soon be taking a well-deserved sabbatical, following his decades of hard work instructing young people and improving the Emory brand not just across the Commonwealth, but across the country. It is my hope that he enjoys this time, and returns refreshed to work on a memoir of his years at Emory and Henry.

I am honored to officially congratulate Dr. Saliba, pay tribute to his legacy, and thank him for all he has done for the Emory and Henry family.

## TRIBUTE TO THE ATHLETES OF SAINTS JOHN NEUMANN AND MARIA GORETTI CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY GIRLS' BASKETBALL TEAM

### HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extremely talented Saints John Neumann and Maria Goretti High School Girls' Varsity Basketball Team of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. They have achieved the consensus recognition as the Number 1-ranked and National Champion girls' basketball team in the United States of America, and won the Pennsylvania State Championship (PIAA Class AA), Philadelphia City Championship (PIAA District 12), and the Philadelphia Catholic League Championship.

The Lady Saints put on a dominant performance in their state championship game against the Seton-LaSalle Rebels of Pittsburgh, with a commanding victory of 79–34 to become Pennsylvania State Champions. Not only did they finish their unprecedented season a perfect 30–0, but they've also been recognized as the ''Team of the Year'' by the Philadelphia Inquirer for the Philadelphia and Southeastern Pennsylvania region.

These talented young women were mentored throughout the season by former head coach Letty Santarelli, who was a star-player at Immaculata University, and were led by Head Coach Andrea Peterson. Following this remarkable season, Coach Peterson has been named the Top High School Girls' Basketball Coach in the United States, winning the Naismith National Coach of the Year Award.

I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating this team on an outstanding season.

## IN RECOGNITION OF THE REVEREND JAMES R. EDWARDS

### HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 16, 2015*

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding Man of God who has been a longstanding source of inspiration, spiritual guidance, and moral leadership to the people of Southwest Georgia, the Reverend James R. Edwards. Rev. Edwards is retiring after pastoring the New Salem Missionary Baptist Church in Baconton, Georgia for almost twenty years. His friends, family, and church community will honor him at a celebration event on Saturday, April 18, 2015 in Camilla, Georgia.

An Arkansas native, Rev. Edwards began his ministry at Wayland Baptist University in Plainview, Texas, where he earned degrees in Business Administration and Christian Education.

From there, Rev. Edwards was drafted into the United States Marine Corps and began his active duty career on November 17, 1969 in Parris Island, South Carolina. He served our nation honorably for over thirty years both within the United States and overseas. He was promoted from private to warrant officer, and retired on May 31, 2000 with the rank of Major. He is decorated with the Navy Achievement Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, and the Legion of Merit.

Following his calling, Rev. Edwards dedicated a significant portion of his time to ministry while in the Marines and afterward. He was ordained a deacon at Christian Valley Missionary Baptist Church in North Chicago, Illinois in 1978. From November 1980 to June 1982, he served as deacon and Sunday School teacher at Marshall Chapel Missionary Baptist Church in Midway Park, North Carolina. He then served as deacon and president of brotherhood for Second Missionary Baptist Church in Oceanside, California. While at the City of Refuge Christian Church in Waipahu, Hawaii, he accepted his calling into the ministry, preaching his initial sermon on Thanksgiving Day in 1985. He was ordained at the Springfield Missionary Baptist Church in Hawkinsville, Georgia in April 1989.

Rev. Edwards served as associate pastor at Mt. Carmel Missionary Baptist Church in Dale, South Carolina and Grace Christian Church in Kaneohe, Hawaii. He served as pastor at Camp Smith Chapel in Honolulu, Hawaii, New Jerusalem Missionary Baptist Church in Plainview, Texas, and Summerhill Missionary Baptist Church in Pelham, Georgia.

The Second Congressional District of Georgia gained a compassionate and able leader when Rev. Edwards arrived in Albany, Georgia in September 1995. Throughout his pastoral career, always seeking to improve the craft of Christian ministry and discipleship, Rev. Edwards has served on numerous community boards, and as chairman of Faith Community Outreach and the Putney District Union; vice president of the Second District of the General Missionary Baptist Convention of Georgia, Inc.; president of the Mitchell County Ministerial Alliance and Baconton Community Group of Churches; chaplain at the Jimmy Autry State Prison; and CEO of the Southwest Georgia Community House of Hope. And even still, while being the lead member in all of these ministries and organizations, he was also a member of the NAACP, National Naval Officers Association, Montford Point Marine Association, American Red Cross, Southern Leadership Conference, Blacks in Government, and Leadership Albany.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Edwards is a man of integrity who exudes the genuine principles and values of Christian discipleship. A charismatic evangelical leader and pioneer, his spiritual zeal is both infectious and highly contagious. Under his leadership, New Salem Missionary Baptist Church has stood as a beacon of light in our community, serving as a voice for the voiceless and guide for the lost by spreading the ministry and the good news of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Along with his extensive church community, Rev. Edwards is surrounded by the love and support of his family—his wife, Ethel Louise Sheffield, and their five children, sixteen grandchildren, and one great-grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in thanking Reverend James R. Edwards for more than thirty years of dedicated service to our nation, twenty wonderful years of changing South Georgia for the better, and a lifetime of selfless service to God, the church and to humankind.

# *Daily Digest*

## Senate

*Routine Proceedings, pages S2227–S2258*

**Measures Introduced:** Thirty-nine bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 968–1006, S. Res. 136–139, and S. Con. Res. 12.

**Pages S2244–45**

**Measures Passed:**

***Roosevelt University 70th Anniversary:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 137, congratulating the administration, staff, students, and alumni of Roosevelt University on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the University. **Page S2255**

***Congratulating Providence College Men's Ice Hockey Team:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 138, congratulating the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team for winning the 2015 NCAA Division I National Championship. **Page S2255**

***Attack on Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building 20th Anniversary:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 139, commemorating the 20th anniversary of the attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building.

**Page S2257**

**Measures Considered:**

**Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act—Agreement:** Senate resumed consideration of S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2229–34, S2234–40**

Pending:

McConnell (for Cornyn) Amendment No. 1120, to strengthen the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act by incorporating additional bipartisan amendments.

**Page S2229**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to invoke cloture on McConnell (for Cornyn) Amendment No. 1120 (listed above), be withdrawn. **Page S2232**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 2 p.m., on Monday, April 20, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the bill. **Page S2256**

**Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act—Agreement:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader with the concurrence of the Democratic Leader, Senate vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of 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, and that if the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill is agreed to, Senator Corker, or his designee, be recognized to offer a substitute amendment that is the text of S. 615, to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. **Pages S2239–40**

**Hanks Nomination—Agreement:** A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 5 p.m., on Monday, April 20, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of George C. Hanks, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motions be in order. **Page S2255**

**Nominations Confirmed:** Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 95 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. EX. 154), Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security.

**Pages S2234, S2258**

Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years. **Pages S2234, S2258**

**Messages from the House:** **Page S2242**

**Measures Referred:** **Pages S2242–43**

**Measures Read the First Time:** **Page S2243**

**Petitions and Memorials:** **Pages S2243–44**

**Executive Reports of Committees:** **Page S2244**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S2245–46**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:**

**Pages S2246–55**

**Additional Statements:** Page S2242

**Authorities for Committees to Meet:** Page S2255

**Record Votes:** One record vote was taken today. (Total—154) Page S2234

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:48 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 20, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2256.)

# *Committee Meetings*

*(Committees not listed did not meet)*

## APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Education, after receiving testimony from Arne Duncan, Secretary, and Thomas Skelly, Chief Financial Officer, both of the Department of Education.

## APPROPRIATIONS: NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after receiving testimony from Charles F. Bolden, Jr., Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

## DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

*Committee on Armed Services:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Admiral Samuel J. Locklear III, USN, Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, and General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, USA, Commander, United Nations Command, Combined Forces Command, and U.S. Forces Korea, both of the Department of Defense.

## REGULATORY BURDENS TO OBTAINING MORTGAGE CREDIT

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine regulatory burdens to obtaining mortgage credit, including S. 682, to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage orginator and a high-cost mortgage, S. 351, to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt, S. 812, to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, H.R. 685, to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, and H.R. 1210, to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution's portfolio, after receiving testimony from Tom Woods, National Association of Home Builders, Blue Springs, Missouri; Chris Polychron, National Association of REALTORS, Hot Springs, Arkansas; J. David Motley, Colonial Savings, F.A., Fort Worth, Texas, on behalf the Mortgage Bankers Association; and Julia Gordon, Center for American Progress, Washington, D.C.

## ANNUAL ENERGY OUTLOOK FOR 2015

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Outlook for 2015, after receiving testimony from Adam Sieminski, Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy.

## CONGRESS AND THE UNITED STATES TARIFF POLICY

*Committee on Finance:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine Congress and the United States tariff policy, after receiving testimony from Jacob Lew, Secretary of the Treasury; Thomas Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture; and Michael Froman, United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President.

## BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill entitled, "Every Child Achieves Act of 2015";

An original bill entitled, "WIOA Technical Amendments Act"; and

The nominations of Ericka M. Miller, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, and Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, both of the Department of Education,

**INTELLIGENCE**

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

# House of Representatives

## *Chamber Action*

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 59 public bills, H.R. 1830–1888; 1 private bill, H.R. 1889; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 45; H. Con. Res. 37–39; and H. Res. 207–209, were introduced.

**Pages H2305–08**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages H2310–11**

**Reports Filed:** There were no reports filed today.

**Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015:** The House passed H.R. 1105, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 161. **Pages H2275–86, H2290–92**

Rejected the Nolan motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 186 yeas to 232 nays, Roll No. 160.

**Pages H2285–86, H2290–91**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–74, shall be considered as adopted.

**Page H2275**

H. Res. 200, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 622), (H.R. 1105), and (H.R. 1195) was agreed to yesterday, April 15th.

**State and Local Sales Tax Deduction Fairness Act of 2015:** The House passed H.R. 622, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes, by a yea-and-nay vote of 272 yeas to 152 nays, Roll No. 159. **Pages H2286–90**

Rejected the Neal motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 179 yeas to 243 nays, Roll No. 158. **Pages H2288–90**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–74, shall be considered as adopted.

**Page H2286**

H. Res. 200, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 622), (H.R. 1105), and (H.R. 1195) was agreed to yesterday, April 15th.

**Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress—Reappointment:** The Chair announced, on behalf of the Clerk of the House, pursuant to 44 United States Code 2702, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Dr. Sharon Leon, Fairfax, Virginia. **Page H2292**

**Meeting Hour:** Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Friday, April 17th and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, April 19th and that the order of the House of January 6, 2015, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

**Page H2298**

**Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group—Appointment:** The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group: Representative Huizenga (MI), Chairman. **Page H2301**

**Senate Message:** Message received from the Senate today appears on page H2292.

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2289–90, H2290, H2290–91, and H2291–92. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 2:19 p.m.

# Committee Meetings

## MEDICARE POST ACUTE CARE DELIVERY AND OPTIONS TO IMPROVE IT

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Medicare Post Acute Care Delivery and Options to Improve It''. Testimony was heard from Mark E. Miller, Executive Director, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission; and public witnesses.

## LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade held a hearing entitled ''H.R. ____, Targeting Rogue and Opaque Letters (TROL) Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## THE FUTURE OF HOUSING IN AMERICA: INCREASING PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING

*Committee on Financial Services:* Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled ''The Future of Housing in America: Increasing Private Sector Participation in Affordable Housing''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## THE WORST PLACES TO WORK IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:* Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled ''The Worst Places to Work in the Federal Government''. Testimony was heard from David S. Ferriero, Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration; Manuel Ehrlich, Board Member, Chemical Safety Board; Catherine V. Emerson, Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Homeland Security; and Robert Goldenkoff, Director of Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office.

## AN OVERVIEW OF THE BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

*Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:* Subcommittee on Space held a hearing entitled ''An Overview of the Budget Proposal for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Fiscal Year 2016''. Testimony was heard from Charles F. Bolden, Jr., Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

## MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs:* Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a markup on H.R. 473, the ''Increasing the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability to Veterans Act of 2015''; H.R. 475, the ''GI Bill Processing Improvement Act of 2015''; H.R. 476, the ''GI Bill Education Quality Enhancement Act of 2015''; H.R. 1382, the ''Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act''; H.R. 456, the ''Reducing Barriers for Veterans Education Act of 2015''; H.R. 474, the ''Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Programs Reauthorization Act of 2015''; H.R. 643, the ''Veterans Education Survey Act of 2015''; H.R. 1038, the ''Ensuring VA Employee Accountability Act''; H.R. 1141, the ''GI Bill Fairness Act of 2015''; H.R. 1187, to amend title 38, United States Code, to adjust certain limits on the guaranteed amount of a home loan under the home loan program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and H.R. 1313, the ''Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act''. The following bills were forwarded to the full committee, as amended: H.R. 473, H.R. 475, and H.R. 476. The following bills were forwarded to the full committee, without amendment: H.R. 456, H.R. 474, H.R. 643, H.R. 1038, H.R. 1141, H.R. 1187, and H.R. 1313.

## NRO BUDGET

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:* Subcommittee on Department of Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture held a hearing on NRO budget. This hearing was closed.

## NGA BUDGET

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:* Subcommittee on Department of Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture held a hearing on NGA budget. This hearing was closed.

# Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 2015

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

### Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

### House

No hearings are scheduled.

*Next Meeting of the* SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, April 20

Senate Chamber

**Program for Monday:** Senate will resume consideration of S. 178, Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

At 5 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of George C. Hanks, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, with a vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:30 p.m.

*Next Meeting of the* HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 a.m., Friday, April 17

House Chamber

**Program for Friday:** House will meet in Pro Forma session at 10:30 a.m.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E523
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E524, E526
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E512
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E524, E526
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E513, E518
Bucshon, Larry, Ind., E524
Carson, André, Ind., E517, E520, E522, E524
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E521
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E511
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E511, E514
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E524
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E514
Curbelo, Carlos, Fla., E522
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E521
Farr, Sam, Calif., E511
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E516
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E520, E523, E526
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E523
Guinta, Frank C., N.H., E515
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E517
Hurt, Robert, Va., E515
Kennedy, Joseph P., III, Mass., E513
Messer, Luke, Ind., E518, E525
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E521
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E520
Olson, Pete, Tex., E521, E525
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E512
Pittenger, Robert, N.S., E521
Poliquin, Bruce, Me., E521
Price, David E., N.C., E524
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E511
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E513
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E514, E516, E519
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E513
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E515, E519, E521, E522, E525
Torres, Norma J., Calif., E525
Upton, Fred, Mich., E515

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.