United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 21, 2015 No. 79

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 21, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GARRET GRAVES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, God of the Universe, for giving us another day.

As the various Members of this people's House return to their home districts, we ask Your blessing upon each. Give each a discerning ear and the wisdom and good judgment needed to give credit to the office they have been honored by their constituents to fill.

Bless the work of all who serve in their various capacities here in the United States Capitol.

Bless all those who visit the Capitol today, be they American citizens or visitors to our Nation. May they be inspired by this monument to the noble idea of human freedom and its guarantee by the democratic experiment that is the United States.

And as we take time this weekend to remember those who have died serving our country, God, bless America, and may all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DOLD 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.

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, May 21, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 21, 2015 at 9:39 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 47.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, Americans will remember and honor those who have served this Nation to protect and defend the freedoms we cherish. As we reflect on the heroism and devotion of the brave servicemembers who have given their lives in defense of our Nation, we must never forget to thank and pray for their families. Let us take time to show our appreciation for the service and sacrifice of America's heroes.

I especially appreciate Memorial Day. My father served our country as part of the Flying Tigers in India and China during World War II, which inspired my military service, as well as the service of my four sons, who all currently are on military duty.

This weekend, I am thankful for the opportunity to join County Council Chairman Ronnie Young in the Aiken Memorial Day parade. I am grateful to Councilwoman Gail Diggs for her role in the efforts to reinstate the parade ably begun by the Marine Corps League, as well as Wes Jerrell and Betsy Davis with the Aiken Jaycees for their work to honor and support our Armed Forces and their families.

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

BOKO HARAM CRIMES

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, press reports this week show that the reign of terror wrought by Boko Haram in northeastern Nigeria has reached appalling

Printed on recycled paper.

new depths of depravity. They have chosen to use as a weapon of war widespread, organized sexual violence against young girls and women. Hundreds of women and girls as young as 11 have been subjected to systematic, organized rape.

The terrorists have also used women and children to carry out suicide bombings against civilian targets.

These are crimes against humanity, which is why I am pleased to join Congresswoman BARBARA LEE in support of an International Criminal Court investigation.

I am also pleased that the House approved an amendment that Representative ED ROYCE and I offered to the National Defense Authorization Act that calls for continued U.S. support of international efforts to combat Boko Haram.

History has taught us, to our everlasting sorrow, that when such horror arises in the world, the world cannot and should not stand idly by.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF RABBI CARL WOLKIN

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rabbi Carl Wolkin. He is retiring after 35 years of service to the Congregation Beth Shalom in Northbrook, Illinois. He will be sorely missed by many in our community.

Over the past 35 years, Rabbi Wolkin has served as the president of the Northbrook Clergy Association, the Chicago region of the Rabbinical Assembly, the president of the Chicago Board of Rabbis, and he is also a member of the Jewish United Fund board. In these roles, Mr. Speaker, he has worked tirelessly to support his fellow rabbis in making their congregations centers for worship and learning.

In 2004, Rabbi Wolkin was in the first group of graduates of the Center for Rabbinic Enrichment of the Shalom Hartman Institute in Jerusalem.

Rabbi Wolkin has been a tremendous asset to the Jewish community at large, as has his wife, Judy, who has enriched the lives of Jewish children by her teaching at the Solomon Schechter Day School for many years.

I wish Rabbi Wolkin well on his retirement and the next chapter of his life.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, Congress is engaged in a vigorous debate about national trade policy, but no matter where you stand on the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Export-Import Bank is one trade program that we should all get behind.

After all, this is a Federal agency that operates at no cost to taxpayers and whose sole purpose is to create jobs by helping American manufacturers increase exports.

The Export-Import Bank provides loans to help American businesses compete against foreign companies that receive subsidies from their governments, and it provides credit to facilitate the sale of American goods abroad.

Since 2009, the Export-Import Bank has helped dozens of businesses in western New York export nearly $100 million in goods and has helped create or sustain 1.3 million jobs across this Nation.

A number of local business leaders, including Barre Banks, the owner of Midland Machinery in Tonawanda, have reached out to my office to share their stories of success with the Bank and to warn against its expiration.

I urge the majority to stand with American businesses, protect American jobs, and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF CORPORAL FRED WHITAKER, SR.

(Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day, I wish to recognize our servicemembers who have so bravely answered the call to defend our great Nation.

As the daughter of a U.S. Marine, I am eternally grateful for the service and sacrifice our troops make, all in the name of freedom.

Today, I wish to pay a special tribute to a hero that I have the honor of representing in Congress, Corporal Fred Whitaker, Sr. Corporal Whitaker, a World War II veteran, proudly served our Nation in the combat infantry from 1943 to 1946. He participated in several campaigns, including Saar, Rhineland, Central Europe, and the historic Battle of the Bulge.

Corporal Whitaker received numerous awards for his honorable service, including the Distinguished Unit Citation, the Combat Infantry Badge, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Good Conduct Medal, the European Theater Medal with four battle stars, and a World War II Victory Medal.

I thank him for his sacrifice to our Nation and for the sacrifice all military personnel make to keep our country safe and free. We are forever indebted to this true hero of the Greatest Generation.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROJECT HEAD START

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I ask all my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 92, commemorating the 50th anniversary of Project Head Start, launched in the White House Rose Garden on May 18, 1965, as bold and audacious in its scope design and as a project to launch against those who lived in poverty.

President Johnson said: ''We set out to make''—and to contain certain—''that poverty's children would not be forevermore poverty's captives.'' This means that nearly half of the preschool children of poverty will get a head start on their future. These children will receive preschool training and prepare them for regular school in September. They will get medical and dental attention that they badly need, and parents will receive counseling.

Again, we have set out to make certain that poverty's children would not be forevermore poverty's captives.

Today, 160,000 enrolled in Early Head Start, 910,000 enrolled in Head Start, 20,000 American Indian-Alaska Native children, 4,000 American Indians, 32,000 migrant or seasonal workers, and 40,000 homeless children.

We must continue this infrastructure, and I want to thank AVANCE and the Harris County School District in my district because they believe in helping children.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by thanking those who have fallen in battle for the United States of America as we memorialize them on Memorial Day.

CONGRATULATING MAJOR STEPHEN J. BONNER

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my constituent, Major Stephen J. Bonner of the U.S. Air Force, who has earned the Congressional Gold Medal for his distinguished service as an American fighter pilot with the Flying Tigers squadron in World War II.

Growing up in the 1930s and during World War I, Major Bonner had always dreamt of becoming an ace. When he graduated from flight school in 1943, his dream came true when he was assigned to fly with the 76th Fighter Squadron in China, battling Japanese fighter pilots in his P–40 Warhawk.

During his time with the Air Force, Major Bonner became a member of the American Fighter Aces, who have been renowned as our country's most distinguished fighter pilots. In both world wars, along with the Korean war and the Vietnam war, these individuals have not only courageously defended our Nation, but have also made outstanding achievements in aerial combat.

Major Bonner, now 96, lives with his daughter Jane just outside Carlinville in my district in central Illinois. I am proud to congratulate Major Bonner for his outstanding accomplishments as an American Fighter Ace.

The bravery and dedication he displayed as a pilot in World War II make him a very deserving recipient of the Congressional Gold Medal, and I am proud and thankful to have such brave veterans like them in my district.

Congratulations, Mr. Bonner.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, family income shouldn't dictate a child's educational outcome; but today, study after study shows that children from lower-income families face unique social, emotional, and financial challenges that lead them to start school already behind their peers.

We began addressing this problem in 1965 when President Lyndon Johnson established the Head Start program. Fifty years later, over 30 million of our most vulnerable children have benefited from Head Start and a more level playing field.

In Illinois today, there are 48 Head Start programs across the State. These programs not only provide opportunities for more than 40,000 Illinois children and their families each year, but they also give tens of thousands of passionate educators the chance to give our most needy children a shot at success.

This week, as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of Head Start, I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of this vital program. I look forward to ensuring that all children can have an equal opportunity to succeed.

I want to salute our troops, our veterans, and those who gave their lives as we move into Memorial Day.

□ 1015

PROBLEMS AT THE IRS CONTINUE

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, while it may feel like a case of deja vu, the sad fact of the matter is, we are once again talking about real problems at the IRS. This time, the Treasury inspector general reports that 1,600 IRS agents in a 10-year period did not pay their taxes.

While it is bad enough to think that those tasked with collecting our taxes can't manage to pay their own, what makes this case worse is that a majority of these employees were given reduced penalties instead of facing the full consequences of their actions. A number of these employees even received promotions and bonuses.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers deserve better than a government agency that can't seem to follow the rules, and hard-working Americans should be treated with more respect. It is time for more oversight and more transparency at this agency and holding employees accountable who break the rules.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Head Start, which President Johnson announced May 18, 1965. Head Start is our Nation's commitment that every child—regardless of their ZIP Code—has an opportunity to succeed.

Since its creation, Head Start has prepared more than 30 million children for success in the classroom and beyond. My former district director, a brilliant African American man, was a Head Start graduate. His story and millions of others demonstrate just how important early childhood education programs are.

Yet nearly 57,000 children across the country have lost access because of draconian sequester cuts, and the 2016 Republican budget makes it worse by removing another 35,000 children from the program, including 4,500 from my home State of California.

Our children deserve better. How in the world will they compete with children throughout the world if we deny them an early start?

Mr. Speaker, we know high-quality, early childhood education is one of the best investments we can make. So on the 50th anniversary of Head Start, I urge my colleagues to fully support this critical program and leave no child behind.

I, too, want to commemorate and remember my dad, a veteran who served in two wars. And also, I want to commemorate and thank our veterans, our young men and women on duty, and those who have paid a very serious price on behalf of this country.

SPURRING PRIVATE AEROSPACE COMPETITIVENESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2262.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 273 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2262.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1018

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes, with Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, when I was a child, I learned that there was more to our universe than just my home and my town. There were people in great cities. There were buildings that stretched to the clouds. There were machines that could explore the character of atoms and telescopes that saw into distant galaxies. There is so much in the world.

And in recent decades, we have grown accustomed to seeing it all. Entire continents and countries are a plane ride away. The Internet is a window to the world from the comfort of our homes. In this time of innovation, what was once unimaginable is now common, and what was once distant now feels so close.

But we all know there is still so much left to learn. In my heart, I believe man's journey of exploration and discovery has barely begun.

For generations, dating back to the dawn of humankind, every man, woman, and child has looked up to the stars in wonder. We imagined that the dots of light could reveal a glimpse of the future. And we thought that each night, we saw the whole heavens stretching above us.

But as technology has given us new eyes to see the universe, we discovered that even on the clearest of nights, we can only see a fraction of the stars in one small section of our galaxy.

I still look up at the stars with wonder. And I know that we are only at the start of our mission into this great frontier.

You see, I spent time in school, just like every kid in America, learning about our first voyages into space and the Moon landing. I remember how much pride I felt, knowing that America did it first and that our flag still flies up there today.

But that is not where we were meant to stop.

America has always led because it is in our nature to lead. We crossed over the mountains of Appalachia and into the Great Plains. We climbed the Rockies to the golden coast of California and beyond, creating a Nation in

this land that has far surpassed all others in truth, hope, and liberty.

We are a beacon of freedom and human dignity to every person that longs for the right to choose their own future, and we are a force for good unlike anything this world has ever known.

And yet in space, we are losing our ability to lead. We once stood up to the challenge of the Soviet's Sputnik and made it to the Moon. But today our astronauts use Russian rockets, and other nations are working to put people on Mars and beyond.

But we must go beyond. We must face the great unknown with that American spirit of adventure and hope.

To paraphrase President Kennedy, we must lead mankind into space—not because it is easy, but because it is hard and because that goal brings out the very best of our Nation.

There are people—scientists, engineers, astronauts, and entrepreneurs—out in the deserts of California who have a goal, the same goal so many Americans have had before them. It was our forefathers' goal at the founding of this Nation conceived in liberty. It was our goal when two young bicycle repairmen rose above the sand and waves of a North Carolina beach to fly. It was our goal when Chuck Yeager raced through the skies over California and broke the sound barrier.

That goal is to make our dreams a reality.

Today these 21st century explorers in California and across the Nation want to bring man above the clouds, above the Earth, and above the Moon, itself. And we should let them.

Government has great power; that is true. But in America, we believe that power is limited. It cannot, should not, and will not be used to diminish our dreams.

I stand here before you today, Mr. Chairman, presenting a bill. This bill asks us to make a decision: Do we concede our future to one of managed decline where others lead? Or do we make a future where America and her people guide us in our journey to the stars?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015. And I am actually quite saddened by that. It is not the outcome I had hoped for. Like the gentleman from California, I share in the enthusiasm and the wonder of space.

I would note that the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee has just cut $230 million from the President's request for these activities.

It was my sincere belief that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee could have reached bipartisan agreement on a commercial space bill. Indeed, during the past few weeks, there was a concerted attempt on both sides of the committee to reach common ground on tackling these issues and developing a bipartisan bill.

However, with the backdrop of meeting the majority's floor schedule as the top priority, there was insufficient time given to negotiate a compromise before last week's full committee markup.

Mr. Chairman, I think most of us on both sides of the aisle share in the excitement and enthusiasm about the commercial space industry, and we want it to succeed. Indeed, hundreds of millions of dollars have been paid by taxpayers into this industry to get it off the ground. American taxpayers have a lot of skin in the game when it comes to the success of commercial space.

Since the very beginning, the Federal Government has supported the private space industry, at both the State and Federal level, with funding, data, and guidance with best practices.

Since the Commercial Space Launch Act was passed in 1984, followed by the Commercial Space Launch Act Amendments of 1988 and 2004, it is clear that the commercial space industry has made significant strides.

Even in 2004, few would have predicted that NASA would be relying today on commercial space transportation to deliver critical supplies, spare parts, and research material to the International Space Station.

Who knows what developments will occur in the commercial space arena in the coming years. What we do know is that it won't just be commercial cargo transported into space; in fact, it will also be people. That is why it is up to Congress to develop responsible commercial space policies that both encourage the commercial space industry and protect those who participate as the users of the industry's services and activities.

Sadly, this bill just doesn't measure up to that responsibility. Instead, it takes a fundamentally unbalanced approach to the issues facing the commercial space launch industry.

Two key areas should concern all Members, Republicans and Democrats alike.

The first area pertains to safety. A moratorium on the FAA's authority to regulate the safety of crew and spaceflight participants was initially included in the Commercial Space Launch Act Amendments of 2004 in order to allow the commercial space industry the time to acquire experience and data that would inform the development of safety regulations.

However, initial expectations of industry progress simply were not realized. So in 2012, Congress extended the moratorium for 3 more years as part of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012. The end of that learning period is set to expire on September 30, 2015.

H.R. 2262, the bill in front of us, would extend the learning period to December 31, 2025, a decade-long moratorium on FAA's ability to even start proposing a safety framework.

This is very dangerous. This unprecedented regulation-free period for a decade for the commercial and human spaceflight industry puts no pressure on the industry to establish industry consensus standards, standards that could potentially be used as self-regulation measures for the industry.

In addition to providing the industry with 10 years of no safety regulations, H.R. 2262 negatively affects the rights of individuals on important safety matters by requiring spaceflight passengers to waive liability against launch providers and other parties.

What that means is that spaceflight participants have to waive their rights to sue the launch provider and related parties for claims, even if there is negligence involved.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 2262 puts policy in place that favors industry over policy that ensures balanced consideration for those people the industry will serve. That is a position that I and all of my Democratic colleagues on the committee oppose.

Another area of concern pertains to space resource utilization, such as asteroid mining.

Mr. Chair, there is merit to positioning ourselves to answer questions associated with space mining, the property rights that accrue from such activities, and the harmonization with our treaty obligations.

However, establishing prescriptive policies, as H.R. 2262 would do, is simply premature.

To preclude the proverbial placement of the cart before the horse, it would be prudent to establish an interagency review to help identify appropriate roles and responsibilities and a proposed organizational structure for the Federal Government's oversight and licensing of commercial space resource exploration and utilization.

And it would also be prudent, Mr. Chair, to hold hearings on these issues and on this legislation, as well as to have a subcommittee markup, what we sometimes refer to as regular order. H.R. 2262 skips these steps.

Proponents of the space resources utilization provisions in H.R. 2262 argue that the range of issues has been adequately vetted and reviewed by the executive branch.

□ 1030

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that while several individuals in the executive branch have offered technical drafting comments in response to queries about the bill, no Federal agency has taken a position on the bill.

Indeed, the administration says: "While the administration strongly supports the bill's efforts to facilitate innovative new space activities by U.S. companies, such as the commercial exploration and utilization of space resources to meet national needs, the administration is concerned about the ability of U.S. companies to move forward with these initiatives absent additional authority to ensure continuing supervision of these initiatives by the

U.S. Government as required by the Outer Space Treaty.''

In addition to these concerns, we have received a number of letters from legal scholars, consumer interest groups, and attorneys who have raised concerns or are opposed to H.R. 2262 as written. I am submitting for the RECORD letters from Professor Joanne Gabrynowicz, Director of the National Center for Remote Sensing, Air and Space Law; the American Association for Justice; the Center for Justice & Democracy; Consumer Watchdog; the National Consumers League; the Network for Environmental and Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ; Protect All Children's Environment; and Public Citizen.

520 DEER CREEK DRIVE,
Oxford, MS, May 12, 2015.

Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: At the request of Congressional Staff I am submitting this letter as a citizen expert for your consideration. I was requested to review H.R. 1508 and provide a comment. I am currently Professor Emerita at the University of Mississippi School of Law where I taught United States National Space Law, International Space Law, and Remote Sensing Law from 2001 to 2013. Prior to that I taught similar courses in the Space Studies Department at the University of North Dakota Odegard School of Aerospace Sciences from 1987 to 2001. I was the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Space Law from 2001–2013. My complete curriculum vitae is attached for your reference.

1. Outer Space Treaty Art. II prohibition of national appropriation by ''any other means''.

This comment addresses the most important issue raised by the Bill on its face. The Bill provides, ''[a]ny asteroid resources obtained in outer space are the property of the entity that obtained such resources, which shall be entitled to all property rights thereto, consistent with applicable provisions of Federal law.'' The Bill defines a ''space resource'' as a ''natural resource of any kind found in situ in outer space.'' It further defines an ''asteroid resource'' as ''found on or within an asteroid.'' The bill is addressing unextracted resources.

The United States is a State-Party to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. It prohibits ''national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.'' The Bill attempts to grant U.S. jurisdiction over ''any asteroid resource'' in situ in order to authorize and require the ''President . . . to facilitate the commercial exploration and utilization of space resources to meet national needs''. Making unextracted, in situ ''asteroid resources'' subject to U.S. Federal law and requiring the President ''to meet national needs'' is a form of national appropriation by ''other means''.

2. The Bill does not provide for any specific licensing regime.

Unlicensed U.S. commercial space activities are unprecedented in United States space law. All commercial space activities to date require appropriate licensing by an authorized agency. Specific statutes delegate licensing authority to specific agencies. For example, the Commercial Space Launch Act authorizes the FAA to license commercial launch activities. The 1992 Land Remote Sensing Policy Act authorizes the Department of Commerce to license commercial remote sensing systems. Licensing is how the U.S. meets its obligations to authorize and continually supervise the space activities of non-government entities under the Outer Space Treaty.

In particular, it is important to note that the license requirement imposed on the licensee that it maintain 'operational control,' as the term is defined in Section 960.3, is an implementation of U.S. obligations under the United Nations Outer Space Treaty of 1967. That treaty provides that the U.S. Government, as a State party, will be held strictly liable for any U.S. private or governmental entity's actions in outer-space. Consequently, NOAA requires that licensees under this part to maintain ultimate control of their systems, in order to minimize the risk of such liability and assure that the national security concerns, foreign policy and international obligations of the United States are protected.

The lack of a specific licensing regime also fails to meet the State Department's concern raised in a letter to Bigelow Aerospace from the FAA: the lack of a national regulatory framework with respect to private sector activities on celestial bodies.

3. The Bill only provides for a report.

The Bill requires the President to submit a report to recommend which Federal agencies will be necessary to meet U.S. international obligations. This may be sufficient. It is worth noting that reports are not the equivalent of licensing regulations that go through the Administrative Procedure Act process. However, this is a Federalism question, not a space law question so I will only point out the issue and note it is worth questioning and seeking the view of a relevant expert.

Sincerely,

JOANNE IRENE GABRYNOWICZ,
Prof. Emerita.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR JUSTICE,
May 20, 2015.

Re Support the Edwards Amendment to the SPACE Act of 2015 (H.R. 2262)

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: The American Association for Justice (AAJ) supports the Edwards substitute amendment which substitutes the text of S. 1297, a bipartisan Senate companion for the SPACE Act of 2015 the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or SPACE Act of 2015. The American Association for Justice (AAJ), formerly the Association of Trial Lawyers of America (ATLA) with members in United States, Canada and abroad, is the world's largest trial bar. It was established in 1946 to safeguard victims' rights, strengthen the civil justice system, promote injury prevention and foster public health and safety. AAJ is an advocate for a strong civil justice system in order to protect the health and wellbeing of all Americans.

Commercial space travel is an emerging industry that will allow for members of the general public to visit space for recreational or business purposes and AAJ recognizes the challenges of trying to give a new industry the flexibility to grow and innovate. However, Section 8 of the SPACE Act of 2015 requires passengers on commercial spacecraft to waive any right to damages for personal injury, property damage or death resulting from commercial space travel. While it may be acceptable for businesses with equal footing and negotiating power to execute cross waivers limiting their responsibility to each other, this waiver language should not extend to passengers. This provision is unfair and harmful to individuals. As a result, AAJ is supporting the Edwards substitute amendment, which does not contain the harmful cross waiver provision.

The SPACE Act of 2015 as introduced contains a provision which would provide the commercial space industry total immunity. This provision will be eliminated by the Manager's Amendment to the bill. We applaud Chairman Smith for protecting the American public. As the commercial space travel industry grows, safety should be put first and foremost. Industry interests should not be valued over that of the passengers.

Sincerely,

LINDA LIPSEN,
C.E.O.

MAY 20, 2015.

Re Opposition to H.R. 2262 the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or SPACE Act.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned organizations are writing to express opposition to HR. 2262, the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or SPACE Act. While some of our organizations may have concerns about various parts of this legislation, this letter addresses two sections in particular: Sections 7 and 8.

The sweeping immunity proposed by these provisions is alarming. The commercial space industry's safety record has been shoddy with normal rules in place. The last thing Congress should be doing is passing legislation that removes this industry's financial incentive to conduct safe commercial space operations. And it is particularly troubling that this legislation was passed out of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology without a single hearing held.

Section 7 of the bill states: ''Any action or tort arising from a licensed launch or reentry shall be the sole jurisdiction of the Federal courts and shall be decided under federal law.'' Given that no federal tort law exists in such cases, this provision will immunize the private space industry for any harm it causes. It wipes out any tort remedy for death, injuries or property damage suffered as a result of a negligent or reckless launch or reentry. And space passengers are not the only individuals covered by this language. Anyone, from innocent bystanders watching a rocket launch, to people who happen to be at the wrong place at the wrong time, suffering any harm, whether that be losing a house, limb, or life, will be left without recourse. Imagine the vast radioactive carnage that could result from an exploding nuclear rocket, which the industry is discussing for future rocket propulsion.

Section 8 of the SPACE Act requires both companies and passengers on commercial space flights to cross-waive liability claims. It is one thing for companies with equal bargaining power to establish liability agreements between them. However, it is unfair to force passengers into such agreements. This provision does not protect passengers—it strips away their rights.

Supporters of the bill say immunity is needed to spur innovation and save jobs. This is nonsense. If the civil justice system

were harming the industry in some way, this would already be evident. But according to the most recent Space Foundation report, ''The global space economy grew to $314.17 billion in commercial revenue and government budgets in 2013, reflecting growth of 4 percent from the 2012 total of $302.22 billion. Commercial activity—space products and services and commercial infrastructure—drove much of this increase. From 2008 through 2013, the total has grown by 27 percent.''

This industry should be subject to the same civil justice system that applies to every other dangerous industry in America. If a private space company is grossly negligent and harms people, it should be accountable for the harm it causes. For these reasons, we strongly oppose H.R. 2262 the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or SPACE Act.

Very sincerely,

Alliance for Justice; Center for Justice & Democracy; Consumer Watchdog; National Consumers League; Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ; Protect All Children's Environment; Public Citizen.

Ms. EDWARDS. In closing, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2262 is an unbalanced bill that simply doesn't adequately protect the public's interest, whether in matters pertaining to the safety of the general public or in matters pertaining to the safety of the future consumers and customers of the industry, and incorporates prescriptive provisions on space resource utilization that are indeed premature.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my fellow Members to oppose H.R. 2262, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill that comes before us today took some time in drafting. In over four hearings in a bipartisan manner, this committee reached out to the minority in October of last year and gave them a draft of the bill. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the minority party did not come back for 5 months. But we want to make clear that everybody understood the bill.

We also want to make clear that people didn't make misstatements because, in this bill, the section provides FAA's ability to regulate commercial human spaceflight in order to protect the uninvolved public, national security, public health and safety, safety of property, and foreign policy. It also preserves FAA's ability to regulate spaceflight participant and crew safety as a result of an accident or unplanned event.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH, the man who has led this committee in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding, and our thanks go to Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY for introducing such an important piece of legislation. In fact, we have made him an honorary member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. Chairman, space commercialization, this bill, is the future of space. This bill will encourage the private sector to build rockets, to take risks, and to shoot for the heavens. H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015, or SPACE Act, facilitates a progrowth environment for the developing commercial space sector. It creates more stable regulatory conditions and improves safety, which, in turn, attracts private investment.

Members of Congress should know that earlier this week the administration officially stated—and this is the most important thing in my view that the administration said, and it was, unfortunately, omitted from the statement awhile ago that the ranking member quoted. Here is what the administration said:

It does not oppose House passage of this bill.

The SPACE Act secures American leadership in space and fosters the development of advanced space technologies. The SPACE Act preserves the Federal Aviation Administration's ability to regulate commercial human spaceflight in order to protect national security and public health and safety. The act preserves FAA's ability to regulate spaceflight participation and crew safety in the event of an accident.

The bill calls for a progress report on the knowledge the industry and FAA have gained about the operation and licensing of commercial human spaceflight. This allows the commercial space industry to develop standards and coordinate with the FAA so the industry can grow in a stable regulatory environment without the threat of arbitrary regulations that would adversely impact their ability to innovate.

Mr. Chairman, international law places liability for damages that result from space accidents on the launching nation. All spacefaring nations require some form of third-party liability insurance for launching entities.

The current U.S. risk-sharing structure expires in 2016. This act extends indemnification to the year 2025 and requires an update on how the FAA calculates the maximum probable loss associated with launches. Indemnification has never been utilized and is subject to future appropriations. This provision will prevent U.S. space companies from going overseas where other nations have more favorable liability protection.

The SPACE Act also closes a statutory loophole that negates an experimental permit once a launch license is issued for the same vehicle design. This fosters greater innovation and allows an experimental permit holder to continue testing while a license holder conducts operations. Current law only allows for two categories of individuals carried within a spacecraft: crew and spaceflight participants. Now that NASA is allowing other astronauts access to the International Space Station, a new category is necessary to outline the roles, responsibilities, and protections for astronauts on a commercial human spaceflight launch.

This bill also closes a loophole that carved out an exception for spaceflight participants from indemnification coverage. By including these individuals in the indemnification provision, spaceflight participants who may participate in a launch as a result of a contest or for other reasons are not burdened with financial exposure above the limits. This bill also ensures that Federal courts review lawsuits that result from accidents since the Federal Government is ultimately the responsible party, not the States.

Current law requires that all parties involved in a launch waive claims against each other. This bill adds spaceflight participants to the cross-waiver requirement to ensure consistency and reinforce the informed consent requirements.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. All space community stakeholders have expressed support for this bill. They include Blue Origin, Virgin Galactic, Mojave Air and Space Port, SpaceX, the National Space Society, and the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, which represents more than 50 commercial space companies across the United States. The bill also includes many bipartisan provisions recently considered by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

The bill is the product of over 3 years of work, numerous committee hearings, and input from industry, education groups, and grassroots citizen advocacy groups. Virtually every stakeholder group, again, has supported this bill.

H.R. 2262 will keep America at the forefront of aerospace technology, promote American jobs, reduce red tape, promote safety, and inspire the next generation of explorers. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and once again thank the majority leader for introducing it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would note, before yielding to the ranking member, that it should be no surprise that the entire commercial space industry is supporting the majority bill because it is incredibly generous to the industry without due consideration to the safety of the public and to spaceflight passengers who also might travel on their vehicle. So it is not a surprise.

I think all of us here want to see the support of the commercial space industry. We want a regulatory environment that respects their innovation but also protects United States taxpayers' interest. As I have said, taxpayers have, to the tune of hundreds of millions of

dollars, our skin in the game. It is up to us to act responsibly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015.

This bill amends the Commercial Space Launch Act, which is one of the seminal achievements on this committee. That act opened the doors to establishment on the commercial space industry, which is poised to become a major part of the 21st century economy.

I agree that both our committee and the Congress as a whole need to address the Commercial Space Launch Act. We haven't comprehensively addressed these issues since 2004. I also want to be clear that I am a strong supporter of the commercial space industry. I think Members on both sides of the aisle want this industry to succeed because this industry's success is good for our Nation. However, the issues being dealt with in this bill are not straightforward. They are complex and require thoughtful consideration.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology hasn't given these issues thoughtful consideration. We have not held any hearings so far this Congress to examine the issues being debated today. We also haven't had a subcommittee markup to try to work through some of the underlying issues in the legislation. That is really very unfortunate, because we could be considering a bipartisan piece of legislation today if the majority had simply laid the proper groundwork for moving complex legislation. Instead, we have rushed this bill to the floor to meet some arbitrary timetable established by somebody, perhaps the Republican leadership.

So what does this bill do? In every possible measure, H.R. 2262 gives maximum preference to the priorities of the commercial space launch industry—at the expense of the safety of the general public and the safety of the future customers of this very industry, and it does so at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to provide the commercial space launch industry with another decade—decade—of regulation-free operations with respect to protecting the safety of spaceflight passengers. There won't be any passengers when they find out that they have no protection.

Some will state that the industry does not yet have enough experience to establish these regulations. That is rubbish. Both the United States and Russia have been launching humans into space for more than five decades. There has been literally hundreds of space launches on numerous different types of spacecraft during this time. The FAA has had more than enough data to rely on to set commonsense regulations on spaceflight passenger safety.

In addition, this bill also provides a lengthy 9-year extension of commercial space launch indemnification provisions. Congress has extended these provisions many times since they were originally crafted in 1988. Since 1988, the liability exposure of the U.S. Government under this regime has grown each and every year. What began as an approximately $1 billion backstop for the industry has now grown to more than $2.5 billion, and this will continue to grow for 9 more years under this bill. I think this is something that deserves a little more attention. Generally, as an industry matures, you would think their reliance on the U.S. Government for subsidies would decrease rather than increase.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill takes steps into the uncharted waters involving space property rights. I am not against asteroid mining or space resource utilization. Those activities will come in time. However, I am for getting any legislation that addresses these areas right.

We are not at all close to resolving the many unanswered questions and issues concerning space resource utilization and property rights. At the single hearing the majority held on this topic last Congress, several of the invited witnesses expressed their views that there were many unsettled issues with the majority's draft legislation. Moving this legislation without really ever addressing these issues is, I believe, negligent on the part of the Congress.

Some on the other side of the aisle may point to the fact that the administration's Statement of Administration Policy did not include a veto threat against this bill. But I would note that the administration's statement also had serious concerns about sections of the bill and notably did not endorse the bill.

With respect to the asteroid mining provisions, the statement noted: ''the administration is concerned about the ability of U.S. companies to move forward with these initiatives absent additional authority to ensure continuing supervision of these initiatives by the U.S. Government as required by the Outer Space Treaty.''

Mr. Chairman, Ms. EDWARDS will be offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute that I will speak on one more time later. It may not have everything that industry desires, it may not reflect all of our priorities for commercial space launch policy, but it is a clear route to getting a balanced, bipartisan, bicameral commercial space launch bill enacted into law, because ultimately that is what we are trying to do is get a bicameral agreement.

□ 1045

We can argue over differences, or we can just join together to pass bipartisan, bicameral commercial space legislation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2262 in its present form and instead take a bipartisan approach to enacting commercial space launch legislation.

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

Before I yield, I do want it noted, 1969, what all America felt when they watched America make a step on the Moon, on an American rocket and American ingenuity. Unfortunately, today, we pay Russia for an astronaut from America to ride on their rockets. Some may be content with that, but, Mr. Chairman, I am not. That is why this bill today allows us to have some change and growth to make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to thank the sponsor of this bill, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, for his great work. This is very important.

I also want to thank our great chairman, LAMAR SMITH, who has had an unprecedented week in the House of Representatives of passing bills of innovation, advancing science. Congratulations to him as well.

The space industry represents hundreds of billions of dollars in economic investment and thousands of jobs across the United States, but it is not just large companies.

Cain Tubular—a small, multigenerational, family-owned business in my district—is doing the innovative work necessary for safe, weld-free condensing coils for the next generation of rocket engines.

Scot Forge is another business in my district, working under an amazing employee ownership model, that is forging the heavy metal parts and casings for multiple launch systems throughout the supply chain.

The space industry is an engine of economic growth throughout the country, and our opportunity to do this right is vitally necessary to maintain American competitiveness as other nations begin to catch up.

That is why I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015. The SPACE Act facilitates a progrowth environment for the commercial space sector. It fosters a safety framework that will protect the American public, while encouraging the development of new space technologies. This will ensure America's exceptional role is maintained as the most innovative Nation in the world.

This legislation also extends the current risk-sharing structure set to expire next year and requires an update on how the FAA calculates maximum probable loss associated with potential spaceflight accidents. This ensures that U.S. space companies won't be forced to go overseas to compete.

The SPACE Act also establishes a legal framework for government property rights of resources obtained from

asteroids, giving U.S. companies the legal assurance they need to invest in and develop in situ space resource exploration and utilization technologies. The successful exploration and use of in situ asteroid resources is an important step in humanity's development and is in the national interest of the United States.

The SPACE Act helps develop the commercial space industry, ensures commercial space lawsuits are treated fairly, and allows the commercial space industry to grow like never before.

For these reasons, I strongly recommend my colleagues support commercial space with a vote for the SPACE Act of 2015.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maryland has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 17 minutes remaining.

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

I just want to, for the RECORD, because I think it is important for the American people that we don't mix apples and oranges, the Bush administration actually canceled the program that would have enabled us to make sure that we have American rocket vehicles going to the space station.

In the interim period, those requests have been severely underfunded, so I think it is important for us to put into perspective what is happening in the space industry.

Now, I—as somebody who long ago worked in the industry, worked at NASA—understand the importance of investing in science and research and funding the activities of NASA and supporting the industry. I also understand that we have put—this Congress, in fact—has placed burdens both on the industry and on the agency to perform without putting the money to do that.

I would note that this SPACE Act doesn't have any money that goes with it. In fact, on the appropriations side, as I stated earlier, $230 million has actually been cut from the President's request.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), my colleague and the ranking member.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to respond to the statement that we have to rely on Russia.

We are relying on Russia because we won't pay for it in this country, but we are willing to allow a private commercial spaceship to fly at the expense of the government and at the risk of every person who would hire a trip. We are paying them to take supplies to a space station because we refuse to fund space station flight for human flight from this country.

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

Today, we pay Russia $70 million for one astronaut to go to the International Space Station. As commercial space begins to grow, we watched others get into the market—SpaceX—so they could do it for much less. That is what this bill talks about, allowing the commercial space others to join in.

I don't think all the answers come from Washington. I think government should be limited, but we should not limit our ability to grow. Why should we complain if we can use private sector money to even increase our capabilities to go higher into space?

Mr. Chairman, the next person I am going to yield to knows a great deal about this. He represents aerospace corridor. He comes from a family that is renowned in the development of space in America.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), the son of Mr. Pete Knight, who still holds the record for the fastest man on Earth in an X–15.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the majority leader for bringing this forward. This is a vital piece of legislation.

The majority leader brings up a subject that is always very important to me. It happened on December 17, 1903. It happened in a little bicycle shop in Dayton, Ohio. Two innovators took their invention across part of the country out to a little place in North Carolina in Kitty Hawk, and they flew a man-powered controllable aircraft for the first time.

Now, why is that important? It is because the government had thrown a $50,000 grant to get this done, and they couldn't get it done, but two innovators could get it done by nothing other than the brains that they had, the energy, and their two hands.

America needs to ensure that it will continue to be the leader in the space industry. Business and innovation want stability, and this bill does just that, by extending the FAA learning period and duration of indemnification to 10 years.

When I speak to fifth graders—and I think we all do at least a couple times a year; I try to speak to at least 50 schools a year—but when I talk to the fifth graders, I ask them how long it takes to fly from LA to Tokyo. There is always a 2-hour or a 20-hour or anything like that.

I tell them it takes about 10½ hours. I said: But in your lifetime, it is going to take about an hour and a half.

They said: Well, that is great. That is great. I would love to be in an airplane for just an hour and a half or a spacecraft when, today, we have to do 10½ hours.

Well, do you know what, that will happen if we let it happen. Right now, it is happening. Innovation is flourishing. These things are happening. We are doing jousting programs that is dispersing the supersonic wave which means, at some point, we will be able to fly over the continent at more than Mach 1.

That means we will be able to fly home to California in an hour and a half. Now, I know all of us Californians would love to do that instead of the 5½ hours it takes today, just like it took in 1970.

This bill allows the FAA to gather sufficient data to ensure the regulations will help foster growth in the industry. I support this bill.

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

We have been listening to this discussion, and I think, when the other side reclaims their time, it would be really helpful to explain why it is that, if this is so important and that it is so urgent, why it is that the majority has cut $230 million from commercial crew. I will wait to hear the answer, as I am sure the American people are waiting.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

I thank the managers of this bill, including the majority leader.

I just want to say that I come from Space City. Houston, Texas, has as its motto—its defining moment besides railroads—is Space City. I served 12 years on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and I had a strong commitment and continue to have a strong commitment to human space exploration—in particular, the research that is garnered out of that mighty effort.

I have traveled to most of the NASA centers across the Nation, and I have seen outstanding researchers. There is no reason for any of us, Democrats or Republicans, to oppose the idea of space exploration and, in this instance, commercial space exploration.

What I will say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to my good friend, the majority leader, let us walk step-by-step together.

Certainly, I am concerned as someone who offered and wrote legislation to promote more safety on the International Space Station—proudly so—legislation that was ultimately passed and I believe has made the space station more enduring, to be able to suggest that this bill limits to a certain extent the safety requirements that I believe would make this industry a better industry, to say also that we are highlighting or offering the commercial space industry over the investment in NASA, which I have great concern, as we look forward to the implementation of the Orion and the opportunities for further space exploration.

I would want to make sure that this legislation does not undermine our work with NASA and, frankly, that the safety elements that are so important, not only to the civilian population—because I have commercial space entities in Texas just a few hundred miles away from Houston, Texas, but I also have the NASA Johnson Space Center—and I would want to know whether or not there is a conflict between the safety

requirements that we have to implement and the safety requirements and security requirements in commercial space exploration.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. EDWARDS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The other thing that I would offer to suggest, as this bill moves to the Senate, is the investments that are made, the profits that may ultimately be made by commercial space exploration, it would be appropriate to use those moneys to invest in R&D and the Federal Government for it to continue its very important, unrestrained research that has been so mighty to helping so many different people under NASA.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, but I would ask the question: Can we not provide a safety matrix for commercial space exploration as we have done in the public sector?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago, we passed a NASA authorization bill that returns NASA to its core mission, human space flight.

The bill before us, H.R. 2262, builds on that good work. We have many American businesses employing thousands of American workers right now. These businesses are pursuing their own space missions, both orbital and suborbital.

Some of these entrepreneurs have plans to reach below low Earth orbit, such as taking the first steps toward missions to mine asteroids for precious metals. This landmark legislation will do more to secure America as the home of commercial space exploration than any other legislation that Congress has considered. These endeavors are a great complement to Federal investments in civil and military space initiatives.

Let's face it, in any field, no American entrepreneur is going to invest billions of dollars of their own money where there is regulatory uncertainty. The SPACE Act of 2015 creates a regulatory framework and provides certainty for these privately financed endeavors to take the next steps.

□ 1100

This legislation will bolster thousands of high-tech American jobs, building a stronger economy, advancing technological leadership, and strengthening our Nation's industrial base.

I want to recognize the hard work of our colleagues—Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, BILL POSEY, DANA ROHRABACHER, and JIM BRIDENSTINE. These folks have worked hard for several years on key commercial space provisions that have been incorporated into this bill. Their efforts will create an environment for these private sector companies to flourish.

I would also like to thank our chairman, LAMAR SMITH, and Space Subcommittee chair STEVEN PALAZZO for their leadership in moving this legislation through the committee and in bringing it to the House floor.

America has always prospered because we have not stood in the way of visionaries. Rather, we have found a way to enable them to take a chance and succeed on their own.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. BABIN. A vote for this bill is a vote to ignite the flame of commercial space and propel the American entrepreneurial spirit beyond our world and into the final frontier of space. Passing this bill tells the world that America is the home for commercial space.

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

I just want to be really, really clear with the American people because I think sometimes we talk about the commercial space industry as though it exists on its own. In fact, it exists because the Federal Government and Federal taxpayers have been incredibly generous for this innovative, creative, and growing industry. It is because, as taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, we support the industry.

$3 billion alone in inflation-adjusted dollars goes as a backstop for indemnification, which is in case there is an accident or whatever—a $3 billion backstop by the Federal taxpayer. Billions of dollars have gone into the development as the industry has grown. Indeed, some projections say that 9 of every 10 dollars that have gone into the development have actually come from the American taxpayer. Hundreds of millions of dollars support the infrastructure, the launch facilities that are maintained for the industry and—who knows?—countless dollars from State tax credits on down the line.

It would be really inaccurate to say that any of us—Republicans or Democrats or any American taxpayer—does not support the commercial space industry. We want it to be safe. We want to make sure that liability is taken care of. We want to make sure that, in fact, the skin in the game of the taxpayers is met with responsible public policy. To correct the record, it is $243 million that the Republican majority has actually cut from Commercial Crew.

Again, I would say, if you support the industry, then please explain why it is that you have also supported a cut to the very thing that would continue to grow the industry.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. STEWART). The gentleman from California has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Maryland has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, let me note that the commercial space industry has not cost us taxpayers' money. The commercial space industry has generated billions and billions of dollars worth of income to honest citizens who then pay their taxes—who wouldn't have jobs otherwise—not to mention, of course, the billions of dollars the commercial space industry has saved us simply by doing a more efficient job at launching satellites and at supplying the space station than could be done by the public sector—by NASA and other government employees.

H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015, builds on the House Science, Space, and Technology's bipartisan tradition of promoting economic growth in America. Today, we are talking about that economic growth in terms of an emerging, new, entrepreneurial industry that is tremendously beneficial to the bottom line of America—the billions of dollars that it is creating with a new, innovative approach to an industry that goes into space in order to accomplish its missions. The SPACE Act of 2015 specifically continues the streamlined regulatory regime that Congress put in place for commercial human spaceflight just a decade ago in the Commercial Space Launch Amendments Act of 2004.

I am proud to have been the one to have authored that legislation, legislation which passed in Congress with bipartisan support. I would hope that bipartisan support continues because, in 2004, it was Bart Gordon of Tennessee and Nick Lampson of Texas—both Democrats—who made it possible for us to get this legislation passed as well as Silvestre Reyes from Texas. Of course, there are a lot of Texans here today involved in this debate because there are a lot of people in Texas who are hired and who have great jobs because of what we did then.

When we talk about and when we hear that we have cut $243 million, no, no. We were willing to keep that in the budget. Republicans would have been willing if we had found other areas that had been less important. But the reason these things happen is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle cannot seem to prioritize. We prioritize this.

Mr. Chairman, we prioritize launching new industries, creating new jobs, saving billions of dollars in money that would be spent otherwise, because the commercial space industry, like SpaceX and other champions of space entrepreneurship, has done a great deal of benefit to the United States of America.

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

I just want to be very, very clear. I was not originally much of a supporter

before I knew anything about the industry. I didn't know about the industry. Indeed, it was through the bipartisan work on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee that I got to know the industry and to value the role that the commercial space industry plays.

I, actually, don't have a quibble with the American taxpayers in their providing the kind of support in the development work and in resources that are available through NASA to support the industry. I, actually, think it is a good thing for us to do. But I don't want to hide the fact that, given that and that kind of responsibility, it is also our responsibility to provide an important safety framework for the industry to proceed, especially as we go into the future, imagining that we will have many other players.

I would also say that I am concerned about what we do around liability—how we create both a safety regulatory regime but also place liability where it belongs. Although, in the manager's amendment, the majority does try to deal with the question of Federal court jurisdiction, what we don't deal with is this idea of cross-waivers. That is, if you are a passenger—you could be a researcher, not anyone who is particularly wealthy—and if something happens, then you have waived all of your liability even in a case where there would be negligence involved. This, I think, ought to raise great concerns.

The reality is that, at the end of the day, if there is any kind of catastrophic accident, the American taxpayers will, of course, bear the responsibility as we always have for those accidents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My friend on the other side makes a good point in that a lot of people may not know about spaceflight or commercial spaceflight, and they may not know about this bill. That is why this is a great opportunity to explain, and that is why the majority on this side gave the bill to the minority last October. Unfortunately, it was 5 months before anything came back.

There is one point that was brought up—indemnification. That has been extended 9 times in the last 25 years, and it has never been used. The one thing that needs to be noted is that we are in competition with the rest of the world. We are more stringent in this than is any other country with their space. If we plan on being the leader, we need to have the legislation move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this morning, during debate, there have been a number of letters—a litany of letters—by various organizations offered for the RECORD, so I thought it would be appropriate, in the interest of intellectual honesty, actually, to enter a couple of records myself.

Let me read from one of them here:

On May 13, 2015, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology conducted a markup of four critical space-related bills. Among the bills considered was H.R. 1508, the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015. During the markup—I will leave the Member's name out—submitted a letter for the record from Joanne Gabrynowicz, a former professor of space law at the University of Mississippi. After reviewing the letter, we, the undersigned, feel it is important to clarify some errors in Ms. Gabrynowicz' interpretation of H.R. 1508 and to highlight some constructive elements of the bill. There is a duplicate bill in the Senate cosponsored by Senators PATTY MURRAY and MARCO RUBIO. Our comments apply to both.

The basic claims made in the letter rest on two issues: an allegation that the bill violates article II of the Outer Space Treaty and an allegation that the U.S. Government has no licensing regime in place for commercial space activities envisioned by the bill.

Both statements are based on a misreading of the intent and words of the bill.

They go on with another four or five pages to clarify what was completely misleading there. This letter is signed by Henry R. Hertzfeld, Co-Chair of the American Branch, International Law Association, Research Professor of Space Policy and International Affairs, Elliott School of International Affairs and Adjunct Professor of Law, The George Washington University; by Matthew Schaefer, Law Alumni Professor of Law, Director—Space, Cyber and Telecommunications Law Program, University of Nebraska College of Law, Co-Chair, American Branch of International Law Association—Space Law Committee; by James C. Bennett, Consultant, Fort Collins, Colorado, Space Fellow, Economic Policy Centre, London; and by Mark J. Sundahl, Professor and Associate Dean for Administration, Cleveland State University, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law.

MAY 15, 2015.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, CHAIRMAN SMITH, RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN PALAZZO, AND RANKING MEMBER EDWARDS: On May 13, 2015, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology conducted a markup of four critical space-related bills. Among the bills considered was H.R. 1508, the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015. During the markup Ranking Member Johnson submitted a letter for the record from Joanne Gabrynowicz, a former professor of space law at the University of Mississippi. After reviewing the letter we, the undersigned, feel it is important to clarify some errors in Ms. Gabrynowicz's interpretation of H.R. 1508 and highlight some constructive elements of H.R. 1508. There is a duplicate bill in the Senate, S. 976, co-sponsored by Senators Patty Murray and Marco Rubio. Our comments, below, apply to both H.R. 1508 and S. 976.

The basic claims made in the letter commenting on H.R. 1508 and, by extension, S. 976 rest on two issues:

1. An allegation that the bill violates Article II of the Outer Space Treaty (OST), and

2. An allegation that the U.S. Government has no licensing regime in place for commercial space activities envisioned by the bill.

Both statements are based on a misreading of the intent and words of the bill.

1. With regard to the allegation that the bill violate the OST by enabling national appropriation:

The bill does not grant U.S. jurisdiction to an asteroid or any asteroid resource. It does grant U.S. jurisdiction to companies that fall under U.S. jurisdiction as specifically defined in §51301 with the intent of adjudicating claims of ''harmful interference'' between those companies if such allegations are made in the future. Protecting entities from ''harmful interference'' is consistent with, and indeed furthers, the purposes of the OST, that requires ''due regard'' be given to other's space activities and requires advance consultations if a proposed activity ''would cause potentially harmful interference.''

The letter states that the bill is addressing ''unextracted resources.'' In fact, there are several steps: identifying the resources, extracting resources, and then using/delivering them. The words of the bill are ''resources obtained'', leaving the unknown technical details to be specified in the future when they can be better defined and a process can be developed for regulatory actions as needed. In any event, ''obtained'' is inconsistent with ''unextracted.''

The use of the word ''in situ'' in defining space resources simply means resources in place in outer space; but any such resource within or on an asteroid would need to be ''obtained'' in order to confer a property right. The use of the word ''in situ'' in merely defining a space resource in the bill is not equivalent to claiming sovereignty or control over celestial bodies or portions of space. Further, there is clear Congressional direction in the bill that the President is only to encourage space resources exploration and utilization, including lowering barriers to such activity, ''consistent with'' and ''in accordance with'' US international obligations—which precludes Ms. Grabynowicz' interpretation of the impact of the term ''in situ.''

The bill does not, in any manner, claim sovereignty over a celestial body or portions of outer space; it only provides for rights for private entities to use the resources on a celestial body (specifically asteroids) just as States have in the past. Article I of the Outer Space Treaty states that ''the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall be free for exploration and use by all States''. This Article has been interpreted as allowing for the extraction of natural resources.

Examples: return of Moon rocks and soil by U.S. and Russia (Soviet Union); return of asteroid materials by Japan. Each government has declared that these are their property and has enforced that action:

United States Government has treated the theft of moon rocks as a criminal offense

Russia has in the past put moon rocks up for a public auction

Japan has put its asteroid materials in a Japanese museum A customary international law of the right to claim ownership over extracted natural resources has emerged due to the collections of moon rocks by the United States and the subsequent gifting of these rocks to foreign nationals without any objections from any states.

In the ''One Lucite Ball'' case, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Miami Division, upheld the right of Honduras to assert ownership over a moon rock (unpublished Case No. 01–0116–CIV–JORDAN). The court discussed two sales of lunar rock samples involving private parties (one involving a slide of lunar dust sold at Sotheby's auction and the second involving the lunar sample and plaque given by the U.S. to Nicaragua that was purchased by a private buyer from the middle east).

The NASA proposed Asteroid Recovery Mission involves similar technologies and the current proposal is to move a boulder from an asteroid to a lunar orbit. Some of these activities may be done in partnership with private entities in the United States.

These activities, ranging from scientific missions to commercial sales have never been judged to be in violation of Article II of the OST.

If governments and private companies are ever going to ''use'' space for benefits to all humankind, the extraction of resources from celestial bodies will have to be allowed, and this foreseeable future is provided for in the space treaties. There is no prohibition on private entities or profit-making entities performing these services either for themselves or for their governments.

However, government(s) are responsible for the continuing supervision of non-government activities in outer space (Art. VI of the OST), and the United States Government has the most complete and comprehensive set of regulations for space in the world.

There already exist regulatory requirements for commercial companies that want to get to space and to use space. The particular U.S. regulatory mechanisms vary with each application but include launch payload reviews, spectrum/communications approvals, and, when appropriate, national security and export control approvals.

Since there are a variety of related new proposed activities in outer space (e.g. on-orbit satellite servicing) proposing a specific licensing requirement for resource utilization alone in this bill would be inappropriate until all new activities are reviewed together.

The required report in the bill is the first step in developing new procedures and processes for activities in outer space that have not been done before by private entities.

The criticism that this bill is to meet ''national needs'' alone is incorrect. Those words are taken out of the context of §51302. That section focuses on what the Federal agencies should do to encourage private activities in space and refers to the economic incentives for those companies. The global needs and information obtained from the science and technology behind resource extraction and use may indeed benefit all humankind through knowledge, through the future global provision of currently scarce minerals, and through expanded space exploration. Further, private foreign companies subject to the jurisdiction of the United States—and thus facing exposure to non-interference claims—also can be beneficiaries of non-interference rights under the bill.

Last month the U.S. State Department made a statement at the United Nations Committee On the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) that clearly outlines a responsible path to balancing the requirements of our Treaty obligations with the needs of new commercial entities in space:

''My Government sees great promise in private investment in path-breaking new activities to advance our understanding of the solar system and to unlock new space applications that benefit all mankind. The history of space exploration—and innovation—teaches us that it is difficult, if not impossible, to foresee the technological innovations, and downstream applications, arising from efforts to push the envelope of exploration—and that the benefits of these innovations and applications are enjoyed across the Earth. As the United States goes about encouraging private investment—from all nations—in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, *and evolves its national mechanisms for authorizing and supervising non-governmental space activities*, we will continue to be guided by the four core, and widely accepted, treaties on space—the Outer Space Treaty, the Rescue and Return Agreement, and the Liability and Registration Conventions. Under the legal framework of these treaties, the use of space by nations, international organizations, and private entities has flourished. As a result, space technology and services contribute immeasurably to economic growth and improvements in the quality of life around the world.'' [*Emphasis added*]

The Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act is in complete compliance with all existing international obligations of the United States. The bill further insists that actions taken pursuant to the bill, both by the Executive Branch and U.S. commercial space resource utilization entities (to benefit from non-interference rights), be consistent with international obligations of the United States. The bill also compliments and furthers the position of the Executive Branch. As Ms. Gabrynowicz notes in her letter regarding the Presidential report requirement, ''This may be sufficient.'' Indeed, it is not only sufficient but the most pragmatic path forward for the U.S. Government to create a process, informed by industry and international concerns, that creates the legal framework necessary to meet our existing international obligations. Creating such a legal framework right now would be short-sighted and likely hamper or destroy our growing space resource industry. Placing a legal framework in this bill is not needed to meet any current United States international obligations. There are adequate interim means of meeting those obligations through existing authorities should new activities in outer space begin before constructing a new legal framework.

The U.S., between 1980 and the effective date of the Commercial Space Launch Act, October 1984, set precedents for OST-compliant control in the absence of explicit legislation or activity-specific regulation. Two suborbital launch vehicles were privately developed and tested in the U.S. during that time period, Space Services Inc.'s Percheron (1980) and Arc Technologies' (later Starstruck, Inc.'s) Dolphin (1983–84). The U.S. Government licensed both activities. In each case, the Government used existing regulatory requirements and mechanisms (FAA airspace control, FCC radio licenses, OMC export permits) to review the proposed activities and impose conditions such as liability insurance on the launch operators. Lessons learned from these licensing exercises were incorporated in the drafting of the Commercial Space Launch Act.

Therefore, there is U.S. precedent for control of space activities, adequate to satisfy OST requirements for supervision and control, even in the absence of specific statutory law or regulation describing the particulars of the activity in question. Using these interim mechanisms can serve to provide an experience base for crafting better legislation subsequently.

In summary, the bill is a necessary step to begin to address our obligations of continuing supervision for commercial space activities and to fulfill our commitments under the terms of the OST.

It is also important to note the many constructive things that H.R. 1508 and S. 976 accomplish:

1. Advance U.S. Technology and Leadership

a. H.R. 1508 and S. 976 provide a legal foundation that provides private U.S. companies to ability to raise funds, protect their investments, employ aerospace professionals, and develop cutting edge aerospace technologies.

b. Other nations, such as China and Russia, have stated an intent to recover resources from objects in space. H.R. 1508 and S. 976 give U.S. industry a legal foundation that provides a head start to compete with these nations.

2. Create Constructive Dialogue for International Frameworks for Commercial Space Resource Exploration and Utilization

a. As stated by the U.S. delegate to COPUOS, the U.S. will need to develop a framework that meets existing international obligations and creates an environment in which all nations can benefit from space resource exploration and utilization. H.R. 1508 and S. 976 allow the U.S. to lead and direct this international discussion.

A failure to pass H.R. 1508 and S. 976 will create uncertainty about the U.S. Government's position on space resource exploration and utilization. This uncertainty would be extremely detrimental to our developing space resource industry and it would provide encouragement for other nations to challenge our leadership in this area.

It is apparent that considerable effort has gone into drafting H.R. 1508 and S. 976. These bills create a valid legal foundation to begin the processes necessary to create informed oversight mechanisms, which are required by the treaties, and are in compliance with all existing U.S. international obligations.

Sincerely,

HENRY R. HERTZFELD,
Co-Chair of the American Branch, International Law Association, Research Professor of Space Policy and International Affairs, Elliott School of International Affairs and Adjunct Professor of Law, The George Washington University.

MATTHEW SCHAEFER,
Law Alumni Professor of Law, Director—Space, Cyber and Telecommunications Law Program, University of Nebraska College of Law, Co-Chair, American Branch of International Law Assoc.—Space Law Committee.

JAMES C. BENNETT, CONSULTANT,
Fort Collins, Colorado, Space Fellow, Economic Policy Centre, London.

MARK J. SUNDAHL,
Professor and Associate Dean for Administration, Cleveland State University, Cleveland—Marshall College of Law.

Mr. POSEY. There is a similar letter, and I will submit that also. It is by Dennis J. Burnett, District of Columbia Bar Association; J.D., University of Nebraska; LL.M., Georgetown University; Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Nebraska College of Law—U.S. Trade Law and Commercial Space Law; Vice Chairman, Advisory Board, Space, Cyber and Telecom Program, University of Nebraska College of Law; Secretary and Director, International Institute of Space Law.

MAY 16, 2015.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, CHAIRMAN SMITH, RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN PALAZZO, AND RANKING MEMBER EDWARDS: On May 13, 2015, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology conducted a mark-up of four critical space-related bills. Among the bills considered was H.R. 1508, the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015.

During the markup Ranking Member Eddie Bernice Johnson submitted a letter for the record from Joanne Gabrynowicz, Professor Emerita of space law at the University of Mississippi. After reviewing H.R. 1508 and Professor Gabrynowicz's letter, I would like to comment on several issues of international law related to the proposed legislation.

In particular, I will comment on the following issues: (1) whether recognition of property rights in asteroid resources would result in a ''national appropriation'' in violation of Article II of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies (the ''Outer Space Treaty''); and (2) whether the absence of the creation of a licensing regime by H.R. 1508 would result in a failure to authorize and supervise the activities of nationals of the United States in the exploration and use of outer space as is required by Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty.

Is the use of asteroid resources and acquisition of property rights in asteroid resources is not a violation of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty?

It should be clearly stated that there is no provision of the Outer Space Treaty that explicitly prohibits the acquisition of property rights in asteroid resources. To the contrary, the Outer Space Treaty explicitly recognize the right of ''exploration and use'' of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. A right of use is a well-recognized property right in both common law and civil law.

While it may be asserted that granting property rights in asteroid resources is a national appropriation, this assertion is inconsistent with state practice. For example, Moon rocks and soil returned to the Earth by U.S. and Russia (Soviet Union), and asteroid materials return to Earth by Japan have been treated as property of those governments. The United States has prosecuted theft of moon rocks and Russia has auctioned moon rocks. These actions have never been judged to be in violation of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty.

Does the absence of a licensing regime in H.R. 1508 result in a failure to authorize and supervise the activities of nationals of the United States in violation of Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty?

It is quite clear that Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty requires the United States to authorize and supervise the activities of its nationals in outer space. It also is clear that H.R. 1508 does not authorize any executive agency or any independent commission to regulate (i.e., authorize and supervise) the activities of U.S. nationals in outer space that are not already regulated.

It is my understanding that there are a variety of new proposed activities in outer space (e.g on-orbit satellite servicing, space tourism, moon habitation, solar satellites, etc.). It may be argued that these activities need appropriate authorization and supervision by the United States if conducted by nationals of the United States. At this time it appears that there is no agreement on basic issues of what authority is required, which agency, if any, should authorize and supervise, which agency should have which responsibility and what resources would be required to implement those responsibilities.

In lieu of imposing a solution when the problem is not fully understood, it is my understanding that the drafters of H.R. 1508 propose that the President prepare a report to Congress as the first step in developing new procedures and processes for activities in outer space for which there may be no existing agency authority to authorize and supervise. It appears that the drafters are attempting to create a valid legal foundation to begin the processes necessary to create appropriate mechanisms for any authorization and supervision that may be required by the Outer Space Treaty and other existing U.S. international obligations.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. BURNETT.

Mr. POSEY. I think that, clearly, they reflect that there has been some misleading information put forth in objecting to this bill, and I urge my colleagues to take that into consideration and to vote favorably for this badly needed historic and constructive legislation to make America's space program and commercial space industry much better.

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

Just for the record, I would note that the letters that have been submitted by the majority are interesting. I would note that one of the authors, in fact, is paid by one of the companies that is involved in this legislation, so we should take that into consideration.

I also want to point out that, with respect to indemnification, again, the United States in current—today's—dollars bears a responsibility for about $3 billion in indemnification should there be an accident.

Lastly, of course, it is really important for us to understand that these liability concerns are not small potatoes. In fact, the Judiciary Committee should have taken a look at this when it came to looking at Federal court jurisdiction. We should have had additional hearings on this when it comes to looking at the impact on international treaties. We have not had any hearings in that regard. I just think we ought to proceed more responsibly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1115

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015, or the SPACE Act.

Since 2004, when Congress last amended the Commercial Space Launch Act, commercial space companies have made significant contributions to space technology development and helped to strengthen American leadership in space. Congress must keep up with the changes in the industry, and the CSLA needs to be updated to ensure that the space sector can flourish in the years to come.

Currently, all major spacefaring nations require some form of third-party liability insurance for launching entities. The indemnification regime of the CSLA expires next year. The act would extend indemnification to 2025 in order to prevent U.S. launches from going overseas and taking high-tech American jobs with them.

In a letter praising the act's extension of the indemnification, Tom Stroup, president of the Satellite Industry Association, wisely stated that the act is ''an important step in maintaining U.S. innovation and leadership in satellite launch and one that promotes overall access to space.'' Several other groups, such as the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, have had similar comments praising the extension.

Moreover, this bill promotes stability and flexibility in the commercial space market through regulatory reform. By extending the learning period to 2025, the Federal Aviation Administration and industry will have more time to collect information and develop a safety framework for commercial spaceflight. This will ensure that the growing commercial space market will not be overburdened with uninformed regulations.

Space-based technology has become a vital part of our economy. Americans rely on it every day, from GPS to weather forecasting to land remote sensing, in everything we do.

The SPACE Act gives the private sector a chance to expand this growing portion of our economy by allowing commercial spaceflight companies to take passengers to and from space and by setting the groundwork for a comprehensive safety framework that will guide future spacefaring activities.

Now is not the time to turn our backs on the innovators and the entrepreneurs who have made this Nation great. If we care about American leadership in space and the American space economy, I urge you to support this important piece of legislation.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise here today because, as I said in my opening remarks, that I think that most of us on both sides of the aisle share the excitement about the commercial space industry and we do indeed want it to succeed.

We all work for the taxpayer; and the American taxpayer, as I have stated, has a vested interest in the commercial space industry because we have laid out hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars to support it.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate yesterday marked up a bipartisan compromise bill with very few changes to it. On the other hand, this bill, if it passes the House unchanged, is going to be dead in the water. But if we pass the substitute that we are considering later on, that I offer later today, we will have a great chance to do some real lawmaking. It will not have addressed all of the industry concerns. It will not have done anything to get in the way of the advance of commercial space.

So I urge my fellow Members to support a bipartisan process that began over in the Senate. Vote for the substitute amendment later on and say, you know, we can start fresh here, not with something that just disadvantages consumers and taxpayers. Let's try to be on the same page when it comes to the strong support that I think each side feels with respect to the commercial space industry.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I have one question for everyone here: Do you believe America is exceptional?

Fifty-four years ago, President Kennedy spoke to a joint session of Congress in this very Chamber, and he set forth an astounding goal: to put an American on the Moon before the end of the decade.

Many doubted our ability to do that. But like America has done throughout our history, we proved them wrong. So on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong took one small step and changed the course of history.

You see, President Kennedy's vision is part of America's fundamental character. We are pioneers. We always move forward. We never back down from a challenge, and beating the odds is in our DNA.

This was the case for our very founding. We brought forth a new nation in pursuit of a more perfect union. With the winds of freedom at our back, we headed west to unchartered lands, relying on the same spirit of adventure that endures in the Central Valley of California to this day.

We watched as two bicycle repairmen flew above the sand and waves on a beach in North Carolina, not because of government grants or Washington connections, but because they had the audacity to make a dream a reality.

Today, dorm room startups and tech entrepreneurs are connecting our entire world, paving the way to tomorrow.

The world looks to America because we give them a reason to look to us. We show them a vision of the future, and we deliver. But we can't take our global leadership and innovation for granted. Today we pay Russia $70 million for one seat on their rocket.

Right now there is a new generation of pioneers. They want to embark on the next stage of space exploration, and we should not hold them back. The truth is Washington never comes up with the next big idea, but we can support those innovators who do and create the best environment possible for them to succeed.

Steve Jobs, one of America's great innovators, once said ''innovation distinguishes between a leader and a follower.'' That is true for people and for a country. Those words carry special meaning for everyone who ever dared to venture off the beaten path. It means something to the small-business owners working at their kitchen tables and the inventors tinkering in the dorm rooms and garages. It means something to every kid who ever dreamed of space and who still dreams of leading us in a journey to the stars.

So for all American pioneers, those who will lead our Nation through the 21st century, I again ask: Do you believe America is exceptional? Because I do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–17. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2262

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or the ''SPACE Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH

Sec. 101. Consensus standards.
Sec. 102. International launch competitiveness.
Sec. 103. Launch license flexibility.
Sec. 104. Government astronauts.
Sec. 105. Indemnification for space flight participants.
Sec. 106. Federal jurisdiction.
Sec. 107. Cross-waivers.
Sec. 108. Orbital traffic management.
Sec. 109. State commercial launch facilities.
Sec. 110. Space support vehicles study.
Sec. 111. Streamline commercial space launch activities.
Sec. 112. Space Launch System update.

TITLE II—SPACE RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND UTILIZATION

Sec. 201. Short title.
Sec. 202. Title 51 amendment.

TITLE III—COMMERCIAL REMOTE SENSING

Sec. 301. Annual reporting.
Sec. 302. Statutory update report.

TITLE IV—OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCE

Sec. 401. Renaming of Office of Space Commercialization.
Sec. 402. Functions of the Office of Space Commerce.

TITLE I—COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH

SEC. 101. CONSENSUS STANDARDS.

Section 50905(c) of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (8); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) INTERIM INDUSTRY VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS REPORT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, or its successor organization, shall provide a report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the progress of the commercial space transportation industry in developing voluntary consensus standards or any other construction that promotes best practices to improve the industry. Such report shall include, at a minimum—

''(A) any voluntary industry consensus standards or any other construction that have been accepted by the industry at large;

''(B) the identification of areas that have the potential to become voluntary industry consensus standards or another potential construction that are currently under consideration by the industry at large;

''(C) an assessment from the Secretary on the general progress of the industry in adopting voluntary consensus standards or any other construction;

''(D) lessons learned about voluntary industry consensus standards or any other construction, best practices, and commercial space launch operations;

''(E) any lessons learned associated with the development, potential application, and acceptance of voluntary industry consensus standards or any other construction, best practices, and commercial space launch operations; and

''(F) recommendations, findings, or observations from the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, or its successor organization, on the progress of the industry in developing industry consensus standards or any other construction.

This report, with the appropriate updates in the intervening periods, shall be transmitted to such committees no later than December 31, 2016, December 31, 2018, December 31, 2020, and December 31, 2022. Each report shall describe and assess the progress achieved as of 6 months prior to the specified transmittal date.

''(4) INTERIM REPORT ON KNOWLEDGE AND OPERATIONAL EXPERIENCE.—The Secretary shall provide a report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the of the Senate on the status of the knowledge and operational experience acquired by the industry while providing flight services for compensation or hire to support the development of a safety framework. Interim reports shall by transmitted to such committees no later than December 31, 2018, December 31, 2020, and December 31, 2022. Each report shall describe and assess the progress achieved as of 6 months prior to the specified transmittal date.

''(5) INDEPENDENT REVIEW.—No later than December 31, 2023, an independent, private systems engineering and technical assistance organization or standards development organization contracted by the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an assessment of the readiness of the commercial space industry and the Federal Government to transition to a safety framework that may include regulations. As part of the review, the contracted organization shall evaluate—

''(A) the progress of the commercial space industry in adopting industry voluntary standards or any other construction as reported by the Secretary in the interim assessments included in reports provided under paragraph (4); and

''(B) the knowledge and operational experience obtained by the commercial space industry while providing services for compensation or hire as reported by the Secretary in the interim knowledge and operational reports provided under paragraph (4).

''(6) LEARNING PERIOD.—Beginning on December 31, 2025, the Secretary may propose regulations under this subsection without regard to paragraph (2)(C) and (D). The development of any such regulations shall take into consideration the evolving standards of the commercial space flight industry as identified through the reports published under paragraphs (3) and (4).

''(7) COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to discuss potential approaches, potential performance standards, or any other topic related to this subsection with the commercial space industry including observations, findings, and recommendations from the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, or its successor organization, prior to the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking. Such discussions shall not be construed to permit the Secretary to promulgate industry regulations except as otherwise provided in this section.''.

SEC. 102. INTERNATIONAL LAUNCH COMPETITIVENESS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for updating the methodology used to calculate the maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code, with a validated risk profile approach to provide reasonable maximum probable loss values associated with potential third party losses from commercially licensed launches. An appropriately updated methodology will help ensure that the Federal Government is not exposed to greater financial risks than intended and that launch companies are not required to purchase more insurance coverage than necessary.

(b) MAXIMUM PROBABLE LOSS PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a plan to update the methodology used to calculate maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code, through the use of a validated risk profile approach. Such plan shall include, at a minimum—

(1) an evaluation of the reasonableness of the current single casualty estimate and, if needed, the steps the Secretary will take to update such estimate;

(2) an evaluation, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the heads of other relevant executive agencies, of the reasonableness of the dollar value of the insurance requirement required by the Secretary for launch providers to cover damage to Government property resulting from a commercially licensed space launch activity, and recommendations as to a reasonable calculation if, as determined by the Secretary, the current statutory threshold is insufficient;

(3) a schedule of when updates to the methodology and calculations for the totality of the Maximum Probable Loss will be implemented, and a detailed explanation of any changes to the current calculation; and

(4) consideration of the impact of the cost of its implementation on the licensing process, both in terms of the cost to industry of collecting and providing the requisite data and cost to the Government of analyzing the data.

(c) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 270 days after transmittal of the plan under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an assessment of—

(1) the conclusions and analysis provided by the Secretary of Transportation in the plan required under subsection (b);

(2) the implementation schedule proposed by the Secretary in such plan;

(3) the suitability of the plan for implementation; and

(4) any further actions needed to implement the plan or otherwise accomplish the purpose of this section.

(d) LAUNCH LIABILITY EXTENSION.—Section 50915(f) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2016'' and inserting ''December 31, 2025''.

SEC. 103. LAUNCH LICENSE FLEXIBILITY.

Section 50906 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''launched or reentered'' and inserting ''launched or reentered under that permit'';

(2) by amending subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

''(1) research and development to test design concepts, equipment, or operating techniques;'';

(3) in subsection (d)(3), by striking ''prior to obtaining a license'';

(4) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''suborbital rocket design'' and inserting ''suborbital rocket or rocket design''; and

(5) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

''(g) The Secretary may issue a permit under this section notwithstanding any license issued under this chapter. The issuance of a license under this chapter shall not invalidate a permit under this section.''.

SEC. 104. GOVERNMENT ASTRONAUTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (22) as paragraphs (5) through (23), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) 'government astronaut' means an individual designated as such by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, pursuant requirements established by the Administrator, who—

''(A) is an employee of—

''(i) the United States Government, including the United States Armed Forces; or

''(ii) a foreign government that is a party to the Intergovernmental Agreement Among the Government of Canada, Governments of Member States of the European Space Agency, the Government of Japan, the Government of the Russian Federation, and the Government of the United States of America Concerning Cooperation on the Civil International Space Station, signed on January 29, 1998; and

''(B) is carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle in the course of his or her employment, which may include performance of activities directly relating to the launch, reentry, or other operation of the launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.'';

(3) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''government astronaut,'' after ''crew,'';

(4) in paragraph (7)(A), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''government astronaut,'' after ''(including crew training),'';

(5) in paragraph (14), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''government astronauts,'' after ''crew,'';

(6) in paragraph (15)(A), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''government astronaut,'' after ''(including crew training),'';

(7) by amending paragraph (18), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, to read as follows:

''(18) 'space flight participant' means an individual, who is not crew or a government astronaut, carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.''; and

(8) in paragraph (22)(E), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''.

(b) RESTRICTIONS ON LAUNCHES, OPERATIONS, AND REENTRIES; SINGLE LICENSE OR PERMIT.—Section 50904(d) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''.

(c) LICENSE APPLICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS; APPLICATIONS.—Section 50905 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''crews and space flight participants'' and inserting ''crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(D), by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''to crew or space flight participants'' each place it appears and inserting ''to crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''.

(d) MONITORING ACTIVITIES.—Section 50907(a) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''crew or space flight participant training'' and inserting ''crew, government astronaut, or space flight participant training''.

(e) ADDITIONAL SUSPENSIONS.—Section 50908(d)(1) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''to crew or space flight participants'' each place it appears and inserting ''to crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''.

SEC. 105. INDEMNIFICATION FOR SPACE FLIGHT PARTICIPANTS.

Chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 50914(a)(4), by adding at the end the following:

''(E) space flight participants.''; and

(2) in section 50915(a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''or a contractor'' and inserting ''a contractor''; and

(B) by striking ''but not against'' and inserting ''or''.

SEC. 106. FEDERAL JURISDICTION.

Section 50914 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) FEDERAL JURISDICTION.—Any action or tort arising from a licensed launch or reentry shall be the sole jurisdiction of the Federal courts and shall be decided under Federal law.''.

SEC. 107. CROSS-WAIVERS.

Section 50914(b)(1) of title 51, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: ''(1) A launch or reentry license issued or transferred under this chapter shall contain a provision requiring the licensee or transferee to make a reciprocal waiver of claims with its contractors, subcontractors, and customers, the contractors and subcontractors of the customers, and any space flight participants, involved in launch services or reentry services or participating in a flight under which each party to the waiver agrees to be responsible for property damage or loss it or they sustain, or for personal injury to, death of, or property damage or loss sustained by its own employees resulting from an activity carried out under the applicable license.''.

SEC. 108. ORBITAL TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, as none currently exists, there may be a need for a framework that addresses space traffic management of United States Government assets and United States private sector assets to minimize the proliferation of debris and decrease the congestion of the orbital environment.

(b) STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall enter into an arrangement with an independent, private systems engineering and technical assistance organization to study frameworks for the management of space traffic and orbital activities. The study shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of current regulations, Government best practices, and industry standards that apply to space traffic management and orbital debris mitigation.

(2) An assessment of current statutory authority granted to the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and how those agencies utilize and coordinate those authorities.

(3) A review of all space traffic management and orbital debris requirements under treaties and other international agreements to which the United States is a signatory, and other nonbinding international arrangements in which the United States participates, and the manner in which the Federal Government complies with those requirements.

(4) An assessment of existing Federal Government assets used to conduct space traffic management and space situational awareness.

(5) An assessment of the risk associated with smallsats as well as any necessary Government coordination for their launch and utilization.

(6) An assessment of existing private sector information sharing activities associated with space situational awareness and space traffic management.

(7) Recommendations related to the framework for the protection of the health, safety, and welfare of the public and economic vitality of the space industry.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the report required in subsection (b).

(d) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORITIES.—Congress recognizes the vital and unique role played by the Department of Defense in protecting national security assets in space. Nothing in this section shall be construed to amend authorities granted to the Department of Defense to safeguard the national security.

SEC. 109. STATE COMMERCIAL LAUNCH FACILITIES.

It is the Sense of Congress that State involvement, development, ownership, and operation of launch facilities can help enable growth of the Nation's commercial suborbital and orbital space endeavors and support both commercial and Government space programs. It is further the sense of Congress that State launch facilities and the people and property within the affected launch areas of those State facilities are subject to risks if the commercial launch vehicle fails or experiences an anomaly. To ensure the success of the commercial launch industry and the safety of the people and property in the affected launch areas, it is the further sense of Congress that States and State launch facilities should seek to take proper measures to secure their investments and the safety of third parties from potential damages that could be suffered from commercial launch activities.

SEC. 110. SPACE SUPPORT VEHICLES STUDY.

Not less than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a report on the use of space support vehicle services in the commercial space industry. This report shall include—

(1) the extent to which launch providers rely on such services as part of their business models;

(2) the statutory, regulatory, and market barriers to the use of such services; and

(3) recommendations for legislative or regulatory action that may be needed to ensure reduced barriers to the use of such services if such use is a requirement of the industry.

SEC. 111. STREAMLINE COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH ACTIVITIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that eliminating duplicative requirements and approvals for commercial launch and reentry operations will promote and encourage the development of the commercial space sector.

(b) REAFFIRMATION OF POLICY.—Congress reaffirms that the Secretary of Transportation, in overseeing and coordinating commercial launch and reentry operations, should—

(1) promote commercial space launches and reentries by the private sector;

(2) facilitate Government, State, and private sector involvement in enhancing U.S. launch sites and facilities;

(3) protect public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(4) consult with the head of another executive agency, including the Secretary of Defense or the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as necessary to provide consistent application of licensing requirements under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation under section 50918 of title 51, United States Code, and subject to section 50905(b)(2)(C) of that title, shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate—

(A) to identify all requirements that are imposed to protect the public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle; and

(B) to evaluate the requirements identified in subparagraph (A) and, in coordination with the licensee or transferee and the heads of the relevant executive agencies—

(i) determine whether the satisfaction of a requirement of one agency could result in the satisfaction of a requirement of another agency; and

(ii) resolve any inconsistencies and remove any outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the Secretary of Transportation determines no outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government exist, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the commercial space sector, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(A) A description of the process for the application for and approval of a permit or license under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code, for the commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle, including the identification of—

(i) any unique requirements for operating on a United States Government launch site, reentry site, or launch property; and

(ii) any inconsistent, outmoded, or duplicative requirements or approvals.

(B) A description of current efforts, if any, to coordinate and work across executive agencies to define interagency processes and procedures for sharing information, avoiding duplication of effort, and resolving common agency requirements.

(C) Recommendations for legislation that may further—

(i) streamline requirements in order to improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary costs, resolve inconsistencies, remove duplication, and minimize unwarranted constraints; and

(ii) consolidate or modify requirements across affected agencies into a single application set that satisfies the requirements identified in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) any applicable definitions set forth in section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, shall apply;

(B) the terms ''launch'', ''reenter'', and ''reentry'' include landing of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle; and

(C) the terms ''United States Government launch site'' and ''United States Government reentry site'' include any necessary facility, at that location, that is commercially operated on United States Government property.

SEC. 112. SPACE LAUNCH SYSTEM UPDATE.

(a) CHAPTER 701.—

*(1) AMENDMENT.—The chapter heading of chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''**SPACE SHUTTLE**'' and inserting ''**SPACE LAUNCH SYSTEM**''.*

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Space Shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(b) SECTION 70101.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 70101 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**space shuttle**'' and inserting ''**Space Launch System**''; and*

(B) by striking ''space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating section 70101 in the table of sections for chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code is amended by striking ''space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(c) SECTION 70102.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 70102 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**Space shuttle**'' and inserting ''**Space Launch System**'';*

(B) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''space shuttle'' both places it appears and inserting ''Space Launch System'';

(C) in subsection (a)(1)(A)(i), by inserting ''directly to cis-lunar space and the regions of space beyond low-Earth orbit'' after ''human presence'';

(D) in subsection (a)(1)(B), by striking ''a shuttle launch'' and inserting ''a launch of the Space Launch System'';

(E) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''a space shuttle mission'' and inserting ''a mission of the Space Launch System'';

(F) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''space shuttle'' each place it appears and inserting ''Space Launch System''; and

(ii) by striking ''from the shuttle'' and inserting ''from the Space Launch System'';

(G) in subsection (c), by striking ''space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''; and

(H) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'Space Launch System' means the Space Launch System authorized under section 302 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating section 70102 in the table of sections for chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code is amended by striking ''Space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(d) SECTION 70103.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 70103 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**space shuttle**'' and inserting ''**Space Launch System**''; and*

(B) by striking ''space shuttle'' each place it appears and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating section 70103 in the table of sections for chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code is amended by striking ''space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

TITLE II—SPACE RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND UTILIZATION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015''.

SEC. 202. TITLE 51 AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle V of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 513—SPACE RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND UTILIZATION

''Sec.
''51301. Definitions.

''51302. Commercialization of space resource exploration and utilization.
''51303. Legal framework.

''§ 51301. Definitions

''In this chapter:

''(1) SPACE RESOURCE.—The term 'space resource' means a natural resource of any kind found in situ in outer space.

''(2) ASTEROID RESOURCE.—The term 'asteroid resource' means a space resource found on or within a single asteroid.

''(3) STATE.—The term 'State' means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

''(4) UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL SPACE RESOURCE UTILIZATION ENTITY.—The term 'United States commercial space resource utilization entity' means an entity providing space resource exploration or utilization services, the control of which is held by persons other than a Federal, State, local, or foreign government, and that is—

''(A) duly organized under the laws of a State;

''(B) subject to the subject matter and personal jurisdiction of the courts of the United States; or

''(C) a foreign entity that has voluntarily submitted to the subject matter and personal jurisdiction of the courts of the United States.

''§ 51302. Commercialization of space resource exploration and utilization

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through appropriate Federal agencies, shall—

''(1) facilitate the commercial exploration and utilization of space resources to meet national needs;

''(2) discourage government barriers to the development of economically viable, safe, and stable industries for the exploration and utilization of space resources in manners consistent with the existing international obligations of the United States; and

''(3) promote the right of United States commercial entities to explore outer space and utilize space resources, in accordance with the existing international obligations of the United States, free from harmful interference, and to transfer or sell such resources.

''(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall submit to Congress a report that contains recommendations for—

''(1) the allocation of responsibilities relating to the exploration and utilization of space resources among Federal agencies; and

''(2) any authorities necessary to meet the international obligations of the United States with respect to the exploration and utilization of space resources.

''§ 51303. Legal framework

''(a) PROPERTY RIGHTS.—Any asteroid resources obtained in outer space are the property of the entity that obtained such resources, which shall be entitled to all property rights thereto, consistent with applicable provisions of Federal law and existing international obligations.

''(b) SAFETY OF OPERATIONS.—A United States commercial space resource utilization entity shall avoid causing harmful interference in outer space.

''(c) CIVIL ACTION FOR RELIEF FROM HARMFUL INTERFERENCE.—A United States commercial space resource utilization entity may bring a civil action for appropriate legal or equitable relief, or both, under this chapter for any action by another entity subject to United States jurisdiction causing harmful interference to its operations with respect to an asteroid resource utilization activity in outer space.

''(d) RULE OF DECISION.—In a civil action brought pursuant to subsection (c) with respect to an asteroid resource utilization activity in outer space, a court shall enter judgment in favor of the plaintiff if the court finds—

''(1) the plaintiff—

''(A) acted in accordance with all existing international obligations of the United States; and

''(B) was first in time to conduct the activity; and

''(2) the activity is reasonable for the exploration and utilization of asteroid resources.

''(e) EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction over an action under this chapter without regard to the amount in controversy.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the items for subtitle V the following:

''513. Space resource exploration and utilization ..... 51301''.

TITLE III—COMMERCIAL REMOTE SENSING

SEC. 301. ANNUAL REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 601 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 60126. Annual reporting

''The Secretary shall provide a report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the SPACE Act of 2015 and annually thereafter on—

''(1) the Secretary's implementation of section 60121, including—

''(A) a list of all applications received in the previous calendar year;

''(B) a list of all applications approved;

''(C) a list of all applications denied;

''(D) a list of all applications that required additional information; and

''(E) a list of all applications whose disposition exceeded the 120 day deadline established in section 60121(c), the total days overdue for applications that exceeded such deadline, and an explanation for the delay;

''(2) all notifications and information provided to the Secretary pursuant to section 60122; and

''(3) all actions taken by the Secretary under the administrative authority granted by section 60123(a)(4), (5), and (6).''.

SEC. 302. STATUTORY UPDATE REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Advisory Committee on Commercial Remote Sensing, shall report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on statutory updates necessary to protect national security, protect privacy (which is not to be taken as altering any condition or standards for licensing), protect the United States industrial base, and reflect the current state of the art of remote sensing systems, instruments, or technologies.

TITLE IV—OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCE

SEC. 401. RENAMING OF OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCIALIZATION.

(a) CHAPTER HEADING.—

*(1) AMENDMENT.—The chapter heading for chapter 507 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''**COMMERCIALIZATION**'' and inserting ''**Commerce**''.*

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to chapter 507 in the table chapters for title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commercialization'' and inserting ''Commerce''.

(b) DEFINITION OF OFFICE.— Section 50701 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commercialization'' and inserting ''Commerce''.

(c) RENAMING.—Section 50702(a) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commercialization'' and inserting ''Commerce''.

SEC. 402. FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCE.

Section 50702(c) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commerce.'' and inserting ''Commerce, including to—

''(1) foster the conditions for the economic growth and technological advancement of the United States space commerce industry;

''(2) coordinate space commerce policy issues and actions within the Department of Commerce;

''(3) represent the Department of Commerce in the development of United States policies and in negotiations with foreign countries to promote United States space commerce;

''(4) promote the advancement of United States geospatial technologies related to space commerce, in cooperation with relevant interagency working groups; and

''(5) provide support to Federal Government organizations working on Space-Based Positioning Navigation, and Timing policy, including the National Coordination Office for Space-Based Position, Navigation, and Timing.''.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114–127. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 18, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(3)''.

Page 14, lines 18 and 19, strike ''and shall be decided under Federal law''.

Page 15, line 18, insert '', in consultation with the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Department of Defense,'' after ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration''.

Page 17, line 18, insert ''(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—'' before ''It is the Sense''.

Page 18, after line 8, insert the following:

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the potential inclusion of all government property, including State and municipal property, in the existing indemnification regime established under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code.

Page 23, line 19, insert ''in the table of chapters'' after ''chapter 701''.

Page 31, line 22, amend subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) a list of all applications denied and an explanation of why each application was denied, including any information relevant to the interagency adjudication process of a licensing request;

Page 32, line 10, after paragraph (3), insert the following:

Such report may include classified annexes as necessary to protect the disclosure of sensitive or classified information.

Page 32, after line 10, insert the following:

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 601 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 60125 the following new item:

''60126. Annual reporting.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment contains minor corrections to the underlying bill and is generally technical in nature. The amendment provides clarity to some of the reports in the bill on the learning period, orbital traffic management, commercial remote sensing, and the inclusion of classified annexes.

Additionally, this amendment ensures that Federal courts handling legal disputes will look to substantive State law to resolve claims that arise from a federally licensed launch.

Finally, this amendment includes a reporting requirement from the Government Accounting Office about the inclusion of State and municipal launch facilities in the indemnification regime.

This technical amendment will improve the clarity of multiple sections of the bill and ensure continued support for the growing commercial space industry. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

The amendment partially addresses the concerns that we have had with the Federal jurisdiction provision in H.R. 2262. Maintaining ''under Federal law'' would have resulted in eliminating the rights of individuals to bring almost any type of legal action against companies related to commercial spaceflight accidents due to the lack of any applicable Federal law.

I would also like to highlight another change in the manager's amendment that goes beyond a technical remedy or a simple clarification. The amendment adds a requirement for the Secretary of Commerce to provide an annual report on its review of applications for licenses for commercial remote sensing. The manager's amendment now makes accommodation for the inclusion of classified annexes as necessary.

Mr. Chair, while this is a necessary addition to protect the disclosure of sensitive or classified information, it is only necessary because this amendment adds the requirement for the Secretary of Commerce to provide information related to the interagency adjudication process of a commercial remote sensing licensing request.

I highlight these two changes because they demonstrate that the process of developing H.R. 2262 has, in fact, been rushed and not very well thought out. Had we taken the time to hold hearings and sort things out, we actually could have had an opportunity to consider these changes as part of the committee process.

That said, I support the chairman's amendment to make some needed improvements to the bill, though I firmly believe it still needs an awful lot more work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A House Report 114–127.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, lines 18 through 20, amend paragraph (1) to read as follows:

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''that will be launched or reentered'' and inserting ''or reusable launch vehicles that will be launched into a suborbital trajectory or reentered under that permit'';

Page 10, lines 1 and 2, amend paragraph (3) to read as follows:

(3) in subsection (d)(3)—

(A) by striking ''prior to obtaining a license''; and

(B) by inserting ''or vehicle'' after ''design of the rocket'';

Page 10, line 5, insert '', or for a particular reusable launch vehicle or reusable launch vehicle design,'' after ''rocket design''.

Page 10, line 5, strike ''and''.

Page 10, line 6, redesignate paragraph (5) as paragraph (6).

Page 10, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) in subsection (e)(2), by inserting ''or launch vehicle'' after ''the suborbital rocket'';

Page 10, line 11, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

Page 10, after line 11, insert the following new paragraph:

(7) in subsection (h), by inserting ''or reusable launch vehicle'' after ''suborbital rocket''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment to support and facilitate innovation in cutting-edge American enterprises. My amendment will expand the eligibility for experimental permits for reusable rockets to include reusable launch vehicles.

Experimental permits currently have three uses: the research and development of new test designs, concepts, equipment, or operating techniques; to show compliance with requirements as part of the process for obtaining a license; or to train crews before they receive a license for launch or reentry. However, the FAA currently does not have the ability to grant experimental permits for launch vehicles.

□ 1130

Under current law, they are restricted to granting permits for reusable suborbital rockets. This can require industry and the Federal Government to go to extraordinary lengths to find ways to conduct tests. In some cases, there is no alternative for testing.

Expanding access to these permits will help innovators develop new and important technologies right here in America. These permits will create new opportunities for American businesses and will help harness the tremendous potential of our space exploration industry.

I want to thank Chairman LAMAR SMITH, Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and their staffs for their assistance with this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment ensures that the commercial space industry is not pigeonholed into specific vehicle designs. By allowing different types of vehicles to be included in the launch license flexibility regime, we will allow the industry to grow, innovate, and continue to improve safety designs.

This amendment is reasonable and consistent with the spirit of the license flexibility provisions of the underlying bill. I support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 106. INDEPENDENT STUDY OF INDEMNIFICATION FOR SPACE FLIGHT PARTICIPANTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report detailing the results of a study of the issues associated with space flight participants and potential third party claims that could arise from a potential accident of a commercial licensed launch vehicle or reentry vehicle that is carrying space flight participants. The study shall—

(1) identify the issues associated with space flight participants and third party liability;

(2) identify options for addressing the issues;

(3) identify any potential unintended consequences and issues associated with each of the options; and

(4) identify any potential costs to the Federal Government for each of the options.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment calls for a study analyzing our approach to third-party liability with regard to spaceflight participants. The study will identify issues, options to address those issues, consequences of those options, and the potential cost to the Federal Government for each option.

I would note that the idea for this study was originally put forward by Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, someone whom I deeply admire and listen to when she makes her points. We heard her make her points during discussion with our committee, and I felt it was a very good idea, and I am moving forward with it today.

The underlying bill includes a legislative fix for third-party liability and spaceflight participants. That is what our bill does. However, a study would see if there is even a better way or if we have covered all of our bases with the fix that is in this bill.

Right now, a spaceflight participant is financially at risk if the vehicle they fly on has some kind of an incident. It doesn't matter if you are a billionaire or someone who has scrimped for a long time to get one of these spaceflights, maybe a contest winner or a science teacher who wants to share his experience with students or a scientist accompanying their experiment.

Right now, these folks aren't just paying the fare; they are potentially risking everything that their family owns because they may be liable if something goes wrong.

As I say, we have a fix about that in the current bill, but this study would see if there is a better way, along with some other things we can do, to make that fix better. There is no reason at this point to believe that this approach is any worse than the other approaches, but let's keep our minds open.

Right now, we have a hole in the bridge, and this bill puts a patch on that hole. Let's see if there is a study to see if there is a better way to fix the bridge. In the meantime, we have got something in place in this bill—a study—to see if we can do a better job.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to note for the record, though I am not in opposition, I think the study is a good idea. Ideally, I would think that Congress would choose to study the thing before it actually passes the law, but that is not where we are today. I think it is a good idea to proceed forward with this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the gentlewoman for giving us the idea for this study in the first place, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank my colleague from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, for yielding me time.

I simply want to say that this amendment requires an independent report about the inclusion of spaceflight participants in the indemnification regime. This is an important topic, and gathering additional information on this policy would be helpful for future legislation.

Requiring this study is reasonable and consistent with the spirit and the policies of the underlying bill, so I support it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 19, insert ''nonprofit,'' after ''independent,''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank my colleague from San Antonio, Chairman LAMAR SMITH, and also follow Texan EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, the ranking member, for their work on this bill and for consideration of my amendment.

My amendment amends the section of the bill concerning the orbital traffic management study. The bill, as written, has the Administrator of NASA enter into an agreement with an independent private systems engineering and technical assistance organization to study frameworks for the management of space traffic and orbital activities.

My amendment would include nonprofits, so that nonprofit independent research organizations can contribute to this critical work. In addition to allowing for private contractors to be part of this discussion, my amendment would also allow for nonprofits to do the same.

In Texas, we have become a hub for space research and exploration. Some of the private industries or private businesses doing work in this business include Lockheed and Boeing, but there are also wonderful nonprofits like the Southwest Research Institute, in our hometown of San Antonio, and the Universities Space Research Association, which is based in Houston. My amendment would allow these nonprofits to also be part of this work.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires the orbital traffic management study in the underlying bill to be conducted by an independent, nonprofit, private systems engineering and technical assistance organization.

Requiring the study to be done by a nonprofit is reasonable and consistent with the spirit of the study requirement in the underlying bill.

I appreciate the gentleman's amendment; I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, line 19, strike ''and''.

Page 22, line 23, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 22, after line 23, insert the following:

(iii) facilitate outreach to minority- and women-owned businesses on business opportunities in the commercial space industry.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the manager of the bill, the chairman of the full committee, and the ranking member of the full committee for the hard work they do on issues that are important to our Nation and their service to this country. Let me also thank the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for her astute leadership on many of these issues.

Let me as well indicate my commitment to space exploration. As I said earlier, I hope that we can work on a number of issues, but I hope we can work together on what I think is an important economic engine for the Nation, first starting with John F. Kennedy's challenge to all of us and developing, through President Johnson, the NASA centers across America, and the enormous research that has been done by NASA over the years.

I remember debating this question of funding for NASA really in the 1990s and 2000s, talking about the research of heart disease, cancers, HIV/AIDS.

I say that to say that, as we move into commercial space exploration, we certainly want to make sure that opportunities are given to all of America. This is commercial, yes; but the provisions of commercial space work are enhanced by the government in the resources that we have.

My amendment is to provide that recognition and to conduct outreach to the small-, minority-, and women-owned business community. It requires that the provisions of the bill that address future legislation should include work on how to effectively conduct outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and minorities.

As we have all worked hard to encourage small-business owners to produce jobs, this is a great entrepreneurial effort, and therefore, I support the initiatives that would increase an outreach to small businesses and create more jobs.

There are approximately 6 million minority-owned businesses in the United States—representing significant aspects of our economy—and many, many more women and small businesses and other minority-owned businesses.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their efforts to advance our nation's space exploration horizon.

I am a firm believer that commercial and government unmanned and manned space exploration complement each other.

The Internet was initially a federal government research and development project that transitioned to a commercial and public resource that has in less than 2 decades fueled economic opportunities for thousands of U.S. companies large and small.

The transition to commercial space exploration will need the collaboration and support of the Federal government to be sure that it is inclusive, safe and profitable.

The commercial space industry must yield opportunities for all U.S. businesses, which is why I am offering Jackson Lee Amendment Number 5.

The Jackson Lee Amendment requires that the provisions of the bill that address future legislation also lay the foundation for the commercial space industry to include work on how to effectively conduct outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and minorities.

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their current and future potential.

That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs.

These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing.

Outreach is key to developing healthy and diverse small businesses in all sectors of the economy.

There are approximately 6 million minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy.

According to the most recent available Census data, minority owned businesses employ nearly 6 million Americans and generate $1 trillion dollars in economic output.

Women owned businesses have increased 20% between 2002 and 2007, and currently total close to 8 million.

My home city of Houston, Texas, the home of the Johnson Space Center, is also home to more than 60,000 women owned businesses, and more than 60,000 African American owned businesses.

Just as the national highway system and rural electrification has led to opportunities for communities to participate in the national economy, so will federal investment in our nation's infrastructure and capacity in space exploration pave the way for a new era of economic growth and opportunity.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the Jackson Lee Amendments.

I would ask that my amendment be accepted, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I don't oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires the launch license streamlining report to include recommendations on how the FAA should facilitate outreach to minority- and women-owned businesses about opportunities in the commercial space industry. I don't object to the gentlewoman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. May I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that women-owned businesses have increased 20 percent between 2002 and 2007. They currently total close to $8 million. According to the most recent available Census data, minority-owned businesses employ nearly 6 million Americans and generate $1 trillion in economic output.

My home city of Houston, the home of the Johnson Space Center, is also home to more than 60,000 women-owned businesses, 60,000 African American-owned businesses, and multitudes of minority-owned businesses.

I would offer to say that, if we can include this amendment, that outreach to these entities under this commercial space exploration legislation will be adding more jobs to the American economy.

I ask for the support of the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, line 19, strike ''and''.

Page 22, line 23, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 22, after line 23, insert the following:

(iii) facilitate the participation of the Emerging Researchers National Conference in STEM, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation Program (LAMP), Historically Black Colleges and Universities Undergraduate Program (HBCU-UP) of the National Science Foundation, Emerging Researchers National Conference in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, the University of Florida's Institute for African-American Mentoring in Computing Sciences, the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, the National Indian Education Association, and other institutions, organizations, or associations as the Secretary of Transportation determines to be useful in investigating the feasibility of developing programs for fellowships, work-study, and employment opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1145

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, my appreciation to all of those who are on the floor today.

My amendment speaks to discussions that this Congress has had over many, many years on the question of science, technology, engineering, and math and, in particular, working with more vulnerable communities.

My amendment would facilitate the participation of HBCUs, Hispanic Serving Institutions, National Indian Institutions, in fellowships, work-study, and employment opportunities in the emerging commercial space industry.

I remember some years ago that we developed a fellowship for graduate and Ph.D. candidates at Texas Southern University to interact at NASA Johnson. It was a very effective effort, and certainly, well-received by those who were able to participate.

That is, again, investing in universities and colleges that interact, again, with vulnerable populations or do outreach to minority students and expose them, again, at graduate level and undergraduate level to science, technology, engineering, and math.

For over two decades the Nation has known that the economy will be driven, not by the hammer and anvil, but by the ingenuity and hard work of our Nation. Therefore, the imagination that fuels invention is so valuable to the well-being of our Nation.

My amendment would follow in that spirit by increasing awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities and, I would hope, would create partnerships between the commercial space industry and our HBCUs, our Native American Institutions, Hispanic Serving, and allow work-study and employment opportunities in this growing and emerging commercial space industry.

I believe it would be an excellent partnership and would be an excellent contribution to the economic engine of this Nation. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution states that "The Congress shall have Power to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts . . ."

Too often the interpretation of these words are only about patents and inventions, but it extends to our nation's federal investment in areas of science that open up new avenues for economic and technological advancements.

I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their work to advance the scientific horizon of our nation.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 6, made in order by the Rules Committee, would facilitate the participation of HBCU, Hispanic Serving Institutions; National Indian institutions, in fellowships, work-study and employment opportunities in the emerging commercial space industry.

For over 2 decades the nation has known that the economy will be driven by the hammer and the anvil, but by the ingenuity and hard work of our nation's people.

The imagination that fuels invention—is so valuable to the wellbeing of our nation that the founders placed it as a key responsibility of the legislative branch.

My amendment would follow in this spirit by increasing awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities in the commercial space industry.

One of the most enduring difficulties faced by underrepresented populations in the STEM field is a lack of awareness and understanding of the connection between STEM and employment opportunities.

In 2012, a survey found that despite the nation's growing demand for more workers in science, technology, engineering, and math grows, the skills gap among the largest ethnic and racial minorities groups remain stubbornly wide.

Blacks and Latinos account for only 7 percent, of the STEM workforce despite representing 28 percent of the U.S. population.

All of our nation's citizens must be able to tap into, what has been described in the Brookings' Metropolitan Policy Program Report as, "The Hidden STEM Economy."

This report stated that in 2011, 26 million jobs or 20 percent of all occupations required knowledge in 1 or more STEM areas.

Half of all STEM jobs are available to workers without a 4 year degree, and these jobs pay on average $53,000 a year, which is 10 percent higher than jobs with similar education requirements.

Houston, Texas, the home of the Johnson Space Center, has the second highest concentration of engineers (22.4 for every 1000 workers according to the Greater Houston Partnership).

Houston has 59,070 engineers, the second largest population in the nation.

This Jackson Lee Amendment will open up an avenue to allow underrepresented groups in the STEM economy a means of learning about the commercial space industry through the development of fellowships, work study, and employment opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the Jackson Lee Amendments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires the launch license streamlining report in the underlying bill to include recommendations on how the FAA might facilitate the participation of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and National Indian Institutions in the emerging commercial space industry. I don't object to this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman for his support for both of my amendments. And I, again, would indicate that every opportunity we have to grow the economy and expand to those populations not fully included, this Congress should take an opportunity to do.

I see, in this amendment, opportunity for jobs, for partnerships, and certainly opportunities for growing the engineers and other talented persons whom we need for, in essence, a new America with a new economy, technologically-based.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 51, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 3. LIABILITY INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is in the public interest to update the methodology used to calculate the maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code, with a validated risk profile approach in order to consistently compute valid and reasonable maximum probable loss values.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the commercial space sector and insurance providers, shall—

(1) evaluate and, if necessary, develop a plan to update the methodology used to calculate the maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code;

(2) in evaluating or developing a plan under paragraph (1)—

(A) ensure that the Federal Government is not exposed to greater costs than intended and that launch companies are not required to purchase more insurance coverage than necessary; and

(B) consider the impact of the cost to both the industry and the Government of implementing an updated methodology; and

(3) submit the evaluation, and any plan, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. LAUNCH LIABILITY EXTENSION.

Section 50915(f) is amended by striking "December 31, 2016" and inserting "December 31, 2020".

SEC. 5. COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH LICENSING AND EXPERIMENTAL PERMITS.

Section 50906 is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''launched or reentered'' and inserting ''launched or reentered under that permit'';

(2) by amending subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

''(1) research and development to test design concepts, equipment, or operating techniques;'';

(3) in subsection (d)(3) by striking ''prior to obtaining a license'';

(4) in subsection (e)(1) by striking ''suborbital rocket design'' and inserting ''suborbital rocket or suborbital rocket design''; and

(5) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

''(g) The Secretary may issue a permit under this section notwithstanding any license issued under this chapter. The issuance of a license under this chapter may not invalidate a permit issued under this section.''.

SEC. 6. LICENSING REPORT.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on approaches for streamlining the licensing and permitting process of launch vehicles, reentry vehicles, or components of launch or reentry vehicles, to enable non-launch flight operations related to space transportation. The report shall include approaches to improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary costs, resolve inconsistencies, remove duplication, and minimize unwarranted constraints.

SEC. 7. SPACE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, and the commercial space sector, shall—

(1) assess current, and proposed near-term, commercial non-governmental activities conducted in space;

(2) identify appropriate oversight authorities for the activities described in paragraph (1);

(3) recommend an oversight approach that would prioritize safety, utilize existing authorities, minimize burdens, promote the U.S. commercial space sector, and meet the United States' obligations under international treaties; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the assessment and recommended approaches.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this section shall apply to the activities of the ISS national laboratory as described in section 504 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 18354), including any research or development projects utilizing the ISS national laboratory.

SEC. 8. SPACE SURVEILLANCE AND SITUATIONAL AWARENESS DATA.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation in concurrence with the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, study the feasibility of processing and releasing safety-related space situational awareness data and information to any entity consistent with national security interests and public safety obligations of the United States; and

(2) submit a report on the feasibility study to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SAFETY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SAFETY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 50905(c)(3) is amended by striking ''Beginning on October 1, 2015'' and inserting ''Beginning on October 1, 2020''.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Section 50905(c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary to discuss potential regulatory approaches with the commercial space sector, including observations, findings, and recommendations from the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, prior to the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking.''.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representative a report specifying key industry metrics that might indicate readiness of the commercial space sector and the Department of Transportation to transition to a regulatory approach under section 50905(c)(3) of title 51, United States Code, that considers space flight participant, government astronaut, and crew safety.

(d) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Beginning on December 31, 2016, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation and coordination with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report that identifies the activities, described in subsections (c) and (d) of section 50905 of title 51, United States Code, most appropriate for regulatory action, if any, and a proposed transition plan for such regulations.

SEC. 10. INDUSTRY VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS.

(a) INDUSTRY VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—Section 50905(c), as amended in section 9 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) The Secretary shall continue to work with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, to facilitate the development of voluntary consensus standards based on recommended best practices to improve the safety of crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants as the commercial space sector continues to mature.''.

(b) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Beginning on December 31, 2016, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation and coordination with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report detailing progress on the development of industry voluntary consensus standards under section 50905(c)(6) of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 11. GOVERNMENT ASTRONAUTS.

(a) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—Section 50901(15) is amended by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew'' each place it appears.

(b) DEFINITION OF GOVERNMENT ASTRONAUT.—Section 50902 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (22) as paragraphs (7) through (25), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) '*government astronaut*' means an individual who—

''(A) is either—

''(i) an employee of the United States Government, including the uniformed services, engaged in the performance of a Federal function under authority of law or an Executive act; or

''(ii) an international partner astronaut;

''(B) is identified by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

''(C) is carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle; and

''(D) may perform or may not perform activities directly relating to the launch, reentry, or other operation of the launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.

''(5) 'international partner astronaut' means an individual designated under Article 11 of the International Space Station Intergovernmental Agreement, by a partner to that agreement other than the United States, as qualified to serve as an International Space Station crew member.

''(6) 'International Space Station Intergovernmental Agreement' means the Agreement Concerning Cooperation on the International Space Station, signed at Washington January 29, 1998 (TIAS 12927).''.

(c) DEFINITION OF LAUNCH.—Paragraph (7) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking ''and any payload, crew, or space flight participant'' and inserting ''and any payload or human being''.

(d) DEFINITION OF LAUNCH SERVICES.—Paragraph (9) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking ''payload, crew (including crew training), or space flight participant'' and inserting ''payload, crew (including crew training), government astronaut, or space flight participant''.

(e) DEFINITION OF REENTER AND REENTRY.—Paragraph (16) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking ''and its payload, crew, or space flight participants, if any,'' and inserting ''and its payload or human beings, if any,''.

(f) DEFINITION OF REENTRY SERVICES.—Paragraph (17) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking ''payload, crew (including crew training), or space flight participant, if any,'' and inserting ''payload, crew (including crew training), government astronaut, or space flight participant, if any,''.

(g) DEFINITION OF SPACE FLIGHT PARTICIPANT.—Paragraph (20) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended to read as follows:

''(20) 'space flight participant' means an individual, who is not crew or a government astronaut, carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.''.

(h) DEFINITION OF THIRD PARTY.—Paragraph (24)(E) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''.

(i) RESTRICTIONS ON LAUNCHES, OPERATIONS, AND REENTRIES; SINGLE LICENSE OR PERMIT.—Section 50904(d) is amended by striking ''activities involving crew or space flight participants'' and inserting ''activities involving crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''.

(j) LICENSE APPLICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS; APPLICATIONS.—Section 50905 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''crews and space flight participants'' and inserting ''crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(D), by striking ''crew or space flight participants'' and inserting ''crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''crew and space flight participants'' and inserting ''crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''to crew or space flight participants'' each place it appears and inserting ''to crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''.

(k) MONITORING ACTIVITIES.—Section 50907(a) is amended by striking ''crew or space flight participant training'' and inserting ''crew, government astronaut, or space flight participant training''.

(l) ADDITIONAL SUSPENSIONS.—Section 50908(d)(1) is amended by striking ''to crew or space flight participants'' each place it appears and inserting ''to any human being''.

(m) ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTY.—Section 50917(b)(1)(D)(i) is amended by striking ''crew or space flight participant training site,'' and inserting ''crew, government astronaut, or space flight participant training site,''.

(n) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, LAWS, AND INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS; NONAPPLICATION.—Section 50919(g) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) NONAPPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This chapter does not apply to—

''(A) a launch, reentry, operation of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle, operation of a launch site or reentry site, or other space activity the Government carries out for the Government; or

''(B) planning or policies related to the launch, reentry, operation, or activity under subparagraph (A).

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The following activities are not space activities the Government carries out for the Government under paragraph (1):

''(A) A government astronaut being carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle under this chapter.

''(B) A government astronaut performing activities directly relating to the launch, reentry, or other operation of the launch vehicle or reentry vehicle under this chapter.''.

(o) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be construed to modify or affect any law relating to astronauts.

SEC. 12. STREAMLINE COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH ACTIVITIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that eliminating duplicative requirements and approvals for commercial launch and reentry operations will promote and encourage the development of the commercial space sector.

(b) REAFFIRMATION OF POLICY.—Congress reaffirms that the Secretary of Transportation, in overseeing and coordinating commercial launch and reentry operations, should—

(1) promote commercial space launches and reentries by the private sector;

(2) facilitate Government, State, and private sector involvement in enhancing U.S. launch sites and facilities;

(3) protect public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(4) consult with the head of another executive agency, including the Secretary of Defense or the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as necessary to provide consistent application of licensing requirements under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation under section 50918 of title 51, United States Code, and subject to section 50905(b)(2)(C) of that title, shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate—

(A) to identify all requirements that are imposed to protect the public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle; and

(B) to evaluate the requirements identified in subparagraph (A) and, in coordination with the licensee or transferee and the heads of the relevant executive agencies—

(i) determine whether the satisfaction of a requirement of one agency could result in the satisfaction of a requirement of another agency; and

(ii) resolve any inconsistencies and remove any outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the Secretary of Transportation determines no outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government exist, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the commercial space sector, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(A) A description of the process for the application for and approval of a permit or license under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code, for the commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle, including the identification of—

(i) any unique requirements for operating on a United States Government launch site, reentry site, or launch property; and

(ii) any inconsistent, outmoded, or duplicative requirements or approvals.

(B) A description of current efforts, if any, to coordinate and work across executive agencies to define interagency processes and procedures for sharing information, avoiding duplication of effort, and resolving common agency requirements.

(C) Recommendations for legislation that may further—

(i) streamline requirements in order to improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary costs, resolve inconsistencies, remove duplication, and minimize unwarranted constraints; and

(ii) consolidate or modify requirements across affected agencies into a single application set that satisfies the requirements identified in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) any applicable definitions set forth in section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, shall apply;

(B) the terms ''launch'', ''reenter'', and ''reentry'' include landing of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle; and

(C) the terms ''United States Government launch site'' and ''United States Government reentry site'' include any necessary facility, at that location, that is commercially operated on United States Government property.

SEC. 13. OPERATION AND UTILIZATION OF THE ISS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) maximum utilization of partnerships, scientific research, commercial applications, and exploration test bed capabilities of the ISS is essential to ensuring the greatest return on investments made by the United States and its international partners in the development, assembly, and operations of that unique facility; and

(2) every effort should be made to ensure that decisions regarding the service life of the ISS are based on the station's projected capability to continue providing effective and productive research and exploration test bed capabilities.

(b) CONTINUATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.—

(1) MAINTAINING USE THROUGH AT LEAST 2024.—Section 70907 is amended to read as follows:

''§ 70907. Maintaining use through at least 2024

''(a) POLICY.—The Administrator shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the International Space Station remains a viable and productive facility capable of potential United States utilization through at least September 30, 2024.

''(b) NASA ACTIONS.—In furtherance of the policy under subsection (a), the Administrator shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that the International Space Station, as a designated national laboratory—

''(1) remains viable as an element of overall exploration and partnership strategies and approaches;

''(2) is considered for use by all NASA mission directorates, as appropriate, for technically appropriate scientific data gathering or technology risk reduction demonstrations; and

''(3) remains an effective, functional vehicle providing research and test bed capabilities for the United States through at least September 30, 2024.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 709 is amended by amending the item relating to section 70907 to read as follows:

''70907. Maintaining use through at least 2024.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this substitute amendment because I think we have a unique opportunity this week to pass bipartisan commercial space legislation that actually stands a chance of becoming law. That is what we need to focus on this morning.

The choice before us is really quite straightforward. We can spend the morning, as we have, fighting over the provisions of H.R. 2262, several of which were opposed by all of the Democratic members of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee when its provisions were marked up just last week. And when we are done, Members can

vote, largely on party lines, to pass the bill.

But to what end, Mr. Chairman?

The Senate has already made it clear that H.R. 2262 has the proverbial snowball's chance of being adopted by the Senate.

Pursuing House legislation, House passage of a bill that is going nowhere in the Senate seems to me to be the ultimate exercise in futility, and one that does a real disservice to the commercial space launch industry that all of us are trying to help succeed. But we don't have to go down that path.

My amendment would replace the underlying text of H.R. 2262 with provisions of the bipartisan Senate commercial space bill, the one that was marked up in committee just yesterday.

Let me repeat that. The language in the substitute amendment, in my amendment, already has garnered bipartisan support in the Senate. It is language that is cosponsored by Senators TED CRUZ, BILL NELSON, CORY GARDNER, and GARY PETERS, which is not something you can say about many other bills that we consider in the House.

Now, the Senate bill doesn't have everything I would like to see in a commercial space bill. I am sure that is the same for my Republican colleagues and for some in the industry. That is actually how legislation is made.

However, it has a core set of provisions that I think we and the industry can support, and that is what good compromises are all about.

The amendment addresses key issues facing the industry. It extends the ''learning period'' for another 5 years. It extends third-party liability and indemnification of the entire regime for another 4 years.

It provides commercial space launch licensing and experimental permit flexibility. It provides a NASA-sought definition of ''Government Astronaut'' and provides a path for streamlining commercial space launch activities.

The Senate provisions also provide for a review of issues related to commercial activities in space, as well as matters related to space situational awareness data.

They provide encouragement for the FAA and the industry to work together to facilitate the development of voluntary consensus standards, and they also ensure the International Space Station can remain a viable and productive facility through 2024.

Mr. Chairman, that is what my amendment does. It doesn't give the commercial space industry anything or everything that some in the industry might want.

But I would remind colleagues that the Senate bill has been endorsed by the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, the National Space Society, Students for Exploration and Development of Space, SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic, among others. That is the Senate bill. That is the substitute that is being offered.

So Members today can feel perfectly comfortable that my amendment is one that the commercial space industry believes meets its legitimate needs.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, we have a clear choice today. We can maintain a counterproductive, partisan divide and hold out for provisions that won't move this legislation even 1 inch closer to becoming law.

Or we can step back, take a deep breath, and embrace the bipartisan compromise that our colleagues in the Senate have worked out. They have handed us a golden opportunity to move past partisan posturing and actually deliver legislation that can meet the needs of the commercial space industry and be enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, House Democrats support the provisions of my amendment. Democrats and Republicans in the Senate support the provisions of my amendment.

If my Republican colleagues here today in the House can join us in supporting this substitute amendment, the provisions in the amendment, we can pass bipartisan legislation that could be on its way to the President for enactment in a matter of weeks.

I can think of no better way to end this week, and I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment seeks to strike and replace the entire underlying bill with Senate legislation which differs with the House bill in many respects.

The Senate bill, S. 1297, is a work product of the Senate. It has not been negotiated with any Member of this Chamber. In fact, the Senate just marked up the bill yesterday. This amendment abdicates the House's legislative responsibilities to the Senate.

The SPACE Act paves the way for the next generation of explorers and innovators. This amendment prevents the House from providing any direction for the future of space exploration.

We must consider what we will forfeit if we accept this amendment. The amendment significantly shortens the extension of the regulatory learning period and the extension of the indemnification regime.

These changes reduce certainty in the commercial launch market and could threaten the jobs of thousands of Americans. These are hard-working men and women who depend on the extension of these laws for their jobs. They count on us to provide some certainty for their industry.

This amendment strikes all of the commonsense transparency provisions in the SPACE Act and significantly shortens the extension of the learning period. This extension is essential to the health of the commercial space industry.

Also, this amendment includes a significant reduction to the regulatory flexibility provided in the underlying bill. The underlying bill requires assessments from the FAA on the growth of the industry, constructive interactions between stakeholders and the FAA, a glide path to a safety framework that enables and encourages innovations, and improvements in safety.

These are all part of a development structure that combines lessons learned from the industry with the inherent government function to protect the public.

The underlying bill preserves FAA's ability to regulate commercial human spaceflight in order to protect national security, public health, and safety. It also preserves FAA's existing authorities to regulate spaceflight participant and crew safety.

This amendment does not include any comparable benchmarking tools for Congress to monitor the growth of the industry. The amendment removes the ability of stakeholders to work with the FAA to develop safety standards that will improve the industry as a whole.

The amendment will have a chilling effect on the industry and put stakeholders on the defense against an onslaught of government intervention and possible lawsuits. This does not support a dynamic space economy or encourage innovation.

This amendment assumes that the commercial space industry has not placed a priority on safety. It is unfortunate that the minority looks at the American entrepreneurial spirit in this way.

Under the Senate bill, spaceflight participants would be exposed to significant financial risk and liability. This amendment strikes the vital provisions of the underlying bill which help ensure that human spaceflight is available to anyone who wants to participate.

The minority talks a lot about safety. I appreciate that. I think everyone involved in the space industry places a high priority on these endeavors being as safe as possible. I just wish the minority had a higher opinion of the scientists, engineers, and technicians building these systems.

Let's be clear. Space is inherently risky. America's memory is imprinted with tragic events such as the Apollo 1 fire, Challenger, and Columbia. The appropriate way to improve safety systems and reduce risk is to test, launch, learn, study, and repeat.

The entire space industry is behind this bill.

I do not oppose the gentlewoman's amendment simply because the Senate bill has no good qualities. I oppose the gentlewoman's amendment because it would abdicate the responsibilities of the House.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and not turn their backs on so many space companies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman.

I rise in strong support of Ms. EDWARDS' amendment. This amendment offers the possibility of actually accomplishing something worthwhile today and is an amendment that should garner bipartisan support.

Just last week, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee reported out H.R. 2262 and H.R. 1508 on party-line votes. Of course, we had moved to markup without any hearings on commercial space issues in the 114th Congress, nor a legislative hearing on either bill, nor a subcommittee markup. It is, thus, not surprising that they could not garner any significant bipartisan support for these bills.

And yet, now here we are on the floor, with these same bills. If we take the same path we took in yesterday's consideration of the COMPETES legislation, we will get a similar result, a partisan vote, and a bill that will never become law.

Ms. EDWARDS offers us another way forward. Just yesterday, the Senate Commerce Committee favorably reported out S. 1297, the Senate's bipartisan commercial space bill, a bill introduced by Senators TED CRUZ and BILL NELSON.

□ 1200

As I said, it is a bipartisan bill that was endorsed by a large segment of the commercial space industry when it was introduced. The gentlewoman from Maryland's (Ms. EDWARDS) amendment simply incorporates provisions of S. 1297 into her amendment.

Mr. Chairman, instead of engaging in a meaningful exercise, we could vote today to approve bipartisan legislation that Senate Democrats and Republicans are supporting.

While the Senate bill is not the bill I would have written, it is a vast improvement over the bill we have before us today.

As the gentleman said earlier, America is exceptional. And that is why we have a Congress. That is why we have committee structure. That is why we have subcommittees that examine issues and listen to witnesses. That is why we have committee work. It provides really a means for us to come together.

The bill that is in the Senate provides constructive updates to the Commercial Space Launch Act.

I know that some Members want to go further than the Senate bill in some areas, but the reality is, there is no bipartisan consensus to doing so. And if we proceed to pass H.R. 2262, we will have passed a bill that the Senate probably will not take up. We did that with the COMPETES bill yesterday. Do we really want to continue to waste our time in the same way again this morning?

Holding out hope that somehow these contentious provisions will find favor in a House-Senate conference is also an exercise in futility. Time is not on our side in dealing with the two expiring authorities in this bill, and we know from experience that Congress can act to extend them without passing a commercial space bill.

I think that outcome would be unfortunate, but I see little likelihood that the Senate will do anything with H.R. 2262 in its current form. And in a conference, I think that House Democrats will be disinclined to support provisions that we are opposing today.

Ms. EDWARDS' amendment offers us an opportunity to avoid months of pointless back-and-forth between the two Chambers. We can pass legislation that we already know has bipartisan support in the Senate, and if we do, we can look forward to seeing a bill head to the President's desk within weeks. All it takes is my Republican colleagues being willing to forgo the temptation to posture for that last extra bit of advantage and, instead, accept a reasonable compromise bill that will do much to meet the legitimate needs of the commercial space launch industry.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), who is a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and is also the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I thank the chairman of the Science Committee for yielding and for his strong leadership on working this bill through regular order so that all of the amendments that we have made, all the Members have had their voices heard in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maryland.

The language she is proposing to insert into our House bill is authored by Senator CRUZ of Texas, and it does have bipartisan support with Senator NELSON of Florida. But there are provisions that we got included because of the open process that we went through that are not included in that bill.

I would like to just run through a few of those that I, myself, got included into this bill, starting with section 110, which was an amendment I offered at markup that will require a GAO report to capture the role of space support vehicles—training vehicles, if you will—in the commercial space industry; regulatory and statutory barriers to the services these vehicles offer and recommendations for updates that will address these barriers. This is critically important in my neck of the woods. In the State of Oklahoma, we have a spaceport at Burns Flat. There are businesses there that are very interested in doing training for commercial crew and commercial spaceflight participants.

This was a provision of the bill that went through an open process. It was an amendment that was accepted in a very bipartisan way. And I am hopeful that when the full bill gets to the floor, it also will be accepted in a bipartisan way.

Additionally, title III of this bill incorporates H.R. 2261, the Commercial Remote Sensing Act, which was also bipartisan legislation that I introduced with my friend from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER). This title sets metrics to give Congress a full picture of the workload facing the Department of Commerce when licensing remote sensing activities and what issues are preventing them from meeting statutory deadlines.

Title III also recognizes the importance of seeking input from the Advisory Committee for Commercial Remote Sensing, which is largely made up of private sector representatives. This legislation will be crucial as industry expands beyond traditional remote sensing satellites and activities and as Congress looks to update the statutes governing these activities for the first time since the 1990s.

My case for this being bipartisan is that I worked very hard with the other side on the amendments that I ultimately got into this bill. There were some amendments that maybe were not as bipartisan. But I would attest that there is support on the other side of the aisle for a lot of the provisions that we got into this bill.

I look forward to taking a vote on this bill. I oppose the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I encourage all my colleagues to pass the bill that went through regular order in the House of Representatives. I hear a lot of people talking about regular order. This was a very open process. Everybody had their voice heard. I encourage passage of the bill but not passage of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, we have offered my amendment in the nature of a substitute because we are interested not just in making speeches here on the House floor, but we are interested in passing law and good policy that will be signed by the President, that will set the commercial space industry onto a pathway of continued innovation and success.

As has been described, the Senate yesterday, out of committee, marked up a bill that is bipartisan in nature. And because of the negotiations, there are not going to be any changes.

We want to make law for the industry, and we believe that this amendment in the nature of a substitute is good policy. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this substitute amendment and to support the underlying bill, which has significant improvements to the Senate bill, and that is why we should pass it.

I will now enter into the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology regarding H.R. 2262.

MAY 18, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I write concerning H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 2262, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

MAY 18, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2262, the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015.''

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional interests in matters pertaining to the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Transportation Safety Board, and that your Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 2262. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation, if in your jurisdiction, should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 236, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
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
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
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
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
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
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—23

Allen
Bera
Beyer
Blackburn
Brat
Butterfield
Capps
Carter (GA)
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Crawford
Davis, Danny
Donovan
Lewis
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Rush
Smith (WA)
Tsongas

□ 1233

Messrs. GROTHMAN and TED LIEU of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. MASSIE, JONES, Ms. KUSTER, Messrs. DOGGETT and GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 261, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Thursday, May 21, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 261. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Edwards Amendment to H.R. 2262, Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015.

Stated against:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 261 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 261 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 261 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. STEWART, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 273, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 274.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 284, nays 133, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

YEAS—284

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
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
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
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
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
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
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
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
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
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—133

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Neal
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bera
Blackburn
Capps
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Crawford
Davis, Danny
Donovan
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Smith (WA)
Tsongas

□ 1243

Mr. MOULTON changed his 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 against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 21st, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 262. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on passage of H.R. 2262, Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1335, STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 274) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 174, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

YEAS—237

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
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
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 (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
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
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—174

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
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
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Bera
Blackburn
Capps
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Courtney
Crawford
Davis, Danny
Donovan
Duncan (TN)
Hinojosa
Kind
Lowenthal
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Russell
Smith (WA)
Tsongas

□ 1252

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 21st, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 263. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 274, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes on May 20 and May 21, 2015 and would like the record to reflect that I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 250: "no," rollcall No. 251: "no," rollcall No. 252: "yes," rollcall No. 253: "no," rollcall No. 254: "yes," rollcall No. 255: "yes," rollcall No. 256: "yes," rollcall No. 257: "yes," rollcall No. 258: "no," rollcall No. 259: "yes," rollcall No. 260: "yes," rollcall No. 261: "yes," rollcall No. 262: "yes," rollcall No. 263: "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on May 20th and May 21st, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 258, "yes" on rollcall No. 259, "no" on rollcall No. 260, "yes" on rollcall No. 261, "no" on rollcall No. 262, and "no" on rollcall No. 263.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1622

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representative ADAM SCHIFF be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1622.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On May 20, 2015, pursuant to sections 3307 and 3315(b) of Title 40, United States Code, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider two building project survey resolutions and one resolution that amends a resolution approved by the Committee on February 12, 2015, and which was included in the General Services Administration's (GSA) Fiscal Year 2015 Capital Investment and Leasing Program.

The Committee continues to work to cut waste and the cost of federal property and leases. The two building project surveys establish clear timetables on reviews GSA is currently undertaking to address space emergencies. The amended resolution incorporates additional information provided to the Committee by GSA with respect to leased space that will ultimately be released and consolidated into government-owned space.

I have enclosed copies of the resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on May 20, 2015.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

BUILDING PROJECT SURVEY—UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3315(b), the Administrator of General Services shall investigate the feasibility and need to construct or acquire a replacement facility to house the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and other Federal agencies, located in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. The analysis shall include a full and complete evaluation including, but not limited to:(i) the identification and cost of potential sites and (ii) 30–year present value evaluations of all options, including Federal construction, exchange, purchase (including lease with an option to purchase or purchase contract), and lease. The Administrator shall submit a report to Congress within 120 days of the date of adoption of this resolution.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

BUILDING PROJECT SURVEY—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to Title 40 U.S.C. §3315(b), the Administrator of General Services shall investigate and identify a long-term space solution for the courthouse located at 1 N. Palafox Street in Pensacola, Florida to address the space emergency of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida. The analysis shall include a full and complete evaluation including, but not limited to: (i) the identification and cost of potential options and (ii) 30 year present value evaluations of all options, including acceptance of the offer to donate the current building, repair and acquisition. The Administrator shall submit a report to Congress within 120 days.

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

LEASE—FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, 85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for lease extensions of up to 168,000 rentable square feet of space for the Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force currently located at 85 10th Avenue in New York, New York at a proposed total annual cost of $14,616,000 for a lease term of up to 5 years, a prospectus, as amended by this resolution, for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 12, 2015.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, the Administrator of General Services and tenant agencies agree to apply an overall utilization rate of 218 square feet or less per person.

Provided that, except for interim leases as described above, the Administrator may not enter into any leases that are below prospectus level for the purposes of meeting any of the requirements, or portions thereof, included in the prospectus that would result in an overall utilization rate of 218 square feet or higher per person.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-02-NY15
Congressional District: 8

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes lease extensions of up to five years for 168,000 rentable square feet of space for the Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force (FBI) currently located at 85 10th Avenue in New York, NY. FBI has occupied space in the building since 2005 under two leases that will expire January 17 and June 5, 2015. The long-term plan is to relocate FBI from 85 Tenth Avenue to government-owned space; a lease extension is needed as space is vacated and readied at the Government-owned location. GSA will attempt to secure flexibility and the right to terminate the entire lease periodically within the five year term.

Extension of the current leases will enable FBI to provide continued housing for its personnel and meet its current mission requirements. FBI will maintain its current office utilization rate of 148 USF per person and its overall utilization rate of 218 USF per person.

Description

Occupants:	Federal Bureau of Investigation
Lease Type:	Lease Extension
Current Rentable Square Feet (RSF):	168,000
Proposed Maximum RSF:	168,000
Expansion/Reduction RSF:	0
Current Usable Square Feet/Person:	218
Proposed Usable Square Feet/Person:	218
Proposed Maximum Lease Term:	5
Expiration Date of Current Leases:	1/17/ 2015 and 6/5/ 2015
Proposed Delineated Area:	85 Tenth Avenue New York, NY
Number of Official Parking Spaces:	0
Scoring:	Operating Lease
Maximum Proposed Rental Rate[1]:	$ 68.00 per RSF
Proposed Total Annual Cost[2]:	$ 11,424,000
Current Total Annual Cost:	$ 7,589,152 (leases effective 1/18/2005 and 6/06/2005)

[1]This estimate is for fiscal year 2015 and may be escalated by 1.9 percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for negotiating this lease extension to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the government. Lease award shall not exceed the maximum rental rate as specified in this prospectus.

[2]Any new lease may contain an annual escalation clause to provide for increases or decreases in real estate taxes and operating costs.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-02-NY15
Congressional District: 8

Justification
The leases at 85 10th Avenue will expire January 17 and June 5, 2015. FBI requires continued housing at this location to carry out its mission until it can relocate its personnel and operations to government-owned space. A five-year lease extension is needed to protect occupancy until such time as space is vacated and readied for FBI at a government-owned facility.

Resolutions of Approval
Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing
GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the extension. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on September 29, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

April 2014

Housing Plan
Federal Bureau of Investigation

PNY-02-NY15
New York, NY

Locations	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
85 10th Avenue, New York, NY	542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173						
Proposed Lease							542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173
Total	542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173	542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173

Office Utilization Rate (UR)[2]		
	Current	Proposed
Rate	148	148

UR=average amount of office space per person
Current UR excludes 22,612 usf of office support space
Proposed UR excludes 22,612 usf of office support space

Overall UR[3]		
	Current	Proposed
Rate	218	218

R/U Factor[4]	Total USF	RSF/USF	Max RSF
Current	118,173	1.42	168,000
Proposed	118,173	1.42	168,000

Special Space	USF
ADP	1,977
Break Room	731
Conference/Training	2,367
Health	488
Mug and Fingerprint	244
Physical Fitness	2,560
Mail Room	366
Interview rooms	512
Restroom	146
Total	9,391

NOTES:

[1]USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.
[2]Calculation excludes Judiciary, Congress and agencies with less than 10 people
[3]USF/Person = housing plan total USF divided by total personnel.
[4]R/U Factor = Max RSF divided by total USF

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
U.S. House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515

Bill Shuster
Chairman

Christopher P. Bertram, Staff Director

Peter A. DeFazio
Ranking Member

Katherine W. Dedrick, Democratic Staff Director

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY
PNY-02-NY15

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for lease extensions of up to 168,000 rentable square feet of space for the Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force currently located at 85 10th Avenue in New York, New York at a proposed total annual cost of $13,776,000 for a lease term of up to 5 years, a prospectus, as amended by this resolution, for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, the Administrator of General Services and tenant agencies agree to apply an overall utilization rate of 218 square feet or less per person.

Provided that, except for interim leases as described above, the Administrator may not enter into any leases that are below prospectus level for the purposes of meeting any of the requirements, or portions thereof, included in the prospectus that would result in an overall utilization rate of 218 square feet or higher per person.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

Adopted: **February 12, 2015**

Bill Shuster, M.C.
Chairman

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-02-NY15
Congressional District: 8

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes lease extensions of up to five years for 168,000 rentable square feet of space for the Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force (FBI) currently located at 85 10th Avenue in New York, NY. FBI has occupied space in the building since 2005 under two leases that will expire January 17 and June 5, 2015. The long-term plan is to relocate FBI from 85 Tenth Avenue to government-owned space; a lease extension is needed as space is vacated and readied at the Government-owned location. GSA will attempt to secure flexibility and the right to terminate the entire lease periodically within the five year term.

Extension of the current leases will enable FBI to provide continued housing for its personnel and meet its current mission requirements. FBI will maintain its current office utilization rate of 148 USF per person and its overall utilization rate of 218 USF per person.

Description

Occupants:	Federal Bureau of Investigation
Lease Type:	Lease Extension
Current Rentable Square Feet (RSF):	168,000
Proposed Maximum RSF:	168,000
Expansion/Reduction RSF:	0
Current Usable Square Feet/Person:	218
Proposed Usable Square Feet/Person:	218
Proposed Maximum Lease Term:	5
Expiration Date of Current Leases:	1/17/ 2015 and 6/5/ 2015
Proposed Delineated Area:	85 Tenth Avenue New York, NY
Number of Official Parking Spaces:	0
Scoring:	Operating Lease
Maximum Proposed Rental Rate[1]:	$ 68.00 per RSF
Proposed Total Annual Cost[2]:	$ 11,424,000
Current Total Annual Cost:	$ 7,589,152 (leases effective 1/18/2005 and 6/06/2005)

[1]This estimate is for fiscal year 2015 and may be escalated by 1.9 percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for negotiating this lease extension to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the government. Lease award shall not exceed the maximum rental rate as specified in this prospectus.

[2]Any new lease may contain an annual escalation clause to provide for increases or decreases in real estate taxes and operating costs.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-02-NY15
Congressional District: 8

Justification
The leases at 85 10th Avenue will expire January 17 and June 5, 2015. FBI requires continued housing at this location to carry out its mission until it can relocate its personnel and operations to government-owned space. A five-year lease extension is needed to protect occupancy until such time as space is vacated and readied for FBI at a government-owned facility.

Resolutions of Approval
Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing
GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the extension. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on September 29, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

April 2014

Housing Plan
Federal Bureau of Investigation

PNY-02-NY15
New York, NY

Locations	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
85 10th Avenue, New York, NY	542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173						
Proposed Lease							542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173
Total	**542**	**542**	**102,782**	**6,000**	**9,391**	**118,173**	**542**	**542**	**102,782**	**6,000**	**9,391**	**118,173**

Office Utilization Rate (UR)[2]		
	Current	Proposed
Rate	148	148

UR=average amount of office space per person
Current UR excludes 22,612 usf of office support space
Proposed UR excludes 22,612 usf of office support space

Overall UR[3]		
	Current	Proposed
Rate	218	218

R/U Factor[4]	Total USF	RSF/USF	Max RSF
Current	118,173	1.42	168,000
Proposed	118,173	1.42	168,000

Special Space	USF
ADP	1,977
Break Room	731
Conference/Training	2,367
Health	488
Mug and Fingerprint	244
Physical Fitness	2,560
Mail Room	366
Interview rooms	512
Restroom	146
Total	**9,391**

NOTES:

[1]USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.
[2]Calculation excludes Judiciary, Congress and agencies with less than 10 people
[3]USF/Person = housing plan total USF divided by total personnel.
[4]R/U Factor = Max RSF divided by total USF

There was no objection.

HONORING BRAVE SOUTHERN ARIZONANS WHO MADE THE ULTIMATE SACRIFICE IN SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women from southern Arizona who have given their lives in service to our country.

Countless southern Arizonans have bravely raised their right hands and volunteered to make the defense of our Nation their responsibility. Some have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Their stories of bravery and selflessness are remembered every day by those who knew and loved them—stories like that of U.S. Army Command Master Sergeant Martin R. Barreras, who graduated from Sunnyside High School and was killed in Afghanistan in 2014; or of U.S. Army Specialist Christian M. Adams, a native of Sierra Vista, who was killed in Afghanistan in 2010; or of U.S. Air Force Senior Airman Benjamin D. White, who was based at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and was killed when his helicopter was shot down in Afghanistan in 2010.

These are just some of the many stories of brave southern Arizonans who fought and died to preserve our way of life. Their sacrifices remind us this weekend and every day that freedom is never free.

Have a meaningful Memorial Day.

BRAIN TUMOR AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Brain Tumor Awareness Month.

Every single year, nearly 70,000 people in our country will be diagnosed with a brain tumor. Tragically, over 4,000 of them will be children. By the end of this year, roughly 14,000 Americans will lose their lives due to a brain tumor.

Like many others across this country, my family has also been touched by this painful disease, but for patients and their loved ones, hope persists, whether through increased funding for NIH research, which just passed the Energy and Commerce Committee this morning, or through the tireless efforts of nonprofit organizations like the National Brain Tumor Society.

We should not and cannot accept the notion that a brain tumor is untreatable any longer. This month and every month, we must support the efforts of our scientists, doctors, and advocates as they search for new treatment options to develop new cures.

HONORING OUR MEN AND WOMEN OF THE ARMED FORCES ON MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on what Memorial Day means to our country and to honor our men and women of the Armed Forces.

Our Nation has always stood strong on its founding principle of freedom, but it has taken wars and generations of brave, selfless individuals to preserve and defend it.

For their service, we are eternally grateful. We are especially mindful of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country and of the fact that freedom is not free. Their valiant acts in the line of duty have kept our families safe, both at home and abroad, and there are no words for the gratitude we hold in our hearts today and always.

As we spend time this weekend with our loved ones on this great American holiday, please keep our active and fallen servicemen and -women in your thoughts and prayers, and we pray for those currently serving that they return home safely.

Happy Memorial Day, and God bless the United States of America.

□ 1300

CONGRATULATIONS TO FORT WORTH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT'S HUSBAND AND WIFE TEACHER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mario Pureco-Razo and Maria Ceron-Ponce, the first husband and wife to have ever been named as teachers of the year at their respective schools. Mario and Maria immigrated to the United States from Mexico to become bilingual educators.

Maria, who teaches dual language for third grade at Glen Park Elementary School, and Mario, who teaches dual language pre-K at Mitchell Boulevard Elementary School, one of the many elementary schools I attended in Fort Worth ISD, have both proudly served the district for 7 years.

While each present a different style of teaching in the classroom, both exemplify the dedication and passion needed to shape the minds and lives of our youngest members of society.

Although we should recognize the hard work of all the teachers that perform on behalf of their students each and every day, today I want to recognize Maria and Mario's unique achievement.

It brings me great pride to represent the teachers of Texas' 33rd Congressional District, and I wish Mario and Maria continued success.

Congratulations on this outstanding achievement.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

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

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as National Foster Care Month.

Before I came to Congress, I was the CEO of a home for abused, neglected, and abandoned children called HomeSafe. In addition to providing a caring home for children in need, our staff and volunteers helped connect them with foster families, whom we also helped certify.

I saw firsthand the struggles that children face when they don't have a safe and permanent home. I saw what a remarkable difference it could make when they found a stable and loving family, and I saw the incredible joy that these children brought to the lives of their foster families, our staff and volunteers, and everyone who worked to support them.

All children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent home. We must continue to work together to make that goal a reality for the 400,000 children in our foster care system.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING TAX CREDIT OF 2015

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, since taking office, my top priority has been to support policies that improve our economy and strengthen the Inland Empire's middle class.

Last month I released my jobs plan, summarizing what I have heard from small-business owners, job seekers, and community leaders throughout San Bernardino County. Among the many issues people face is the skills gap, the disconnect that exists between potential employees and the available job market demands of those who possess specific or technical skills. That was one of the biggest problems that I heard.

That is why yesterday I introduced the On-the-Job Training Tax Credit of 2015, a bill that creates a temporary tax credit for employers to use to help pay for the costs of training new hires. This will enable local owners to expand their businesses and empower employees with critical skills to help them succeed in the 21st century economy.

Through apprenticeship programs, vocational schools, community colleges, and more, job seekers who have been locked out of today's economy will be retrained and brought back into the fold in the Inland Empire's economy.

Studies tell us that approximately 3½ million manufacturing jobs will be open over the next 10 years, but we will only be able to fill 2 million of them due to the skills gap. It is time to retrain our workforce and build up the middle class. This bill will help us do just that.

CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS SECTION 702 OF THE FISA AMENDMENTS ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the PATRIOT Act was designed to protect us from terrorists abroad. Now we have learned that section 215 of the PATRIOT Act has been abused by the NSA, and it is spying on Americans, taking metadata.

But there is more. There is another law. The FISA Amendments Act of 2008, section 702, allows the seizure, without a warrant, of the content of emails, text messages, and phone calls by our government. Congress must address this, as it has addressed section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. It also allows, under 702, the backdoor search; in other words, NSA can go into Google and seize information about Americans without a warrant.

NSA cannot be trusted to protect and follow America's laws that protect our privacy. This Soviet-style surveillance on Americans has got to stop. The right of privacy is sacred.

I have introduced, along with ZOE LOFGREN, a bipartisan bill to eliminate section 702 so that Americans are protected. We cannot allow the bruising of the Fourth Amendment by the snooping NSA under the false claim of national security. If you have probable cause to seize that information, get a warrant under the Constitution of the United States.

And that is just the way it is.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Head Start program, which has served more than 30 million American children.

As a former Head Start teacher, I know firsthand what access to education and a hearty breakfast can do for a child. Head Start has introduced millions of children to learning; and, as a result, many of them have gone on to earn college degrees and become teachers, lawyers, doctors, and even elected officials.

Mr. Speaker, without Head Start, many children from low-income families would not receive the nutritional and educational services that are so important to early childhood development.

I stand with my colleagues in the House and on the Committee on Education and the Workforce calling for continued funding for this vital program, which has been crucial in improving the lives of countless deserving children across the country.

RECOGNIZING PHILIP KIRKWOOD

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a real American hero who risked his life to preserve the freedoms we all enjoy today. Yesterday, Navy Ace Commander Philip Kirkwood of Seminole, Florida, accepted the Congressional Gold Medal presented to our American Fighter Aces.

Born in New Jersey, Mr. Kirkwood enlisted in the U.S. Navy in 1942. Earning his Navy wings a year later, Mr. Kirkwood joined the VF–10 flying Hellcats off of the USS *Enterprise*. Mr. Kirkwood recorded his first air victory over the Caroline Islands in 1944, but it would be far from his last. Over his distinguished career, Commander Kirkwood recorded 12 confirmed victories and 1 probable.

One of fewer than 80 living fighter aces, Commander Kirkwood is decorated with the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Air Medal with five Gold Stars.

I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Commander Kirkwood for his years of service and his bravery.

May God bless Philip Kirkwood, and may God bless each of our American Fighter Aces.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF BISHOP CURTIS MONTGOMERY

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Bishop Curtis Montgomery of Tacoma, Washington.

He was a key leader who shepherded Tacoma's Hilltop neighborhood through civil rights struggles and troubled times. His steadfast leadership and staunch belief in the power of community involvement will be remembered in the revitalization of this historically significant neighborhood.

His contributions to the Hilltop include the establishment of Christ Temple Church, which later became Greater Christ Temple Church, and the Oasis of Hope Center, a faith-based community outreach center that was the culmination of Bishop Montgomery's longstanding vision to provide a safe and stable place for the community.

Scripture tells us that God loves a cheerful giver, and it is safe to say that God loves Curtis Montgomery and his parishioners, who have given so much to so many.

On behalf of his congregation and the people of the Hilltop neighborhood in Tacoma, Washington, I honor the lifetime achievements of Bishop Curtis Montgomery of Greater Christ Temple Church in the Congress of the United States.

HONORING OUR VETERANS

(Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, the way that we show gratitude to those who have served in our military, the men and women, is to honor them, and we will join as a country doing so on Memorial Day.

But we also can show our gratitude by making sure that they get the care that they need. It has been over a year since the long waiting lists at the VA were exposed in alarming numbers all across the country. We have learned just this week that at least $6 billion in taxpayers' money has been lost in illegal contracts at the VA and of VA employees improperly receiving gifts, including room upgrades, meals, limousine services, golf, spa, helicopter rides, tickets for the Rockets.

This week the House passed six bills that give American veterans the support they need, and demands accountability at the VA. We must get answers, and I am committed to being a part of the solution.

Next week, I will visit the Spokane Veterans Hospital and recognize those who do work hard to serve our veterans. Every day we are working to support veterans in eastern Washington. This week my team attended the VA2K relay for homeless veterans with military and community and VA staff. We are going to continue to work with county leaders to address the needs of our veterans throughout eastern Washington.

May God bless all those who have served.

FIRST COUNTY OF VETERANS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 29, I will have the privilege of attending a ceremony and play in Warren County, Pennsylvania, titled, ''Beyond Glory,'' which will highlight the stories of eight Medal of Honor recipients in the wars of the 20th century.

The theme of the evening is First County of Veterans, recognizing the fact that Warren County, Pennsylvania, has the largest veteran population per capita of any county in Pennsylvania. I am looking forward to celebrating this special evening with local veterans who have sacrificed so much.

Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is right around the corner, and as the proud father of an Army soldier and a daughter-in-law who is now a veteran, it is my privilege to serve our Nation's veterans and my honor to recognize those who have lost their lives in service to our country.

Memorial Day for many Americans has become the holiday that marks the

start of the summer season, but for the men and women who have served in our Armed Forces, and in doing so gave their lives, we owe them our remembrance and demonstrated appreciation.

It is my sincere hope that you will pause this Memorial Day in remembrance of our fallen soldiers, whose courage and bravery sustain our liberty.

HONORING JASON KORTZ

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is a day to honor those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation. I can think of no better time to remember one of those brave, young men who made the ultimate sacrifice as he trained to protect the values that we as a nation hold so dear.

An elite member of the Naval Special Warfare Group 1, Special Warfare Operator 3rd Class Jason Kortz distinguished himself consistently throughout his life and during his short military career.

Hailing from Highlands Ranch, Colorado, he graduated from the University of Denver. Most recently, Jason set himself apart when he was selected as the honor man of his basic underwater demolition SEAL class.

Tragically, this true patriot and consummate professional gave his life in defense of our Nation when he died during a training accident on March 18, 2015.

On this Memorial Day, please join me and the family of Jason Kortz to pause and reflect on the ultimate sacrifices that warriors like Jason have made to uphold all that we value as a nation.

□ 1315

ASTHMA AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, May is Asthma Awareness Month. As co-chair of the Congressional Asthma and Allergy Caucus and a senior member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce's Health Subcommittee, I want to take this opportunity to bring attention to the prevalence of asthma in the United States, as well as what must be done to control its growth.

Asthma is one of the most serious chronic diseases in the country. It affects almost 26 million Americans and nearly 7 million children. It can cause shortness of breath, coughing, wheezing, chest pain, and even death.

In my home State of New York, asthma takes a particularly heavy toll, especially in my home county of the Bronx. About 390,000 children and 1.4 million adults in New York have asthma. The total cost of asthma-related hospitalizations in New York in 2007 was a staggering $535 million.

I have been a strong supporter of the Centers for Disease Control's National Asthma Control Program, which helps States implement systems to monitor and treat asthma. This program's work has resulted in $23.1 billion in asthma healthcare costs since 2001.

We must continue to increase awareness and preventative measures to help people manage their disease. We must work collaboratively across sectors to address the burden that asthma creates.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that adults and children across the United States can live healthier and more successful lives and that we can conquer the scourge of asthma.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL R. MARTIN UMBARGER

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Hoosier and American, Major General R. Martin Umbarger, the Adjutant General of Indiana, who is retiring after 11 years as the leader of the Indiana Guard Reserve and the Indiana Army and Air National Guard.

Major General Umbarger's distinguished career in the military spans five decades and began when he enlisted as a soldier in the Indiana Army National Guard in 1969.

As secretary of state, I had the privilege of working with Major General Umbarger to protect Hoosiers serving in the military, both out of State and overseas, by promoting and improving absentee voting processes.

As Indiana's Fourth District Representative, I have also worked with Major General Umbarger on legislation which would study the structure of our military and how Reserve components can be best utilized.

In short, Major General Umbarger is one of the most accomplished adjutant generals in the country and a valuable leader in Indiana and the USA. He has led our National Guard and served our State and Nation with integrity and distinction over his 45-year military career.

I would like to thank Major General Umbarger for his selfless service and wish him well in his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO JOE GALUSKI

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Joe Galuski, a beloved central New York broadcaster who spent more than 25 years on air on WSYR radio.

Known for his ability to discuss with knowledge any topic presented to him, Joe faithfully kept our community updated on the latest local stories and provided us with news from around the Nation.

A legend in central New York radio, Joe Galuski is fondly recognized by the thousands of listeners who tuned in religiously on morning commutes and to hear him on SU football's pre- and postgame talk shows.

Joe was more than a radio host; he had the power to communicate and entertain and became a large part of the lives of many of his listeners. He was a gracious and tough interviewer who was quick with a joke. His personality, sense of humor, and intelligence could always be heard in his voice.

Joe Galuski was loved by central New York, a community he cared deeply about. His spirit as the voice of our community will not be forgotten by his family, friends, colleagues, and listeners.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM THOMAS KIRCHHOFF, JR.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today, I pay homage to the legacy of a man who not only resided in Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, but much more importantly, a man who served the Commonwealth and our Nation with pride, as an exemplary businessman, phenomenal athlete, and true patriot.

William Thomas Kirchhoff, Jr., was a standout quarterback for Lafayette College, eventually being inducted into their hall of fame. After college, Tom continued on to the NFL, being signed by the Philadelphia Eagles.

While he is known in Pennsylvania as a great athlete, Tom is know by his family and community as a great man. His fierce quest to live a full life and raise a happy family, despite his struggle with ALS, is beyond inspirational. In fact, his attitude and drive should inspire every citizen to live fully, completely, and with a purpose, despite the challenges that may confront them.

Tom physically may have left us on March 10, 2015, but his soul, spirit, and legacy will endure. To his devoted wife, Staci, and their four children—Tommy, Sam, Brynley, and Ty—on behalf of the Commonwealth and the Nation, thank you. Thank you for sharing Tom's all too short but extremely meaningful life with us.

I am truly honored and humbled to be even a small part of the recognition of a truly great American.

Tom, we wish you Godspeed.

CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION AND CHOICE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of

the bill (H.R. 2496) to extend the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, to make certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN)?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I do want to thank my colleague from Colorado concerning what will be a short time to continue negotiations to finish our hospital in the Denver area.

As we come into this Memorial Day weekend, veterans in the Rocky Mountain West have waited 15 years for this hospital to be built. Substantial construction has taken place. Any further delay just delays delivering good services—great services—to our veterans.

We need to continue to move this along. The fact that we are moving beyond Memorial Day, keeping this project going forward, without mothballing it, is a step in the right direction; but, Mr. Speaker, I ask the majority and the Republican leadership to work with the VA to get this finished, so that we can provide the best medical care possible, similar to what Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS was talking about at her hospital in Washington. We want that same thing in Denver, Colorado.

We need to finish this hospital as soon as possible.

I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws his reservation.

Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN)?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2496

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 ''Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, in fiscal year 2015, in an amount not to exceed $900,000,000.

(b) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 8104(c) of title 38, United States Code, or any other provision of law, funds may not be obligated or expended for the project described in subsection (a) in an amount that would cause the total amount obligated for that project to exceed the amount specified in the law for that project (or would add to total obligations exceeding such specified amount).

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF DISTANCE REQUIREMENT FOR EXPANDED AVAILABILITY OF HOSPITAL CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES FOR VETERANS THROUGH THE USE OF AGREEMENTS WITH NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(b)(2) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''(as calculated based on distance traveled)'' after ''40 miles''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking subclause (II), and inserting the following new subclause (II):

''(II) faces an unusual or excessive burden in traveling to such a medical facility of the Department based on—

''(aa) geographical challenges;

''(bb) environmental factors, such as roads that are not accessible to the general public, traffic, or hazardous weather;

''(cc) a medical condition that impacts the ability to travel; or

''(dd) other factors, as determined by the Secretary.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to care or services provided on or after such date.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

BENGHAZI ATTACK

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 years, on September 11 and 12, 2012, the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, were the target of terrorist attacks. These attacks resulted in the deaths of four Americans: Sean Smith; Tyrone Woods; Glen Doherty; and the U.S. Ambassador to Libya, Chris Stevens, as well as two other Americans critically injured.

It comes at a time close to Memorial Day, when this country can honor these individuals that gave their life and their service not just for this country, but for the freedom and democracy around the world of others.

The gravity of the attacks raise serious questions regarding the U.S. presence in Benghazi, Libya, particularly as those questions related to the policies, decisions, and activities of the administration and relevant executive branch agencies before, during, and after the attacks.

For nearly 2 years, Congress sought answers to these questions. However, the administration's valid response has exposed the limits encountered by our standing committees.

□ 1330

These responses revealed a less than competent or transparent accounting about the attacks. Consequently, the House created, with the support of our Democratic colleagues, the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attacks in Benghazi, Libya.

Everywhere I go, Mr. Speaker, I have people ask me: What is taking so long? What is taking so long for us to get the facts about what happened in Benghazi?

We are going to do our best today to explain to the American people and to the public and to you, Mr. Speaker, why it has taken so long, why it is requiring us to continue to subpoena and beg and plead for the information that we need to be able to deliver this report to this body and to the American people.

The Speaker appointed me and six of my Republican colleagues to this committee. The minority leader appointed five of our Democratic colleagues. We have been directed by the House to conduct a complete investigation across the spectrum of all, A-L-L, all relevant executive branch agencies and issue a definitive final report on the events surrounding the September 11–12, 2012, terrorist attacks in Benghazi, Libya.

Specifically, we are directed to investigate and report on: all policies, decisions, and activities that contributed to the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11 and 12, 2012, as well as those that affected the ability of the United States to prepare for those attacks; number two, all policies, decisions, and activities to respond to and repel the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11 and 12, 2012, including efforts to rescue United States personnel; number three, internal and public executive branch communications about the attacks on the United States facility in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11 and 12, 2012; number four, accountability for policies and decisions relating to the security of facilities in Benghazi, Libya, and the response to the attacks, including individuals and entities responsible for those policies and decisions; number five, executive branch authorities' efforts to identify and bring to justice the perpetrators of these attacks on the U.S. facilities in Benghazi, Libya, September 11 and 12, 2012; number six, executive branch activities and efforts to comply with congressional inquiries into the attacks on the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11 and 12, 2012; recommendations for improving executive branch cooperation and compliance with congressional oversight investigations; information related to lessons learned from the attacks and executive branch

activities and efforts to protect United States facilities and personnel abroad; and any other relevant issues relating to the attacks, the response to the attacks, or the investigation by the House of Representatives into the attacks.

I think that number nine is a particularly relevant point. It says ''all other relevant issues.'' That is one of the questions that we have been receiving: Are we stepping out of bounds on what this committee was supposed to do? The answer is absolutely not.

Using these instructions as a guide, the committee requested and reviewed a substantial volume of information that was previously produced to the House, and new information never before produced to Congress.

The committee has reviewed more than 20,000 pages of emails and documents produced by the State Department never before released to Congress. This new material includes emails that were sent to or received by the former Secretary of State relevant to Benghazi, as well as documents and emails that were part of the State Department's Accountability Review Board proceedings.

In addition, hundreds of pages of emails never before seen by Congress have been produced by the White House. The Department of Justice and the intelligence community have also produced documents never before seen by Congress.

Further, the committee has interviewed executive branch personnel, including survivors of the Benghazi terror attacks, none of whom have ever been interviewed by previous committees. The committee has also interviewed others who have been able to provide indispensable firsthand details of the U.S. presence in Benghazi, Libya.

We know that this is not a complete universe of information held by the executive branch. Our investigation has uncovered new witnesses, new documents, and new facts related to the Benghazi terror attacks.

Ironically, the largest impediment to getting this investigation done in a timely manner and being able to write a final, definitive accounting of what happened before, during, and after the terrorist attacks in Benghazi is the executive branch itself.

The committee has issued letters, subpoenas, has threatened to hold and has held public compliance hearings, with slow to little to no action at all.

Take the State Department, for example—the State Department is a necessary focus of this investigation; yet their compliance posture with the committee and Congress has proved unpredictable at best.

When this committee was formed 1 year ago, the State Department had yet to fully comply with two outstanding subpoenas issued in 2013 by another committee. One subpoena dealt specifically with documents pertaining to the State Department's Accountability Review Board, known as the ARB.

The other subpoena dealt with documents that had previously undergone limited congressional review, where Members' access to the documents and information was restricted to certain dates and times set by the State Department. These subpoenas were still legally binding on the State Department when this committee was created; yet the Department had not fulfilled them.

In an effort to expedite the Department's fulfillment of these subpoenas, the select committee prioritized the Department's production of documents under these two subpoenas, as opposed to issuing new requests.

In addition, by directing the Department to identify documents under these existing subpoenas, the committee was better positioned to receive new documents in a more expeditious manner while, at the same time, judiciously reviewing the work of past committees.

These negotiations resulted in the State Department providing 15,000 pages of new documents to the committee in August and September of last year. This production also fulfilled the Department's obligation for one of the two subpoenas.

The review of these documents was enlightening, both in what it disclosed and what it did not. Here is what it did disclose. For the first time, the Department produced eight emails, eight to or from former Secretary Clinton.

Additionally, the committee became aware that former Secretary Clinton had used a private email account to conduct official State Department business. Importantly, the committee did not release the existence of the private email account because of its commitment to investigate all the facts in a fair and impartial manner.

Here is what it didn't disclose. From the review of the 15,000 pages, however, the committee recognized that there were significant omissions in the documents. Notably, there were very few emails between and among former Secretary Clinton's senior staff and the Secretary.

As a result, last November, the committee requested the State Department produce specific documents and emails related to Benghazi and Libya for the Secretary and 10 of her senior staff. In the 2 months following the committee's request, committee staff consistently relayed to the Department that its new top priority was all of Secretary Clinton's emails.

Almost 3 months later, on February 13, 2015, the Department produced approximately 300 emails to and from the former Secretary during her time as the head of the State Department. Remember, these are emails of which the State Department never possessed and didn't have to look for; yet it took that length of time.

They didn't produce a single document to the committee related to the remaining portions of the November request. What was the State Department doing during the time the former Secretary was going through her emails?

After they produced these emails, the State Department asked what our priority was. We continued to inform them that the 10 senior officials identified in the November request were our priority, including Cheryl Mills, Jake Sullivan, Huma Abedin, and Susan Rice. The State Department told committee staff that this request was too broad and that it was unable to search for these documents.

On March 4, 2015, the committee issued a subpoena for the documents and emails first requested in November. This subpoena sought documents and emails for the 10 senior State Department officials, including those named previously.

Despite the committee indicating emails and documents from the subpoena were its top priority, the Department informed the committee that it would instead begin producing documents pursuant to the outstanding ARB subpoena. Remember, this subpoena was first issued in August of 2013 and reissued on January 28, 2015, since it expired at the end of the previous Congress.

I would also point out that the law requires that these records—and this is the records from the ARB—and, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that you understand this, that the law says that these ''records shall be separated from all other records of the Department of State and shall be maintained under appropriate safeguards to preserve the confidentiality and classification of information.''

This means the records should have been sitting on a shelf somewhere, easily identifiable. Unfortunately, it took them 2 years to find where this ARB report was supposed to be segregated and put up. The committee continued to indicate that its priority was for the emails from the senior State Department personnel that were first requested in November.

The Department's response: it could not search for these documents. Instead, the Department ignored the committee's request; and, on April 15, 2015, nearly 2 years after Congress first issued a subpoena for the ARB's documents, the State Department finally produced more than 1,700 pages of documents related to the ARB.

Again, instead of responding to the committee's request, on April 23, 2015, the Department produced an additional 2,500 pages of documents related to the ARB. The Department has said that, with minor exceptions, it has now fulfilled the requirements of that subpoena.

Notwithstanding the ARB production, the committee continued to press the Department. Its top priority is the documents from the original November 2014 request and the March subpoena.

The State Department, however, has done little but talk about the breadth

of the subpoena and the inability to adequately search for documents.

The Department continues to state that it does not have the technical capabilities to do such a wide search without specific search terms; yet the Department never used any search terms to conduct in its search, nor has the Department ever suggested any search terms to the committee.

To help the committee better understand the Department's technical capabilities—or lack thereof—the committee has taken several different steps. We asked the State Department to bring its technology expert and its records officer to a meeting to discuss how records were kept, retrieved, and produced.

Specifically, we requested a meeting ''with the relevant people from within the State Department who can explain in detail how the State Department maintains its records and how it has researched for documents pursuant to this committee's November request and further detail the limitations of the Department's ability to fully respond to the Chairman's document request. These people would likely include individuals from Legislative Affairs, Office of the Legal Adviser, Bureau of Information Resource Management, and possibly the records officer and any other individual who will be able to answer detailed questions on the topic. This meeting will help us further sequence and prioritize the information and issues in the committee's request, as you suggested we do in your letter of February 13 to Chairman Gowdy,'' that the State Department sent us.

We also included a list of 13 questions to the Department to help guide the discussion. Samples of these questions include ''the size of the universe of potentially relevant hard copy and/or electronic field for each person from the data range period, keyword or phrase searches the Department plans to use for production,'' and ''any limitations imposed on the type of data to be searched.''

These are some pretty straightforward questions.

□ 1345

When the State Department appeared for the meeting, they did not only bring those subject matter experts with them, the staff they did bring could not answer these basic questions. In fact, it was during this meeting for the first time that the committee learned that the State Department was not in possession of the former Secretary's emails. However, there was no mention of her use of a private server.

The committee again asked the Department to meet with these individuals. Again, the Department did not provide them. At an April 10 meeting between committee staff and the Department, the State Department brought in an individual. Yet when pressed by committee staff on these specific questions, the Department refused to provide the specific answers.

Last week, we continued the pressure. We told the Department that members of the committee, including myself, would travel to the State Department to view firsthand how they search for documents and have a discussion about the shortcomings they claim to have.

But what did the Department do when we told them that we were coming? They scrambled and did everything possible to deter our visit.

Earlier this week, however, we did learn more about the Department's internal process for identifying and reviewing documents, but we didn't get this information from the Department. Instead, we had to learn it from a lawsuit.

This past week, on May 18, the State Department's Acting Director for its Information Programs and Services filed a sworn declaration in a FOIA lawsuit, the Freedom of Information lawsuit. That declaration outlined the steps the State Department had taken since it received approximately 55,000 pages of emails from former Secretary Clinton in December of 2014 to review those documents for public release under the Freedom of Information rules.

Also, in that sworn statement, the State Department asserted that it had dedicated, on a full-time basis, a project manager, two case analysts, and nine Freedom of Information reviewers to review all 55,000 pages of emails since April. These 12 individuals are precisely the 12 FTE positions that were recently funded by the State Department's $2.5 million reprogramming request.

Let me say that again. The State Department repeatedly complained to the committee that a lack of staff and other resources prevented it from making more timely production of documents to the committee, so the committee supported a reallocation of funds to enable the State Department to hire additional staff to work on document production to provide to this committee.

However, we continued to press the State Department for answers. Last month, we went so far as to put in writing 27 specific questions that the State Department needed to answer regarding its ability to produce documents to the committee and the use of the private email account by Secretary Clinton.

These were simple questions that fell into three simple categories. These categories are: the State Department's initial approval, if any, of Secretary Clinton's email server arrangement; the State Department's knowledge about this email server arrangement, its attempt to retrieve her email, and the lack of candor by the Department towards the committee about this, despite the committee's persistent requests for these emails; and number 3, details of the Department's review of her emails to ensure the Department is properly marshaling resources to respond to our requests.

Yet here we are, more than 1 month later, and the Department hasn't even been able to answer a single one of the 27 questions in writing.

In addition, we have attempted on multiple occasions to direct the Department toward specific key documents that we are after. We have prioritized our subpoena from 10 names down to 4 names, and then again down to 3 names. We have prioritized dates of documents from 2 years, down to 1 year, down to 3 months.

But again, here we are, 2½ months after we issued a subpoena and 6 months after we first sent the letter, and the Department has still not produced any of these priority documents. First, we moved a foot, then we moved a yard, and now we have moved our position one mile, but the State Department has not budged 1 inch.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to show a little chart that shows the noncompliance that the State Department has done so far:

On 11/18 of 2014: The committee requests from the Secretary 10 senior officials' documents and emails—response, nothing.

On 12/17, we got a response: Let's meet. No documents produced.

2/13/2015: State produced Clinton emails acquired from her attorney.

3/4/2015: We subpoenaed the documents and emails of the 10 senior officials.

The State Department response: Let's meet. No documents produced.

3/26/2015: Three outstanding requests, ARB documents, 10 senior official documents and emails and server questions.

4/10: Briefing on document retention policies and procedures. No documents produced.

4/14: Compliance needed on both subpoenas.

4/15: Part of ARB documents produced 2 years after requested.

4/18: Two subpoenas outstanding. Full ARB compliance and documents. Emails of 10 senior officials.

4/22: Subpoenas outstanding for full ARB compliance and documents and emails of 10 senior officials.

State response: Just beginning to assess volume of emails. No documents produced.

4/24/2015: Response, second part of ARB documents produced 2 years after requested.

4/27/2015: Reminder of priority of 10 senior officials.

4/29: Response: Estimate given for volume of emails for 2 of the 10 senior officials. No documents produced.

5/4/2015: Lack of compliance on document request is unacceptable.

Response from the State Department: State responds but fails to identify any steps taken to produce documents. No documents produced.

Mr. Speaker, we have done everything we know to do to get these documents so we can finish this investigation. I don't know that anybody has any more right to know what has gone on than the American people and especially those families of those four great Americans that lost their lives.

The only thing holding us up from getting a definitive report of those actions before, during, and after those attacks is this executive branch and their Department of State. We are begging them. And as we have said before, we have moved an inch, we have moved a foot, we have moved a yard, we have moved a mile, and they have not moved one iota.

So our request to them is to listen, to give us the documents and let us finish this report.

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

CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN TRADE POLICY

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been over 12 years since the last debate over trade promotion authority, the last time we considered the role of Congress in trade negotiations. Much has changed since then: the world has changed; trade negotiations have changed; and the role of Congress in trade negotiations has changed.

We all recognize that trade can be beneficial. The issue is not whether Congress could pass an Econ 101 class, as President George W. Bush's chair of the Council of Economic Advisers, Gregory Mankiw, recently put it. The issue is whether we are going to face up to the fact that our trading system today is much more complex than the simplistic trade model presented in an Econ 101 class.

A growing number of prominent economists today recognize those complexities, from Nobel Laureate economists like Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman, to Columbia professor Jeffrey Sachs, former IMF chief economist Simon Johnson, and former White House adviser Jared Bernstein. But too many want to pretend the question of a trade agreement is a ''no-brainer,'' as Professor Mankiw suggests; or that the benefits of trade ''flows from the classic theory of trade gains first expounded by David Ricardo in 1817''—from a Council of Economic Advisers report in May 2015—because, as Charles Krauthammer recently wrote: ''The law of comparative advantage has held up nicely for 198 years.''

What do David Ricardo and Adam Smith have to say about the inclusion of investor-state dispute settlement in our trade agreements? Nothing, to my knowledge. What do they have to say about providing a 12-year monopoly for the sale of biologic medicines? about the need to ensure that our trading partners meet basic labor and environmental standards? How about the issue of currency manipulation? What does the theory of comparative advantage have to say about those issues? Absolutely nothing. And yet those are the issues at the crux of the TPP negotiations today.

So how do the old ideas on trade fall short? Let me mention a few examples:

First, as Joseph Stiglitz pointed out recently, 19th century economics and the theory of comparative advantage assumed a fixed level of technology—no technological changes—and full employment. Those assumptions don't fit very well in today's world.

Second, one of the most critical economic issues facing our country today is growing inequality and a stagnant middle class. Many trade economists believe that trade contributes to that inequality. But some try to downplay that fact by pointing out that other factors may contribute more to the problem, as if that means we should not worry about the impact trade is having. Consider this from Dani Rodrik, a Harvard University economist: ''The gains from trade look rather paltry compared to the redistribution of income . . . In an economy like the U.S., where average tariffs are below 5 percent, a move to complete free trade would reshuffle more than $50 of income among different groups for each dollar of efficiency or 'net' gain created . . . We are talking about $50 of redistribution for every $1 of aggregate gain. It is as if we give $51 to Adam, only to leave David $50 poorer.''

David Rosnick of the Center for Economic and Policy Research expects TPP will have a very small but positive impact on U.S. economic growth—0.13 percent of GDP by 2025. However, he notes that economists today generally agree that trade contributes to growing economic inequality in the United States, with estimates ranging from 10 to 50 percent of the total inequality growth. When he combines these two concepts, GDP growth but rising inequality from trade, he concludes: ''under any reasonable assumptions about the effect of trade on inequality, the median wage earner, and therefore the majority of workers, suffers a net loss as a result of these trade agreements.'' In other words, the economic pie may grow slightly as a result of our trade agreements, but the average American worker gets a smaller slice of that pie.

Similarly, in September The Brookings Institution published an economic research paper by three economists, two affiliated with the Federal Reserve system, that found that trade and globalization accounts for the vast majority of labor's declining share of income in the United States over the past 25 years. Specifically, they found that ''increases in import exposure of U.S. businesses can explain about 3.3 percentage points of the 3.9 percentage point decline in the U.S. payroll share over the past quarter century.''

This underscores that the substance of the trade agreements, the international rules, matter. Our trade agreements must be designed to shape trade, to spread its benefits more broadly.

Third, we need to stop pretending that trade only has benefits and few costs. We need to stop talking exclusively about exports and downplaying the negative impact that some imports have, as the Council of Economic Advisers did in a recent paper.

□ 1400

Of course, imports can help to lower prices for manufacturers and consumers. But lower prices don't do you much good if you have lost your job or seen your wage decline or stagnate. Again, as Jeff Sachs has said, ''It is true that the benefits outweigh the costs, leading to the argument that winners can compensate losers. But in America, winners rarely compensate losers; more often than not, the winners attempt to trounce the losers.''

Mr. Speaker, the old economics models are based in part on trade between countries with similar economic structures. This is no longer the case.

The 12 parties involved in the TPP negotiations—accounting for 40 percent of the world GDP—include economies ranging from some of the world's largest market-oriented economies to some of the smallest, least developed command economies. We have never been able to establish a level playing field with Japan—after decades of trying, and multiple ''agreements'' to solve various problems—and the Japanese market stands virtually closed today in key areas like agriculture and automobiles. We have never negotiated a free trade agreement with a communist country like Vietnam where state-owned enterprises are a major concern and the Communist Party and the once so-called labor union are one and the same.

The issues involved in trade negotiations have also changed dramatically. We are no longer simply negotiating tariff levels. As Professor Jeff Sachs of Columbia University said recently, ''Both TPP and TTIP would be better described as multinational business agreements involving three distinct areas: international trade, cross-border investment, and international business regulation.

The TPP negotiations cover a range of subjects far beyond those negotiated in any previous multilateral negotiation, concerning everything from intellectual property and access to medicines, to financial regulations, food safety measures, basic labor and environmental standards, cross-border data flows, and state-owned enterprises. So the economics of trade have changed, and the trade negotiations themselves have changed, and so too has the congressional role.

In recent years some of us have had to take it upon ourselves to rewrite the rules of trade negotiations. In 2006 when the Democrats took the majority in the U.S. House, we made it clear to the Bush administration that we were not going to consider the Peru, Panama, Colombia, and Korea Free Trade Agreements as negotiated. Each of them would need to be fixed.

CHARLES RANGEL and I worked with our House Democratic colleagues to coauthor what became known as the May 10th Agreement on labor and environmental standards in trade agreements. For the first time, fully enforceable labor and environmental standards would be placed in our trade agreements on equal footing with every other commercial provision. The May 10th Agreement also included important provisions on medicines, investment, and government procurement.

After decades of leading the fight to include worker rights provisions in trade agreements, I considered at the time, and still do today, the May 10th Agreement to be a major breakthrough. In the case of our trade agreements with Peru, Panama, and Colombia, their labor laws were changed to come into compliance with ILO standards before the Congress voted.

Then in 2011, with the Korea FTA, working on a bipartisan basis with then-chairman Dave Camp, with Ford Motor, and the UAW, we urged the Obama administration to go back and renegotiate the specific automotive market opening measures with Korea. And they did so, helping to garner broad bipartisan support in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we established the foundation for progressive trade policy. We saw the value of intense congressional involvement to improve trade agreements. We want to make sure it is built upon, not eroded.

Mr. Speaker, now we are facing the largest multilateral trade negotiations since the Uruguay Round. The TPP has the potential to raise standards and open new markets for U.S. businesses, workers, and farmers—or lock in weak standards, uncompetitive practices, and a system that does not spread the benefits of trade, affecting the paychecks of American families. Once the U.S. lowers its own tariffs as broadly as contemplated in TPP, we will no longer have the leverage to bring about lasting change in other countries.

In January, I described what I believed to be an effective way to resolve outstanding issues in the TPP negotiations. I believed that achieving these outcomes could lead to a landmark TPP agreement worthy of major bipartisan support and mine. Unfortunately, in 4 months, none of these suggestions has been taken on by our negotiators.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Hatch-Wyden-Ryan trade promotion authority fails to put TPP on the right track or to help Congress do so. Chairman RYAN and Senator CRUZ wrote an op-ed entitled, ''Putting Congress in Charge on Trade.'' Senator HATCH declared TPA to include ''strict negotiating objectives'' that give the American people a voice on trade priorities. But saying it is so doesn't make it so.

On all the major issues in the negotiations, the negotiating objectives are obsolete or woefully inadequate. They are basically a wish list. And even worse, at the end of the negotiation, TPA allows the President to certify whether his own negotiators achieved the wish list. And the provisions relating to congressional withdrawal of TPA are meaningless. They are never going to be used because they are unusable.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA gives up congressional leverage at exactly the wrong time. Instead of pressing USTR to get a better agreement or signaling to our negotiating partners that Congress will only accept an agreement that ensures reciprocity and helps to spread the benefits of trade, the Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA puts Congress in the backseat and greases the skids for an up-or-down vote after the fact. Real congressional power is not at the end of the process; it is right now, when the critical outstanding issues are being negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, we must meaningfully address currency manipulation—protracted, large-scale, official, one-way intervention in the currency markets to weaken a currency for the purpose of boosting exports and limiting imports. Currency manipulation has cost the U.S. millions of jobs over the past decade and a half. Many people had trouble finding new jobs or had to accept jobs at lower wages.

China manipulated its currency most dramatically in this time period, accumulating the largest stock of foreign exchange reserves the world has ever known. In earlier episodes, Japan, South Korea, and others manipulated their currencies on a protracted, grand scale. Japan's currency manipulation and other trade-distorting practices kept its auto and other markets closed while Japan had access to a very open U.S. market. This one-way trade decimated the U.S. tool and die industry and seriously injured other segments of the auto industry, including U.S. automakers themselves.

The International Monetary Fund has up-to-date guidelines that define currency manipulation and are intended to prevent it. There is nothing wrong with the spirit or even the letter of those guidelines. Unfortunately, the IMF cannot enforce those guidelines because currency manipulators are able to essentially stall action in that forum.

Arguments that prohibiting currency manipulation in TPP is impossible, for technical or political reasons, remind us of previous claims about trade agreements not being able to help defend forests or discourage child labor. For example, some people—prominent people—have asserted that U.S. monetary policy would be put at risk if currency is included in TPP. I responded to that argument in a highly detailed blog months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include that in the RECORD.

[From the Huffington Post Blog Post, Feb. 6, 2015]

THE NEED TO ADDRESS CURRENCY MANIPULATION IN TPP, AND WHY U.S. MONETARY POLICY IS NOT AT RISK

(By Rep. Sander Levin)

Over the past decade, currency manipulation by foreign governments has resulted in an increase in unfairly traded imports into the United States and has made it more difficult for U.S. exporters to compete in foreign markets. The practice has cost U.S. workers between one million and five million jobs—and is responsible for as much as half of excess unemployment in the United States. It has contributed to stagnant wages and to inequality in the United States. And it contributed to the global financial crisis.*

Bipartisan majorities in the House and the Senate have urged the Administration to include strong and enforceable currency obligations in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which includes a number of former currency manipulators, such as Japan. Other countries interested in joining TPP in the future—such as China, Korea, and Taiwan—are also current or former currency manipulators.

The IMF already prohibits currency manipulation and has developed guidelines to define when it occurs. The problem is that the IMF lacks an enforcement mechanism.

I have proposed taking the existing IMF guidelines, building upon them, and establishing an enforcement mechanism through the TPP. Other groups and economists, such as the American Automotive Policy Council (AAPC) and Fred Bergsten of the Peterson Institute, have tabled similar proposals. Economists on the right and left support including currency disciplines in TPP. And the Commission on Inclusive Prosperity recently stated: ''New trade agreements should explicitly include enforceable disciplines against currency manipulation that appropriately tie mutual trade preferences to mutual recognition that exchange rates should not be allowed to subsidize one party's exports at the expense of others.'' Currency manipulation must become a subject in the TPP negotiations.

A chief concern about including strong and enforceable currency disciplines in TPP is that U.S. monetary policy could be successfully challenged by our trading partners, given that our expansionary monetary policy (in the form of 'quantitative easing') may have had the secondary effect of weakening the dollar. What follows is a factual response to that concern.

Again, my proposal is to take the IMF guidelines and make them enforceable. Under the IMF guidelines, currency manipulation is about government interventions in the foreign exchange markets, not about other policies that may have a secondary impact on foreign exchange rates. The IMF guidelines clearly distinguish between currency manipulation—government intervention in foreign exchange markets—and monetary policy.

Article IV of the IMF's Articles of Agreement states that ''each member shall . . . avoid manipulating exchange rates . . . to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other members.'' The IMF has gone on to provide seven factors in its Guidelines to determine whether a country is manipulating its currency. The following review of each factor identified in those guidelines demonstrates that U.S. monetary policy, including quantitative easing, cannot be described as a form of currency manipulation.

Factor 1: Protracted Large-Scale Intervention, in One Direction, in Currency Markets.

The United States intervenes in the currency market less than almost any other

country in the world. The United States has only intervened in the currency markets a total of three days since the late 1990s: June 17, 1998 (during the Asian exchange rate/financial crisis); September 22, 2000 (after the euro was introduced and concerns grew over the euro's significant depreciation against the dollar); and March 18, 2011 (in connection with a Japanese earthquake and tsunami). These three interventions over nearly 20 years cannot be described as ''protracted'' interventions. Compare this record with, for example, China's interventions over the past decade, which have occurred almost daily, and almost always in the same direction, to weaken their currency.

The circumstances surrounding these three interventions are consistent with the Federal Reserve's Foreign Currency Directive: interventions ''shall generally be directed at countering disorderly market conditions.'' They are therefore not consistent with the objective of ''gaining an unfair competitive advantage'' over its trading partners, which is what currency manipulation is about. In fact, the IMF recommends and encourages members to intervene ''to counter disorderly conditions.'' It is also worth noting that in these three instances, the United States coordinated its intervention with the other countries involved, again demonstrating that the action was not taken to gain a competitive advantage. Indeed, in all three cases the other country requested the intervention of the United States.

While the United States has a flexible exchange rate (i.e., it lets the market determine its value), it is also important to note that the IMF Guidelines do not prevent other countries from establishing a fixed or managed exchange rate. The Guidelines only provide that the rate cannot be set at a consistently artificially low level (i.e., countries may engage in ''protracted, large scale'' interventions, so long as all of these interventions are not all in the same ''direction'').

Factor 2: Excessive Accumulation of Foreign Exchange Reserves.

Despite the fact that the United States has the largest or second largest economy in the world, the United States holds fewer foreign exchange reserves than Thailand, Algeria, and Saudi Arabia, among others. Further, China has 25 times as many foreign exchange reserves (nearly $4 trillion) as the United States ($126 billion).

Economists generally use four benchmarks, cited by Treasury in 2006 and 2014 reports, to determine whether a country's reserves are excessive. U.S. reserves are well below each benchmark:

Benchmark #1—Reserves may be excessive if they exceed 100% of short-term external debt (commonly referred to as the ''Guidotti-Greenspan Rule''). U.S. reserves are equal to 2% of its short-term external debt ($1.2 trillion). If only taking into account debt denominated in foreign currencies, U.S. reserves would equal 38% of short-term debt. Note, however, that this benchmark was designed with emerging markets in mind, not the U.S. economy.

By way of comparison, China's reserves are about 700% (i.e., seven times greater than) its short-term external debt.

Benchmark #2—Reserves are excessive if they exceed 5–20% of money supply, commonly referred to as M2. U.S. reserves are 1.1% of U.S. M2 ($11.7 trillion). China's reserves are 43% of its M2.

Benchmark #3—Reserves are excessive if they exceed 20% of GDP. U.S. reserves are less than 1% of U.S. GDP (around $17 trillion). China's reserves are 42% of its GDP.

Benchmark #4—Reserves are excessive if they exceed 3–4 months of imports. U.S. reserves equal less than a single month of U.S. imports (about $200 billion). China's reserves equal 23 months of its imports.

Factor 3: Restrictions on/Incentives for Transactions or Capital Flows for Balance of Payments Purposes.

The United States has one of the least restrictive regulatory structures in the world concerning the free flow of capital. In fact, the World Economic Forum ranks the United States first in the world in terms of capital account liberalization and second in the world under a more general 'financial development' index.

Factor 4: Encouragement of Capital Flows through Monetary Policy for Balance of Payments Purposes.

This is the only guideline that even mentions monetary policy. And while the United States—and every other country in the world—does have a monetary policy, the purpose of U.S. monetary policy is neither to encourage capital flows nor to achieve a balance in payments. The goals of U.S. monetary policy are spelled out in the Federal Reserve Act, which specifies that the Board of Governors and the Federal Open Market Committee should seek ''to promote effectively the goals of maximum employment, stable prices, and moderate long-term interest rates.''

Indeed, the IMF has explicitly supported U.S. monetary policy (including each round of quantitative easing since the ''Great Recession''). As the IMF said in its most recent report ''[IMF] Directors agreed that the current highly accommodative stance of monetary policy is appropriate, consistent with the Federal Reserve's objectives of maximum employment and price stability.'' The IMF has also noted that U.S. monetary policy has been good for other nations ('positive spillover effects') because it has helped to sustain global growth. Similarly, the G-20 (which includes China, Japan, Korea, the United States, and three other TPP countries) has distinguished between monetary policy and exchange rate policy—and has recognized ''the support that has been provided to the global economy in recent years from accommodative monetary policies, including unconventional monetary policies.''

Factor 5: Fundamental Exchange Rate Misalignment.

If anything, the U.S. dollar is properly valued or even overvalued, not undervalued, according to the most recent IMF data and estimates. Further, given the continued weakening of the yen and euro, many expect the dollar to further strengthen in value in 2015.

Factor 6: Long and Sustained Current Account Surpluses.

The United States has had just one current account surplus since 1981. In fact, the United States has been running large current account and trade deficits for almost four decades. Indeed, those imbalances are a major cause of concern to many economists—and currency manipulation by other countries has contributed substantially to the U.S. trade deficits in recent years.

Factor 7: Large External Sector Vulnerabilities from Private Capital Flows.

While the United States does have external sector vulnerabilities (i.e., private and public sector debt owed to foreigners), as reflected in the large current account deficit, much of those vulnerabilities stem from purchases of U.S. debt by foreign governments—not private capital flows. And much of those purchases by foreign governments are the result of foreign government intervention in the currency markets that result in the accumulation of foreign reserves. Thus, if anything, this factor, like Factor 6, tends to suggest that the United States is a casualty of other governments' currency manipulation, not that it is manipulating itself.

The IMF Guidelines demonstrate that the United States is not manipulating its currency and would not be at risk of losing a dispute. The far greater risk is that more middle class jobs will be lost in the United States as a result of foreign governments' currency manipulation. We need strong and enforceable disciplines in TPP to help prevent that from happening.

ENDNOTE

*China's currency manipulation ''is arguably the most important cause of the financial crisis. Starting around the middle of this decade, China's cheap currency led it to run a massive trade surplus. The earnings from that surplus poured into the United States. The result was the mortgage bubble.'' Sebastian Mallaby, ''What OPEC Teaches China,'' Washington Post op-ed (Jan. 2009). The Bush Administration White House also drew the connection: ''the President highlighted a factor that economists agree on: that the most significant factor leading to the housing crisis was cheap money flowing into the U.S. from the rest of the world, so that there was no natural restraint on flush lenders to push loans on Americans in risky ways. This flow of funds into the U.S. was unprecedented.'' Statement by White House Press Secretary Dana Perino (Dec. 2008). Most of the cheap money flowing into the United States came from foreign governments (not the private sector) accumulating foreign exchange reserves and other official assets. See Joseph E. Gagnon, ''Global Imbalances and Foreign Asset Expansion by Developing-Economy Central Banks,'' Peterson Institute for International Economics (Mar. 2012).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have seen no serious rebuttal of the points I made in that post or to similar and related points made by Simon Johnson, Fred Bergsten, and many other notable economists ranging from Art Laffer to Paul Krugman. Nevertheless, those who oppose currency disciplines continue to raise this false argument.

Mr. Speaker, TPP should address instances in which countries buy large amounts of foreign assets over long periods of time to prevent an appreciation of their exchange rate despite running a large current account surplus. The Federal Reserve does not engage in such practices. That is why the U.S. already agreed to and even insisted upon what is in the current IMF guidelines.

And now there is the claim that including currency disciplines in TPP would be a poison pill and that our trading partners would walk away from the table. There is no way to accurately judge this issue until it is properly brought to the negotiating table. To the contrary, the fact is that the administration says this only creates the risk of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

□ 1415

It is irresponsible to make this claim. Indeed, our trading partners in TPP would greatly benefit from these disciplines. Many of them are the victims of manipulation in every bit as much as we are.

A progressive trade agreement for workers and the middle class must address currency manipulation, which has caused millions of job losses and contributed to waste stagnation over the last decade. President Obama is right that we should write the rules and not accept the status quo; but, if

we fail to do address currency manipulation in TPP, we are essentially letting China write the rules and are accepting an unacceptable status quo.

It is vital that our trade agreements balance strong intellectual property rights and access to affordable, lifesaving medicines. Absent a change in course, the final TPP text is likely to provide less access to affordable medicines than provided under the May 10 agreement. My staff has just reviewed a new version of the text that raises some serious new questions; but even the last version of the text raised serious concerns.

For example, developing countries would likely be required to ''graduate'' to more restrictive intellectual property rights standards before they become developed, a clear inconsistency with May 10. There are also a number of concerns that the TPP agreement will restrict access to medicines in the U.S. and other developed countries, for example, by encouraging second patents on similar products, by having long periods of data exclusivity for biologic medicines, by allowing drug companies to challenge government pricing and reimbursement decisions.

Oxfam, a coalition of 17 international development organizations, recently said:

> TPP would do more to undermine access to affordable medicines than any previous U.S. trade agreement, and the intellectual property provisions in TPP reverse the positive step taken under the May 10 agreement in 2007 . . . and thus are a step backwards for public health.

And amFAR, the Foundation for AIDS Research, said this:

> Our gains in reducing global HIV infections would never have been realized if the proposed provisions under the TPP were the intellectual property standard in 2001.

For most of the past 15 years, our trade deficit with Japan has been second only to our deficit with China, and over two-thirds of the current deficit is in automotive products.

Japan has long had the most closed automotive market of any industrialized country, despite repeated efforts by U.S. negotiators over decades to open it. At a minimum, the U.S. should not open its market further to Japanese imports, through the phaseout of tariffs, until we have time to see whether Japan has truly opened its market.

The administration has not stated a specific period of time for when the phaseout in U.S. tariffs for autos, trucks, and auto parts would begin or when they would end. The parties are also still working to address certain nontariff barriers that Japan utilizes to close their market.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA bill broadly states that the U.S. should ''expand competitive market opportunities for export of goods.'' Such a broad negotiating objective provides no guidance regarding how to truly open the Japanese automotive market.

On the related issue of rules of origin, there are a number of rules of origin being negotiated in the TPP for different products, including in the sensitive textile and apparel, agricultural, and automotive sectors. Some of the rules are largely settled while others, including the rules for automotive products, remain open and controversial.

Rules of origin define the extent to which inputs from outside the TPP region—for example, China—can be incorporated into an end product for that product to still be entitled to preferential/duty-free treatment under the agreement.

The rule should be restrictive enough to ensure that the benefits of the agreement accrue to the parties to the agreement. The automotive rule of origin in TPP should be at least as stringent as the rule in NAFTA, given that TPP involves all three of the NAFTA countries, plus nine others.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA bill provides no guidance whatsoever on any rule of origin on any product in the TPP negotiations. It appears that the U.S. and Japan will agree that Japan will reduce tariffs, but never eliminate them, on hundreds of agricultural products, far more carve-outs than under any U.S. trade agreement in the past.

Canada, on the other hand, has not put any offer on the table for dairy products, which is causing some concern in the dairy industry.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA bill has as its objective, ''reducing or eliminating'' tariffs on agricultural products; thus even Japan's opening offer, to reduce but never eliminate tariffs on nearly 600 products, satisfied this objective, demonstrating that it is meaningless.

The TPP negotiations are taking a different approach on environment than we did in the May 10 agreement and in our FTAs with Peru, Panama, Colombia, and Korea, where we stated simply that each country was obligated to implement seven multilateral environment agreements.

TPP negotiators are trying to build the same obligations from scratch, and we still do not know if they have succeeded. Words like ''endeavor'' and ''take steps to'' are not going to lead to the revolutionary changes we have been told to expect.

The President said at Nike recently that the TPP environmental chapter would ''help us do things that haven't been done before.'' Actually, we have done these things before. In May 10, Peru included a special annex on deforestation. It needs more vigorous enforcement.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA bill is obsolete in providing instructions since the TPP is already taking a different approach. The TPA bill also does not address whether or how climate change issues should be handled in TPP, an issue raised by other countries in the TPP negotiations.

There are now more cases of private investors challenging environmental, health, and other regulations in nations, even nations with strong and independent judicial systems and rule of law.

Just last month—just last month—an investor won a NAFTA ISDS case in which the government of Nova Scotia denied a permit to develop a quarry in an environmentally sensitive area.

Other investment disputes involve ''plain packaging'' of tobacco products in Australia aimed at protecting public health and pharmaceutical patent requirements in Canada. This issue is receiving heightened scrutiny among negotiators and from a broad range of interested parties.

Some of our TPP partners do not support ISDS or are seeking safeguards to ensure that nations preserve their right to regulate. The Economist magazine, the Cato Institute, and the Government of Germany—the birthplace of ISDS—have also recently expressed concerns with ISDS.

As far back as 2007, when the May 10 agreement was reached, we recognized growing concerns over investment and ISDS. We insisted that our trade agreements with Peru, Panama, Colombia, and Korea include new preambular language clarifying that the investment obligations in those agreements are not invented to provide foreign investors with greater substantive rights than investors have under U.S. law.

Over the past few years, our concerns over the investment text and ISDS have become even greater. Nevertheless, our negotiators have refused to include the May 10 preambular language in TPP, and the text of the investment chapter in TPP is basically the same model as adopted 10 years ago, even though conditions have changed dramatically in the past 10 years and calls for changes to or elimination of the chapter have intensified.

Despite proposals to include new safeguards in the ISDS mechanism, the administration has not made any attempts to incorporate them.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA investment negotiating objective is the same as it was 12 years ago and, again, is obsolete.

TPP does not ensure compliance by TPP parties that have labor laws and practices that fall short of international standards contained in the May 10 agreement, even though TPP is expected to include the May 10 language.

Vietnam presents the greatest challenge we have ever had in ensuring compliance. Workers there are prohibited from joining any union independent of the Communist Party. While the administration is discussing these issues with Vietnam, Members of Congress and stakeholder advisers have not yet seen any proposal to address these critical areas.

On a recent trip to Vietnam, I met a woman who had been thrown in jail for 4 years for trying to organize workers into an independent union. We cannot simply have the right written obligation in the agreement and expect that

some future dispute settlement panel is going to ensure meaningful change on the ground for workers.

The administration has not committed to ensuring that all changes to laws and regulations are made before Congress votes, as was true with Peru, Panama, and Colombia.

The administration also does not make available to Members of Congress any ''consistency plan'' they are discussing with Vietnam so that we can evaluate the changes to Vietnamese laws and practices they are seeking.

From what I understand, any plan will fall far short of bringing Vietnam into compliance with basic ILO standards, as required under the May 10 agreement. For example, I am concerned Vietnam may refuse to allow industrywide unions to form, a clear inconsistency with ILO standards. Our negotiators also have refused to accept our suggestion that an independent panel be established from the beginning to ensure compliance with the labor obligations and expedite a dispute.

Without such a structure, future cases will need to be built from scratch by outside groups and submitted to the U.S. Government, a process which has taken several years for the Department of Labor to act on in Honduras and Guatemala.

The President said recently that Vietnam ''would even have to protect workers' freedom to form unions, for the first time,'' but the TPP that USTR is negotiating seems far from ensuring those words will become real.

□ 1430

Mexico also has a long way to go. Americans know that Mexico competes in manufacturing. According to Professor Harley Shaiken at UC Berkeley:

''Under NAFTA, the auto industry in Mexico has grown rapidly, and it is in the midst of an unprecedented expansion. Mexico assembled over 3 million vehicles in 2013—more than Canada—and exported over 80 percent of them, mostly to the U.S. Global automakers plan to invest $6.8 billion in Mexico between 2013 and 2015. As a result, Mexico is on track to become the leading source of imported vehicles for the U.S. market by 2015, surpassing both Canada and Mexico. Moreover, Mexico exported $44.8 billion in auto parts to the U.S. last year, more than Japan, Korea, and Germany combined.''

The wage rate in Mexico is about 20 percent of a comparable rate in the U.S.

The administration likes to say that TPP will renegotiate NAFTA. I am all for that, but, again, words in the agreement are not enough. Mexico has to change their laws and their practices. For example, they have to get rid of so-called ''protection contracts'' that serve to block real representation in the workplace, and they need to fundamentally reform or replace the conciliation and arbitration boards that are responsible for resolving disputes over workplace representation and other labor issues. This is vitally important because U.S. workers compete directly with Mexican workers in critical manufacturing and other sectors. While I understand the administration has started conversations with Mexico, I am not informed of any consistency plan that would detail the changes Mexico needs to make to their laws.

TPP negotiators are also working on disciplines for state-owned enterprises, or SOEs. Countries that rely heavily on state-controlled and state-funded enterprises are able to give those champions an enormous and unfair advantage over private companies that compete against them in the marketplace.

The TPP would include disciplines on SOEs that are expected in language to go beyond anything we have ever included in past agreements, but the extent to which an SOE provision will help to level the playing field will be determined by the degree to which parties seek very broad, country-specific carve-outs for particular SOEs. As concerning, the definition of ''SOEs'' is too narrow, allowing enterprises that are effectively controlled by foreign governments—but where the government owns less than 50 percent of the shares—to circumvent the obligations.

There are several other TPP issues that need to be addressed. Food safety is one of them. There is a very broad consensus that not enough resources are being devoted to ensure the safety of our imports. What are we going to do about this issue? It is a real issue in the debate. Unfortunately, specific portions of the negotiations and the shortcomings in TPP are often difficult to discuss because the documents are classified.

I have not argued that the entire negotiations should be open to the public. I understand that, in a wide range of contexts, from peace negotiations to labor negotiations, it is widely assumed that negotiations at times need to be held behind closed doors, and at this point, I am not convinced that trade negotiations are different. The negotiators need to communicate frequently and effectively with stakeholders to ensure that they are seeking the right provisions in negotiations. In a number of respects, our negotiators were not doing that when the TPP negotiations were in the early or even not so early stages.

Thanks to constant pressure from Members of Congress over the past several years, we have made some progress in this regard. For example, just a couple of years ago, USTR refused to share the bracketed text—laying out the positions of various parties—with any Member of Congress. We got them to change that. Much more recently, they refused to let staff from personal offices assist their Members with the text even where the staff member had a top secret security clearance. We got them to change that.

Still, there remain unreasonable and burdensome restrictions on access to the text. For example, Congress created a system of stakeholder advisers many years ago to provide advice to our negotiators and to Congress on the negotiations, but those advisers still can only see U.S. negotiating proposals. They cannot see the proposals of our trading partners. It is very difficult, if not impossible, for them to provide negotiating advice if they can't know what the other side is seeking. Moreover, personal office staff with top secret security clearances still cannot see the negotiating text until the Member is present.

Let me say a few more words about this.

I am not at all confident that our negotiators are sharing with Members of Congress or the stakeholder advisers all of the texts that are being exchanged with other TPP countries. For example, we know our negotiators, as I have said, have been discussing a labor consistency plan with Vietnam for many months now at least, but there is still no text for Members of Congress to review. This is one of the major outstanding issues in TPP, and yet there is no text to review despite the fact that USTR has told us for at least a year now that the negotiations were nearly complete. At a recent meeting to discuss Vietnam, it was classified so that the status of negotiations on this issue cannot be discussed publicly. Many of us left less confident that there has been any progress in the negotiations.

Or take currency manipulation. For years, literally, we have pressed what the administration's position is on the issue given that majorities in both the House and the Senate have urged that strong and enforceable currency disciplines be included in TPP. For years, the administration said it was still deliberating on the issue and had no answer. Now, when pushed through the TPA debate in Congress, the administration claims that they could not possibly include enforceable disciplines in TPP because they would be a poison pill.

Finally, I do not understand why the administration is selectively able to reveal to the public certain aspects that they think the public will like, but those of us who have concerns cannot reveal them. We have examples of officials revealing to the press very specific things from the negotiating text, like when tariffs will be eliminated on a particular product. In my view, as to the Environment Chapter, the problem with that chapter is that many of the verbs used in those obligations—the essence of the commitments—are very weak, but I, presumably, can't tell you what those verbs are.

So one has a hard time understanding the rationale for this process. The way it has been handled by the administration does not make Members and other key parties real participants with a meaningful role, understanding and impacting decisions undertaken in this important negotiation.

Let me say a word regarding an issue that has come up recently. In addition to falling short in getting TPP on the right track, the TPA bill also presents dangers with other agreements. This TPA will be, essentially, in place for 6 years. It gives the President a great deal of latitude in deciding which agreements to negotiate with whatever trading partners the President wants and covering whatever subject the President wants.

Recently, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN drew heavy criticism for expressing the concern that TPA could be used by a Republican President to undermine Dodd-Frank. The concern was dismissed as speculative and desperate, but as explained below, the concern is genuine and legitimate.

In ongoing trade agreement negotiations to establish a TTIP, European officials, U.S. and European banks, and some congressional Republicans have expressed an interest in harmonizing U.S. and EU financial services in a way that would water down U.S. laws and regulations. Similarly, some Republican Presidential candidates have expressed an interest in weakening or in repealing Dodd-Frank, although not simply through the TTIP negotiations. Of course, doing so through TTIP negotiations would give the President the excuse that agreeing to weaken Dodd-Frank was simply part of a quid pro quo to get something we wanted from Europe.

According to an article from Politico: ''White House and pro-trade officials on the Hill say that the fast-track bill currently before Congress includes language that expressly forbids changing U.S. law without congressional action.'' But this language is nothing new. Legislation to implement trade agreements typically includes similar language. The purpose of the language is simply to make clear that, under U.S. law, our trade agreements do not have ''direct effect'' and are not ''self-executing,'' meaning that domestic laws and regulations need to be amended to give effect to any obligation in an international agreement.

Implementing bills typically make changes to U.S. tariff laws to comply with the tariff obligations of trade agreements, but some implementing bills make more substantial, behind-the-border changes to U.S. laws to comply with the obligations in our trade agreements. That has been true of changes to U.S. patent laws and changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With all of these concerns in mind—and, above all, my determination to do everything I can to get TPP in shape to garner broad, bipartisan support in Congress—the Ways and Means Democrats offered a substitute amendment during the markup of the TPA bill. That amendment, the Right Track for TPP Act, includes negotiating instructions, not merely ''negotiating objectives'' like the TPA bill, on each of the 12 major outstanding issues, some of which I have described earlier. It provides that the President will not get an up-or-down vote unless and until Congress determines that the instructions have been followed. It also includes real mechanisms to ensure that a poorly negotiated TPP agreement will not be placed on a fast track.

Regrettably, our substitute amendment was blocked in committee based on a highly questionable procedural determination from the chair. In essence, while the Republican majority was free to mark up a bill that was in both the jurisdiction of our committee and the Rules Committee, we were denied the right to do the very same thing. Our chair was concerned about stepping on the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee, and yet the Rules Committee has waived jurisdiction over the TPA bill.

As is often the case with trade debates, they become about something they are not. This debate is not about being for TPP or against. I am for the right TPP, and that is why I want Congress to be in a position to press negotiators to secure a better outcome.

This debate is not about letting China write the rules. I wrote the amendments to the bill granting China PNTR to try and ensure China did not write the rules when they entered the WTO.

□ 1445

This debate is not about isolationism. Neither I nor any colleague of mine is arguing that we should pull up the drawbridge and isolate ourselves. Indeed, most of us who currently oppose TPA right now have demonstrated on a broad range of issues that we are internationalists, perhaps more so than those who support TPA.

This debate is not about national security or the pivot to Asia. I understand the national security issues. Indeed, what happened was years ago Wilbur Mills said let's take trade negotiations out of the State Department and put them in USTR in order to be sure that the economic advantages were not traded away for political advantages.

In the world today, I don't see how a trade agreement can be in our national security interest if it isn't in our economic interest. Fifty years ago, when the U.S. was an economic superpower, unlike any other nation in the world, maybe we could grant our trading partners disproportionate and nonreciprocal conditions in exchange for political advantages. That is what Wilbur Mills said. That is not the case today. Our economic security is critical to our national security.

Proponents of TPA are trying to sell TPA by selling TPP itself. Unfortunately, that is the problem. TPP is not yet on the right track. It has not earned ''the most progressive trade agreement in history'' moniker that the President has given it. The best course for Congress is to withhold fast track until we know TPP is on a better course, to press the administration to work with us and really respond to our concerns by changing the course of negotiations, to send a signal to our negotiating partners that the Congress has set a high bar for negotiations, that we are demanding the best deal; and, in a number of areas, I think these countries will welcome the improvements I have suggested.

At the end of the day, the goal is to achieve a Trans-Pacific Partnership worthy of support, a TPP that spreads the benefits of trade to the broadest swath of the American public and addresses trade's negative impacts. That is really what this negotiation is all about. This is what really, really very much motivates my concern to get TPP right, not to give away our leverage until TPP is correct.

Voting now for TPA, when there is so much yet to be done to make TPP right, essentially gives away our leverage, essentially is a kind of a blank check to the administration. I feel so deeply about the importance of trade, the importance of getting it right, that I really urge that should be our focus.

So I urge my colleagues not to give away our leverage, not to vote for TPA until TPP is done correctly. That is the challenge before us. That is the challenge likely to be before the House of Representatives the week after next. That is a challenge that we must surmount. That is a challenge that we must meet. That is a reflection of the years of many of us in trying to make trade be put on the right track.

That motivated us years ago when we put together the May 10 agreement; that motivated us when we negotiated the agreement with Peru, we who negotiated it. That is our dedication. We support trade when expanded trade is shaped so that all benefit. That is not true today of this TPP, and therefore I hope my colleagues will join together in voting ''no'' on TPA until TPP is gotten right. That is our goal; that is our purpose—that is our only purpose—and I think that is our challenge, and I hope the week after next we are going to meet it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, America is a beacon of hope and opportunity to the world for a reason. Our military veterans, whom we honor this Monday during Memorial Day, put their lives on the line for our freedoms and constitutional rights. Our Founders put in place a Constitution that is inspired by the fundamental Judeo-Christian belief that men and women are created in God's image, with the right to life, property, freedom to worship, and carry out their

religious convictions without government interference or persecution.

We may take this idea for granted today, with 250 years of history at our backs, but at the time of our Nation's founding, the idea of religious freedom was radical. The world was a different place then. God-fearing, peaceful citizens around the world were commonly persecuted for their beliefs. They were tortured and thrown in prison without a fair hearing. In short, they did not have freedom. These are rights and freedoms that many in our country take for granted. They were denied what our Founders held to be basic human rights.

So at a great risk to themselves and their families, but with deeply held optimism for a new and better future, they sailed the Atlantic Ocean for the shores of the New World, for America.

Here they planted a new society based on freedom. Centuries later, we in this legislative body, are the guardians of this legacy. We are here to advance freedom and protect liberty. But we must be vigilant in this task.

President Ronald Reagan once said:

> Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States where men were free.

I agree with President Reagan, and that is why I rise today. Our basic freedoms are under attack. We must stand up and fight. We don't need to search long to find the wreckage of a society that does not value freedom.

I recently met with a group of constituents, Syrian Americans who live in Charleston, West Virginia. Many of them have family members and loved ones in Syria. Their stories provide a strong warning to us. In Syria, a cruel and brutal dictator, al-Assad, is attempting to silence opposing views. He has resorted to chemical weapon attacks on his own people. He has gunned down his own citizens. He has bombed hospitals and apartment complexes full of women and children. We can learn an important lesson from Syria: once tyranny grabs hold, it will grow and expand its reach. And the consequences can be drastic. In Syria, 4 out of 5 people live in poverty, more than 200,000 have been killed, a million wounded, and more than 3 million have fled the country.

But we should not be so arrogant as to think that our liberties here at home in the United States are safe. The evidence that our basic freedoms are under siege is growing, and I would like to share just a few stories that have recently come to my attention. For example, an 8-year-old second grade student in a New Jersey public school wanted to sing ''Awesome God'' at her after-school talent show, but she was told she couldn't because of the song's religious lyrics.

The Arizona Republic reported in July of 2012 that the pastor of a church in Phoenix, Arizona, was jailed and fined $12,000 for hosting a Bible study meeting in his private home. They outrageously claimed it violated zoning and fire code ordinances.

Five men in Richmond, Virginia, were threatened with arrest by local police officers for sharing their faith on a public sidewalk.

The University of Missouri threatened to withhold a student's diploma because she refused to participate in a class assignment that required her to write a letter to the Missouri legislator in support of homosexual adoption.

In a New York hospital, a pro-life nurse was coerced into providing a late-term abortion, even though her workplace had agreed in writing to honor her religious beliefs.

And in the beautiful Second Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have the honor of representing, Joe Holland, a businessowner, is currently being pushed to violate his religious views and values by an ObamaCare regulation that requires him to provide abortifacient drugs to his employees as a part of so-called health care. A regulation commonly known as the HHS mandate requires him to provide the drugs or face a penalty of $100 per day per employee. For a company of 150 employees, that is about $5.5 million a year, or about $36,000 per employee.

These are just a few of the alarming stories about the religious freedoms of peaceful, God-fearing Americans being snatched away by a government that has lost its way. It is no coincidence that the very First Amendment to the United States Constitution says: ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.''

Religious freedom was protected in the First Amendment to the Constitution. Our Forefathers valued that. They knew what could happen if we didn't protect our religious freedom.

We must take action and recommit ourselves to this basic right. Congress actually has taken action in the past on a bipartisan basis. In 1993, Congress passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, signed by President Clinton. The law says the government should not force anyone to violate their sincere religious beliefs, whether those beliefs are considered widely shared or not. This legislation unanimously passed this Chamber, United States House of Representatives, and it passed the Senate by a vote of 97–3 on October 27, 1993.

The broad support is because the legislation simply affirms our constitutionally endowed rights. But now support for this formerly bipartisan, widely supported law is eroding to the point that it has come under attack around the country, the recent events in Indiana being the recent highest profile example.

I believe that this Congress must be a Congress of action in defending religious freedoms. I understand that my good friend and colleague from Idaho, Mr. LABRADOR, is working on a bill to protect institutions and individuals who believe that marriage is between one man and one woman. I support this effort, and I look forward to being an original cosponsor when he introduces the bill.

I am also a proud cosponsor of the Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act, which will ensure that adoption and foster care providers are not excluded by States for offering their services based on their religious beliefs. Unfortunately, some States have already begun punishing faith-based organizations that provide these services because of their religious beliefs. These religious freedom protections are needed now, and I hope they will be allowed a vote in this Chamber.

We can't do this alone. We do need the President, President Obama, to join with us to protect religious freedom. The President said on June 26, 2013, regarding the U.S. Supreme Court decision to strike down the Defense of Marriage Act the following about religious freedom: ''On an issue as sensitive as this, knowing that Americans hold a wide range of views based on deeply held beliefs, maintaining our Nation's commitment to religious freedom is also vital.''

□ 1500

If the President really believes that religious freedom is ''vital,'' he must back his words up with action. That hasn't happened. In fact, just the opposite has occurred, with the administration's attack on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which attacks those who believe in religious freedom, through its HHS mandate and its attack on the Defense of Marriage Act. He is not protecting religious freedom. We have to do that here.

We have a sacred obligation to pass on to our children and grandchildren a country that has the same love for liberty and religious freedom as the one we inherited, but this won't happen on its own. We need to stand up and fight with courage and conviction, fight right here and right now.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF ALBERT MELVIN MILLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable life and accomplishments of Mr. Albert Melvin Miller, who passed away on Sunday, May 10, at Inova Alexandria Hospital.

Melvin was a well-known political and community leader in the city of Alexandria, Virginia. One of his crowning achievements was his work with the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority, protecting and expanding affordable housing programs across the city.

Mel was a civil rights advocate, a mentor, and a beloved father. He was also a character: kind, interested, ever present, honest, hard-working, inspirational, and—above all—witty. Mel Miller was a person you wanted to spend time with.

Mel grew up in Haddonfield, New Jersey, but his heart belonged to Raleigh, North Carolina, where his alma mater, Saint Augustine's University, is located, and to his adopted hometown of Alexandria, Virginia.

Graduating from Saint Aug's in history and political science, he remained deeply involved with the school by serving on the board of trustees for 35 years and encouraging Alexandria's students to attend his beloved university.

After earning his JD from Howard University School of Law, Melvin was admitted to the Virginia State Bar and moved to Alexandria in 1958. Early in his Alexandria life, Melvin begin his civil rights activism and community involvement by doing pro bono work on school desegregation issues.

This work led him to join an underground association unofficially named the ''Secret Seven,'' which met to discuss possible ways to discuss civil rights and liberties in Alexandria and the surrounding areas. This early local involvement led him to become a prominent figure in Alexandria's education system and the authority and champion for affordable housing.

Melvin's work for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority helped to provide housing for hundreds of Alexandria's poor. His crowning achievement was a deal by Melvin between the city of Alexandria and ARHA, which required any affordable housing that was destroyed to be matched one-for-one with new developments. That deal still stands largely untouched today.

Mel was a tireless mentor of Alexandria's students and an avid high school sports fan. He could often be seen and heard giving advice to local students and cheering at high school sporting events. He also served on the Alexandria school board from 1986 to 1993, serving as board chair from 1990 to 1992.

Mel is survived by his daughter, Ericka Miller; his son, Marc Miller, and wife, Mary; his grandchildren, Max, Chris, Zachary, and Bennett Miller; his daughter-in-law, Vicky McCauley; and a host of other relatives and many friends.

Melvin was preceded in death by son, Eric. His wife of nearly 5 years, Eula Miller, passed away in 2011. Eula was also a tremendous advocate for education in northern Virginia, having helped create many programs supporting caregivers and young mothers in local high schools and Northern Virginia Community College.

I offer my condolences to his family and all the people who have been affected by the loss of this amazing man. Mr. Albert Melvin Miller is a shining example of the effect one person can have on so many local lives. I hope his memory lives as an inspiration for local leaders to come.

At his funeral yesterday, former T.C. Williams High School legendary football coach Herman Boone ended his eulogy with the call to ''Remember the Titan,'' Melvin Miller.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 178. An act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 18, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1191. A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 606. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

Karen L. Haas. Clerk of the House, further reported that on May 19, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2252. To clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 22, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2487. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program to cover recipients of Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2488. A bill to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice by restoring and expanding the Medicare open enrollment and disenrollment opportunities repealed by section 3204(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 2489. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to establish a program to provide grant assistance to States for the rehabilitation and repair of deficient dams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 2490. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the prohibition against interment or memorialization in the National Cemetery Administration or Arlington National Cemetery of persons committing Federal or State capital crimes is consistently carried out, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disinter the remains of George E. Siple from Indiantown Gap National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 2491. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to require consultation with State and local elected officials and a public hearing before awarding grants or contracts for housing facilities for unaccompanied alien children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GRAHAM (for herself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 2492. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to provide for modification of certain Federal water resources development

projects on the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2493. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage the use of assistance dogs by certain members of the Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BASS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2494. A bill to support global anti-poaching efforts, strengthen the capacity of partner countries to counter wildlife trafficking, designate major wildlife trafficking countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Natural Resources, 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. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. HAHN, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2495. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for the TIGER Discretionary Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on 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. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2496. A bill to extend the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, to make certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. considered and passed.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 2497. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to eliminate duplicative environmental reviews and approvals under State and Federal law of rail and highway projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on 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. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 2498. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require that the Congressional Budget Office prepare long-term estimates for reported bill and joint resolutions that would have significant fiscal impact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on 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. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BOST, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 2499. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs, to help create jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2500. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 2501. A bill to require certain States to retain the Congressional redistricting plans in effect as of the first day of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress until such States carry out a redistricting plan in response to the apportionment of Representatives resulting from the regular decennial census conducted in 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 2502. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for bundled payments for certain episodes of care surrounding a hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 2503. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to prevent the payment of unemployment benefits to incarcerated individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2504. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2505. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2506. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2507. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 2508. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit further reductions in sodium levels and to reinstate the grain-rich requirements applicable to the national school lunch and breakfast programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 2509. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Social Security Act relating to demonstration projects designed to promote the reemployment of unemployed workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DOLD, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 2510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. REED (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2511. A bill to condition the eligiblity of disabled children aged 16 or 17 for supplemental security income benefits on school attendance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2512. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make clear that Federal employees who receive back pay for a period during which they are furloughed due to a lapse in appropriations may not also receive unemployment compensation for the same period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 2513. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of hospitals under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent veterans from being disqualified from contributing to health savings accounts by reason of receiving medical care for service-connected disabilities under programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to eating disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JONES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2516. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of health care professionals to treat veterans via telemedicine; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2517. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring energy tax incentives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 2518. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of postsecondary enrollment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 2519. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of audiologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing audiology services under the Medicare program, to improve access to the audiology services available for coverage under the Medicare program and to enable beneficiaries to have their choice of a qualified audiologist to provide such services, 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. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of excise tax on distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 2521. A bill to reinstate Federal Pell Grant eligibility for individuals incarcerated in Federal and State penal institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2522. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to award grants for the provision of furniture, household items, and other assistance to homeless veterans to facilitate their transition into permanent housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2523. A bill to make improvements to the antidumping and countervailing duty laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KIND, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DOLD, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitations for deductible new business expenditures and to consolidate provisions for start-up and organizational expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VELA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COSTA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YODER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. TORRES, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BOST, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 2525. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of Hero Street USA; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 2526. A bill to require automobile manufacturers to disclose to consumers the presence of event data recorders, or ''black boxes'', on new automobiles, and to require manufacturers to provide the consumer with the option to enable and disable such devices on future automobiles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2527. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7802 37th Avenue in Jackson Heights, New York, as the ''Jeanne Sobelson Manford Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2528. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to States to pay the Federal share of carrying out full-day prekindergarten programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2529. A bill to establish limitations on the quantity of inorganic arsenic in rice and rice products under chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. TAKAI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr.

LIPINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 2530. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for private lactation areas in the terminals of large and medium hub airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COOK, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KIND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2531. A bill to amend section 701 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to clarify the period of eligibility during which certain spouses are entitled to assistance under the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 2532. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance the authority under which Federal agencies may pay cash awards to employees for making cost saving disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 2533. A bill to amend the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 relating to local guard contracts abroad under the diplomatic security program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 2534. A bill to amend the Security and Accountability For Every Port Act of 2006 (the SAFE PORT Act) to administer a pilot program for 100 percent scanning of cargo containers at domestic ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 2535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a $1,000 refundable credit for individuals who are bona fide volunteer members of volunteer firefighting and emergency medical service organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 2536. A bill to provide access to medication-assisted therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 2537. A bill to provide for higher education reform; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 2538. A bill to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 2539. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the amount of monthly dependency and indemnity compensation payable to surviving spouses by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2540. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to raise awareness of, and to educate breast cancer patients anticipating surgery, especially patients who are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, regarding the availability and coverage of breast reconstruction, prostheses, and other options; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2541. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2542. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish requirements for releasing a cosigner from obligations of a private education loan, for the treatment of the loan upon the death or bankruptcy of a cosigner of the loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2543. A bill to establish a State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2544. A bill to amend the USEC Privatization Act to require the Secretary of Energy to issue a long-term Federal excess uranium inventory management plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2545. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to educational organizations to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2546. A bill to prohibit the sale of a firearm to, and the purchase of a firearm by, a person who is not covered by appropriate liability insurance coverage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2547. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the development of accelerated approval development plans for investigational drugs and biological products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2548. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to a national pediatric research network; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2549. A bill to amend the HITECH Act with respect to accessing, sharing, and using health data for research purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2550. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare payment incentives to transition from traditional x-ray imaging to digital radiography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BLUM, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BOST, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 2551. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that veterans may attend pre-apprenticeship programs using certain educational assistance provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 2552. A bill to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from procuring certain items directly related to the national security unless the items are grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 2553. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to conduct coastal community vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2554. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to designate the Tenmile Recreation Management Area and Porcupine Gulch Protection Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2555. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to award grants to nonprofit veterans service organizations to upgrade the community facilities of such organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2556. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to repeal the authorization for program development and implementation grants for coastal recreation water quality monitoring and notification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 2557. A bill to promote new manufacturing in the United States by providing for greater transparency and timeliness in obtaining necessary permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 2558. A bill to authorize the provision of health care for certain individuals exposed to environmental hazards at Atsugi Naval Air Facility, to establish an advisory board to examine exposures to environmental hazards at such Air Facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services,

and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 2559. A bill to designate the ''PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway'' in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 2560. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to waive any emission standard or other requirement under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412) applicable to the control of asbestos emissions in the demolition or renovation of a condemned building for which there is a reasonable expectation of structural failure; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LATTA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 2561. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Paul A. Smithhisler for acts of valor in November 1918 during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special expensing rules for certain film and television productions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 2563. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow States to regulate tow truck operations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 2564. A bill to accelerate the adoption of smart building technologies in the private sector and key Federal agencies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 2565. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to restore the regular Medicaid matching rate for newly eligible individuals under the Affordable Care Act and to apply up to $15 billion of the savings each year to the Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 2566. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. STEWART, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 2567. A bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith in recognition of their contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WALKER, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MICA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia):

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution recognizing the daisy as the flower for military caregivers; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that an appropriate site in the Memorial Amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery should be provided for a memorial marker to honor the memory of those who have been awarded or are eligible for the Korean Defense Service Medal who are missing in action, are unaccounted for, or died in-theater; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the execution-style murders of United States citizens Ylli, Agron, and Mehmet Bytyqi in the Republic of Serbia in July 1999; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 280. A resolution honoring the House music genre and its ''Godfather'', the late Frankie Knuckles of Chicago, Illinois, for valuable and longstanding contributions to the culture of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia):

H. Res. 281. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the success of Operation Streamline and the importance of prosecuting first time illegal border crossers; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DELANEY):

H. Res. 282. A resolution expressing support for designation of May as ''National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BERA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 283. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month in May as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Res. 284. A resolution recognizing the significance of National Caribbean American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. Res. 285. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should become an international human rights leader by ratifying and implementing certain core international conventions; to the Committee on Foreign

Affairs, 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.

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. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Clause 12, 13 or 14 of section 8 of article I of the Constititution''.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 2488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2490.

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. OLSON:

H.R. 2491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Ms. GRAHAM:

H.R. 2492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 2493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8: to provide for the Common Defense

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18 (the necessary and proper clause).

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 2497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''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. CHABOT:

H.R. 2499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 2500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 2501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to determine the boundaries of districts for the election of Representatives in Congress pursuant to the authority given to make or alter regulations of the times, places and manner of holding elections for Representatives by Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2503.

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 I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 2506.

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. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2507.

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. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 2509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution—''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . . .''

By Mr. TIBERI

H.R. 2510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 7 and Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2512.

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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18

The Congress shall have Power***to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 2517.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution. he Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:
H.R. 2518.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional Authority for the Act is derived from Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:
H.R. 2519.
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 Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:
H.R. 2520.
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 Debt and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. EDWARDS:
H.R. 2521.
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 Mrs. BEATTY:
H.R. 2522.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S Constitution

By Mr. BOST:
H.R. 2523.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUCHANAN:
H.R. 2524.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:
H.R. 2525.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:
H.R. 2526.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:
H.R. 2527.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: ''The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To establish Post Offices and post roads;''

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:
H.R. 2528.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 2529.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:
H.R. 2530.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section I of the Constitution of the United States of America:
''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:
H.R. 2531.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in:
Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:
H.R. 2532.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 & 18.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:
H.R. 2533.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which allows the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce.

By Ms. HAHN:
H.R. 2534.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.
Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. HANNA:
H.R. 2535.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is enumerated in Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides that ''The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imports and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. HIGGINS:
H.R. 2536.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HIMES:
H.R. 2537.
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. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 2538.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
H.R. 2539.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8; Article IV, Section 3.

By Mr. LANCE:
H.R. 2540.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution
This states that ''Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. LANGEVIN:
H.R. 2541.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 2542.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 2543.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

By Mrs. LUMMIS:
H.R. 2544.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes and Article 1 Section 8, Clause 1 to provide for the common defense

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 2545.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Spending Authorization:
Article I Section 8 Clause 3: ''Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;''

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 2546.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes'';

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:
H.R. 2547.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through administering of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:
H.R. 2548.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through the administration of the National Institutes of Health under the Public Health Service Act.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through the regulations and provisions under Title 42 of the United States Code.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through administering of the Social Security Act.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''

Article 1, Section 8, Clasue 12; ''The Congress shall have the power to . . . raise and support armies . . .

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 13 ''To provide and maintain a navy'' And,

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18; ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution''

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 2552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 2553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

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. SALMON:

H.R. 2556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 2557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §1;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 12;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 13;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 14; and

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 18.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution; and Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 2560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2561.

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.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the ''power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . .''

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 2563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 2565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII. Clause VII

To establish post offices and post roads;

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 2566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce among the several states.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 2567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 24: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 139: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 167: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 220: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 235: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MICA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 292: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 381: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 413: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 427: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 456: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 465: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 475: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 486: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 539: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 578: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 607: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 616: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 627: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 628: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 662: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 703: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 721: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 727: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 745: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 765: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 766: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 768: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 793: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 815: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 828: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 837: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 845: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 864: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 879: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 893: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NEAL, Ms. BASS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN,

Mr. BARTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 913: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 915: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 923: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 970: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 973: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 985: Mr. TURNER, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 986: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1089: Mr. KILMER and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1141: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1150: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1151: Mr. JONES, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1170: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1178: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1192: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1197: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOST, and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1202: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1211: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1214: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1218: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1256: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1270: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 1284: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1300: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1309: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1312: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1342: Mr. KATKO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1401: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1413: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1434: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1482: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1537: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1550: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1559: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1565: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1567: Mr. PERRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1572: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 1575: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1576: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1598: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1603: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1604: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1608: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1611: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1644: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1655: Mr. REED.
H.R. 1680: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1692: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1716: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1717: Mr. KILMER and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1718: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1734: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1736: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1737: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1784: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1786: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1801: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1814: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1830: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1842: Mrs. NOEM and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1858: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1859: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1877: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1893: Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1905: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1908: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1910: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1911: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1919: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1924: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1942: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1953: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1964: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1969: Mr. WELCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1986: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1989: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1994: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1996: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 2008: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2013: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2016: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2017: Mr. SIRES and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2025: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2042: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2043: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2058: Mr. LONG, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2061: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2070: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 2082: Ms. TITUS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2096: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2100: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KNIGHT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2123: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2124: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2132: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2193: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2200: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2205: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2213: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 2218: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2221: Ms. ESTY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2233: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. JONES, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2244: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2251: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2259: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2280: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2289: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2290: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2295: Mr. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2300: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 2302: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2304: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2318: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2328: Mr. BARR and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2330: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2341: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2350: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2371: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2379: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2391: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2393: Mr. BRAT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2398: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2403: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2404: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2407: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KIND, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2410: Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2429: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2449: Mr. POCAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2481: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.J. Res. 22: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. SIRES.
H.J. Res. 25: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. POLIS and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 28: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 54: Mr. MACARTHUR and Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 230: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Res. 233: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COOK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H. Res. 262: Mr. TONKO and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 268: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 279: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. YOHO, Ms. MENG, Ms. BASS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1622: Mr. SCHIFF.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 21, 2015 No. 79

CORRECTION

Senate

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, from generation to generation we will speak of Your greatness. Your voice is full of majesty, and we sense Your glory in the thunder. You sit enthroned as King forever. Thank You for the strength You give to all who love You and for the blessings You bestow upon America.

Lord, bless our Senators. Today, guide their thoughts and speech. Lead them on paths that will keep our Nation strong. May they conduct the work of freedom with justice and humility.

We pray in Your Holy 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. HELLER). The majority leader is recognized.

USA FREEDOM ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 2048.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 87, H.R. 2048, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2048, an act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devises, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, Michael B. Enzi, David Vitter, John Cornyn, Johnny Isakson, Lisa Murkowski, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Bob Corker, Orrin G. Hatch, Jerry Moran, Patrick J. Toomey, Mike Lee, Ted Cruz.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion to proceed to H.R. 2048.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The motion is withdrawn.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 1357.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 86, S. 1357, a bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1357, a bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Daniel Coats, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Lamar Alexander, Michael B. Enzi, David Vitter, Johnny Isakson, Roy Blunt.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion on the Hatch amendment, No. 1221, be waived.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2353

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly vote on cloture——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1314, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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.

Pending:

Hatch amendment No. 1221, in the nature of a substitute.

Hatch (for Flake) amendment No. 1243 (to amendment No. 1221), to strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program.

Hatch (for Inhofe/Coons) modified amendment No. 1312 (to amendment No. 1221), to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to require the development of a plan for each sub-Saharan African country for negotiating and entering into free trade agreements.

Hatch (for McCain) amendment No. 1226 (to amendment No. 1221), to repeal a duplicative inspection and grading program.

Stabenow (for Portman) amendment No. 1299 (to amendment No. 1221), to make it a principal negotiating objective of the United States to address currency manipulation in trade agreements.

Brown amendment No. 1251 (to amendment No. 1221), to require the approval of Congress before additional countries may join the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

Wyden (for Shaheen) amendment No. 1227 (to amendment No. 1221), to make trade agreements work for small businesses.

Wyden (for Warren) amendment No. 1327 (to amendment No. 1221), to prohibit the application of the trade authorities procedures to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement that includes investor-state dispute settlement.

Hatch modified amendment No. 1411 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1299), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly vote on cloture on the Hatch substitute amendment, legislation to renew trade promotion authority and trade adjustment assistance. I know some of my colleagues have concerns about the process. Let me say that I also share those concerns.

From the very beginning of our discussions over 3 years ago on the renewal of TPA, I have done all I could to listen to all of my colleagues and address their concerns.

I first worked with Chairman Baucus to find a way to update TPA in a way that addresses many of the issues that have arisen since 2002, including concerns over labor and the environment.

When Senator WYDEN became chairman of the Finance Committee, I again went to the negotiating table to try to address many of the transparency and procedural issues he raised, and we again came to a bipartisan compromise.

When many of my Senate colleagues said renewal of TAA was a necessary component to passing TPA, I again did my best to meet those concerns, even though I myself have significant reservations about the program.

Throughout the Finance Committee consideration, I tried to conduct an open and fair process, which allowed many Members of the committee, even those who opposed TPA, the opportunity to be heard and to have their amendments adopted. As a result, the committee reported out four pieces of trade legislation, all with strong bipartisan support.

I will acknowledge that the process on the floor has not gone the way any of us would like. At the outset of this endeavor, I stated my commitment to a full, fair, and open debate over our TPA legislation. The majority leader made a similar commitment, and I know that was our intention. Indeed, from the very beginning, we had planned to hear everyone's arguments and consider a number of amendments.

This is how the Senate is supposed to function. Once again, we intended to let it function that way. Unfortunately, there were some who did not want to let that happen. They were, from the very beginning, committed to slow-walking this process and preventing regular order. That is just a fact.

I know there are some who want to blame the majority leader for filing cloture and trying to move this process forward. I am sure some are thinking of voting against cloture this morning in protest. That would be a grave mistake.

Let me remind my colleagues that we tried to move to the bill at the beginning of last week. I know, after the many recent long days on the floor, that seems like a long time ago, but I think everyone here can recall what happened.

We attempted to get on the bill, and we were prevented from doing so. After we found a way to address our colleagues' concerns, we were finally able to begin debate on the TPA bill, but even then the process was slow-going.

As debate began, the majority leader attempted to keep the Senate open on Friday and into the weekend to allow Senators to debate and offer amendments. However, the Senate minority leader objected, which prevented the process from moving forward and set us back even further.

Then, we came to this week and debate finally began in earnest. Shortly thereafter, a new strategy emerged, wholly supported by the opponents of TPA. The strategy has been simple: Prevent any amendments from being called up and object to any and all unanimous consent requests.

I have been here on the floor all week, and I have witnessed firsthand the deployment of this plan to frustrate the process and to prevent a full and fair debate on trade policy. Now here we are facing a cloture vote and the prospect of cutting off debate. It is unfortunate that it has come to this, but given the total lack of cooperation we faced and continue to face on this bill, this is really the only option left.

Invoking cloture is not the end. If we can get agreement with our colleagues, I expect there will still be opportunities to call up and vote on amendments, but we cannot just sit around and wait for solutions to come together on their own.

If any Senator has a proposal for a path forward that will reasonably satisfy the various demands and objections that have been raised and allow us to break the logjam on amendments, I am all ears. Until then, our only choice is to press forward. We could extend this debate forever and still not satisfy every demand; there is no question about that. But this bill is far too important.

I have done all I can to address legitimate concerns, and as a result, the bill is supported by me, Chairman RYAN from the House Ways and Means Committee, Ranking Member WYDEN from the Finance Committee, and, most importantly, the President of the United States.

Let's be real here. We need to get this bill passed. Just this morning, I read that a ministerial that was to begin this month has been canceled, in large part due to the fact that Congress has not approved this bill.

Our Nation's economic health and prestige are on the line here today. The TPA bill is the only way Congress can effectively assert its priorities in our ongoing trade negotiations. It is the only way we can ensure that our trade negotiators can reach good deals with our trading partners. It is the only way

we can ensure that our pending trade agreements even have a shot at reaching the finish line.

As I have stated many times here on the floor this week, I am well aware that some of our colleagues here in the Senate oppose this bill outright and will do everything in their power to keep it from passing. As much as I have tried to change hearts and minds on these issues, there is very little I can do about that. But I also know that there is a bipartisan majority of Senators who support TPA and who, despite concerns about process, want to get this done. We are still in a position to reach a positive outcome on this bill.

I said at the beginning of this debate that this was quite possibly the most important debate we will have this year in Congress. It is President Obama's top legislative priority. It is a very high priority for many of us in Congress. On the substance, this is a good TPA bill, one Senators from both parties can support. It needs to pass. We need to pass it for the American workers who want good, high-paying jobs. We need to pass it for our farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs who need access to foreign markets in order to compete. We need to pass it to maintain our standing in the world and continue to advance American values and interests on the world stage. We need to pass it to demonstrate to the American people that despite our many disagreements, their elected representatives are capable of addressing important issues and solving real problems.

There is a path forward here, one that will still allow us to be successful, but in order to get there, we need Senators to support cloture this morning.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on cloture. It is crucial, it is of paramount concern, and it is something very highly wished for by the President of the United States and by a bipartisan majority in this body.

I hope we will vote yes on cloture here today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Presiding Officer for giving me the opportunity to share some remarks.

I do believe Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN allowed a good debate in the committee. Unfortunately, we have not been able to have the kinds of amendments here on the floor that they allowed in the committee, so we are moving to this massive bill with very little debate, even on the fast-track policy. If that is adopted and TPP appears before us here on the floor, there will be no amendments on it.

In a few moments, we will vote on whether to shut off debate on the fast-track authority legislation. I see no reason that we have to rush this.

I will just note that we have the highway bill expiring, and we have the PATRIOT Act expiring. Those are crises which need to be dealt with this week. This bill does not have to be done in that fashion.

This will be a crucial vote. Fast-track is an affirmative decision by Congress to suspend several of its most basic powers for the next 6 years and to delegate those powers to the Chief Executive.

Under the fast-track procedure, the President, not Congress, writes implementing legislation for any yet-unseen global trade pact. That legislation, no matter its contents, cannot be amended in any fashion. No individual Member of Congress can alter any line of text or remove a single provision that violates the will of Congress. That legislation, once called up, is guaranteed a speedy path forward—only 20 hours of debate—and the vote threshold is lowered to a simple majority. No matter how far-reaching the global trade agreement, Congress cannot subject it to the 60 votes applied to important legislation before the Senate or the 67 votes applied to treaties, as it really should be. Congress will have preapproved swift consideration of sweeping global pacts before the text has been made available and seen by a single Member of this body or the American people.

As usual through these processes—and too often—amendments are being constricted and blocked through one maneuver or another. The net result is we are coming down to a cloture vote without any amendments having been voted on.

Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I sent a letter to the President of the United States asking how fast-track and the vast Trans-Pacific Partnership would impact the jobs and wages of American workers. It is a simple question. Would it increase or reduce manufacturing jobs and wages in the United States? Shouldn't we know that? Is that an improper question to ask? He has refused to answer. I think the reason he has refused to answer is because the answer is not good and will not be well received. They want us to shut off debate and move forward without having these fundamental questions answered.

For too long, the United States has entered into trade deals on the promise of economic bounty, only to see workers impoverished and businesses disappear. Dan DiMicco, the chairman Emeritus of Nucor Steel, explains that this is because these free-trade deals have not been free-trade deals at all. Instead, they have been ''unilateral trade disarmament,'' where we lower our barriers to foreign imports but they retain their barriers to our exports to those countries. This is what is fundamentally at stake here. A lot of people, in their religious view of free trade, don't care whether other countries have barriers. Their view is that we should welcome more imports. Mr. DiMicco has called this the ''enablement of foreign mercantilism,'' a philosophy of trade that is too often present around the world and certainly in the Asian sector.

Consider this in the context of automobiles. The Wall Street Journal published a story 2 days ago about how the American auto sector could be jeopardized by TPP. The Journal wrote:

> In the transportation sector, led by cars, the TPP could boost imports by an extra $30.8 billion by 2025, compared with an exports gain of $7.8 billion.

So the imports of automobiles would increase by $30.8 billion and our exports would increase by only $7.8 billion. That was a study written by Peter Petri, professor of international finance at Brandeis University.

Well, having dramatically more imports than exports is not going to add jobs. Perhaps that is why we cannot get an answer. In other words, job-killing imports would vastly exceed any growth in foreign exports, thereby putting more Americans out of work.

We have seen this story before. The South Korea trade deal—and I supported that. I have great respect for the South Korean and the Japanese business acumen. But the South Korean trade deal, which was supposed to boost our exports by more than $10 billion, actually ended up increasing our exports less than $1 billion. If truth be known, it was $0.8 billion. Instead, the deal boosted South Korean imports to our country by more than $12 billion and nearly doubled the trade gap between our two nations, which was already large.

They say: Well, this time it is different. Trust us. Give us 6 more years of executive authority to pass any global deal we like under fast-track. No deal has ever been blocked.

Well, respectfully, the American people don't trust you. Here is what the Pew Poll reported recently: Twenty percent of Americans think these trade agreements create jobs and 50 percent say it destroys jobs.

Have we been adding jobs in manufacturing or losing jobs in manufacturing? We have been losing jobs in manufacturing. Are the American people so wrong in that conclusion? Forty-five percent of Americans think trade reduces wages; only 17 percent say it increases them. By contrast, 72 percent of Vietnamese believe this trade agreement would increase their salaries.

Because TPP is a living agreement, it can be changed after adoption. It says in the language of the agreement where it has this living agreement language that this is unprecedented. This is the first time this has been put in a trade agreement. The Congressional Research Service tells us that, too.

We are now creating a foreign international entity—one more international entity—with a commission that meets and votes and makes decisions that are binding on the United States of America. Frankly, I think this great Nation is exposing itself to too many of these agreements. Tying down the ability of the world's greatest power and economic engine, the United

States, is weakening our ability to function in a way that sovereignty should allow us to function. Dangerously, this agreement creates a new governing global authority that would add new members of their choice, change the terms of the agreement, and even subject U.S. citizens to its ruling—adjudicated in an international tribunal.

It is time for Congress to defend its shareholders—our shareholders—the American people. It is time to return to the regular order and to the principles of sound governance and to assert, not surrender, the power of Congress to the overreaching Chief Executive. I am therefore going to oppose shutting off debate that actually has not even begun.

I am frustrated that two of my reasonable amendments that I think would have had a very good chance of passing have been blocked and apparently will not get a vote. I don't think we have any need to shut off the debate today and to advance to a bill where we have had too few amendments and where we have had a steadfast refusal by the President of the United States, who is pushing every way he can to get this agreement adopted, until he answers the question: Will it improve manufacturing or further reduce manufacturing, as our previous agreement with South Korea did? It reduced manufacturing. Will it increase jobs or reduce jobs? All they promised—and they promised this repeatedly—is that it will increase jobs in the export sector. They don't say what it will do on net, when we have three, four times as many imports as we do exports, on net. As in the past, it appears this agreement will clearly reduce jobs and reduce wages as well, and reduce manufacturing.

We can't have a strong nation without a manufacturing sector—we just cannot. We can't be a strong nation without a steel industry—we just cannot. We need to ensure in these trade agreements—when we open our markets, what these countries want so desperately is access to the U.S. market. That is something of great value. We should not give it away until they agree to open their markets. That is what a good deal is. That is not what is in this deal, and it will not be in the agreement. It will be like previous agreements.

Mr. President, how much time is left on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. I don't see any others here. I will just discuss this a little bit more.

When Mr. Damico, who has been involved in world trade competition for years, said we are enabling mercantilism, what he is saying is that our trading partners have a goal that we don't seem to have, and that is to maximize their exports and minimize their imports.

They want access to the U.S. market. They have a mercantilist philosophy, and that is what it is, really. That philosophy allows them to put up nontrade barriers, nontariff barriers, to use currency manipulation and other tactics to make it difficult for the United States to penetrate their market. They say they have signed a trade agreement, and they will agree on tariffs, for example, but they still, on net, don't open their market as effectively as we open our markets. That is the reality.

As a result, we have had a continual decline in manufacturing. We have seen a surge in our trade deficits. March was the highest trade deficit in almost a decade. The whole first quarter was horrible. Our trade deficits are increasing.

If this agreement is passed, will it increase or decrease our trade deficits? Isn't that a fair question to ask? Will it increase or decrease our trade deficits? They will not answer. Unfortunately, the answer is it is going to increase our trade deficits. We know that. If it were not true, they would be hollering about how it is going to greatly reduce our trade deficits. They would be saying, on net, we are going to have more jobs. They would say wages would go up.

The truth is we are not negotiating these agreements effectively, and the net result is it is going to weaken manufacturing, allow a reduction in jobs, and really put downward pressure on wages.

I hate to have to oppose this legislation at this time, but I have come to that conclusion. I have supported most of the trade agreements in the past.

I understand that we are in a global economy, and we have trading partners around the world. There is no way we are going to reverse that. Globalism is here to stay. We need to be a part of it. But it is time for our Nation to protect our manufacturing and our workers from unfair competition.

We cannot take the view, as some do and say openly, that if our competitors manipulate their currency to make their products cheaper and they penetrate our market and close American businesses as a result—we cannot say: That is all right; we have cheaper products. Don't worry about it. In the long run, somewhere along the way, it will all work out.

That is a guiding principle for the people pushing this legislation. They won't admit it, at least the politicians won't, publicly, but we know that is the guiding principle. I say that is a mistake. I say that is an extreme position. I say that we do have an interest in protecting our jobs, our manufacturing, and the ability of the American people to have a good job, to have a retirement plan, to have an insurance policy. I think that is important.

So I urge that we back off this agreement now. Let's reevaluate it and have the President of the United States answer the question: Will we create higher wages or lower wages? Will we increase manufacturing or reduce manufacturing? Will we increase wages or not?

I thank the Chair, and I reserve the remainder of the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I echo the words of Senator SESSIONS, my colleague from Alabama.

These free-trade deals are not free trade. If they were free trade, they would be a couple of pages long that simply listed the tariffs that we are eliminating as incentives. Instead, these are a collection of special interest deals that take us somewhere else from where the proponents said they would.

Senator SESSIONS said something interesting: This is really about jobs. They would be making claims about jobs. Instead, they make claims about geopolitics in China and all of that. That is fine, but there are certainly other ways to deal with that better than we have.

We have seen big promises. We saw them from the first President Bush as he negotiated NAFTA. We saw them from President Clinton when he pushed NAFTA through Congress. We saw them from President Clinton on PNTR with China, which was not a trade deal but certainly acted like one in many ways in terms of what happened with China then. We saw them with the second President Bush with the Central America Free Trade Agreement. And we are seeing them now with President Obama and South Korea.

On South Korea, President Obama's administration promised an increase of 70,000 jobs and promised wages would go up. They always say more jobs, higher wages, but then we ended up losing 75,000 jobs under the South Korea Free Trade Agreement.

Today we are voting on whether to end debate on the fast-track bill. If people are a little confused, it is very understandable. We are going to end debate, but we have barely begun it.

Historically, when we do trade agreements in this town—as bad as they have turned out to be for the American public and working families in places such as Reno and Cleveland, and smaller towns such as Mansfield and Lima, and really small towns such as Jackson, OH—when we passed these trade agreements, at least we have had open debate where we could offer amendments. The last time we did fast-track legislation on the Senate floor, there were 3 weeks of debate. This is about 3 days. We considered 50 amendments. We have considered two so far.

The majority leader came to the floor at the end of the first full day of debate and said we are filing cloture to shut down debate. At the end of the first full day of debate, they began the process of shutting down debate. The majority leader promised an open process.

I don't get it when my Democratic colleagues—I guess I get it with the free-trade fundamentalists here and people who are not as independent as Senator SESSIONS and the total party

loyalists who will always vote with their leadership. But I don't get it when Democrats in this body, who really do genuinely care about workers, as do many Republicans—why they are willing to shut down debate because the majority leader says let's shut down debate.

We had two votes on Monday night and none since. Six amendments are pending, but votes for them haven't been scheduled. Two hundred amendments have been filed. At least 30 Senators have filed amendments and a number of Senators have filed multiple amendments. We have 200 amendments filed and 2 votes and 6 amendments pending, even though the 6 amendments that are pending don't have any schedule on how they are going to be dealt with. At least one of them has been second-degreed, basically obviating or taking away any ability to vote strictly on that amendment. We had two votes on Monday night, no votes on this issue since, and as for the six amendments themselves, who knows how they are going to be disposed of. That is an open process?

People on my side of the aisle are willing to vote to shut down debate when 25 of their Democratic colleagues and another—I don't know, a half dozen; I don't know how many Republicans—are also offering amendments. So 200 amendments have been filed by—I just found this. Forty-six Senators have actually filed 200 amendments on an issue we haven't considered in 13 years, and we are going to shut down debate at the end of the first full day of consideration.

We had a truly open legislative process the last time we did it. I think it was a Republican Senate at the time. It was a very closely divided Senate. We have been promised repeatedly that is what this underlying bill deserves. It is what the American people deserve.

Keep in mind this fast-track legislation means that we will be considering—it opens the process, opens the door to two trade agreements that encompass 60 percent of the world's economy. Forty percent of the world's economy is in the Trans-Pacific Partnership and an additional 20 percent with the United States and the European Union, the so-called TTIP agreement. Again, after two votes, the majority leader filed for cloture at the end of the first full day of debate.

We are not being unreasonable. We have played this straight. We are simply asking for the Senate to debate this important legislation. I really don't understand how any Senator in either party, when half of the Senate has offered amendments—200 of them and counting and every day there are more amendments offered—how we can shut down debate when 200 amendments have been filed by 46 Senators. We are simply asking for votes on our amendments. I don't care when we complete it. I don't care if we right now defeat cloture and then come up with some kind of a UC to give us votes on 25 or 50 of these amendments with time scheduled so we can finish. I don't care if we finish today or Friday or Saturday or Sunday or stay to Memorial Day or come back a week after Memorial Day and finish. It really doesn't matter about the time. I know a lot of my colleagues don't want to go home this week and have people who are angry because they know these trade agreements don't serve the public interest, and we know there are millions of Americans who have lost jobs because of decisions we make here.

We make decisions here that throw people out of work. Even the Wall Street Journal editorial page, the greatest cheerleader—the most vigorous, vociferous cheerleader for free trade of any newspaper in the country, I believe—even they acknowledge that people are thrown out of work from trade agreements because of the dislocation. We are going to leave here and vote on this without even having amendments on how to take care of those workers and how to do trade enforcement. It simply doesn't make sense.

Amendments such as the Brown-Portman Leveling the Playing Field Act amendment include much-needed trade enforcement provisions in this trade promotion bill. It was for all intents and purposes unanimously accepted in the Finance Committee. It has all kinds of Republican cosponsorships and all kinds of Democrat cosponsorships. My colleagues in the leadership in both parties, even though the leadership in both parties doesn't reflect the majority of the Members of both parties—that is the way it is sometimes—but we are asking for a vote on that. We haven't been given that yet—an actual vote. There have been promises, but there has been nothing really substantive in the end.

These provisions on a level playing field are supported by the White House and by House Republicans who have asked them to be included in fast-track. They are supported by numbers of U.S. industries that face an onslaught of unfairly traded imports and need our trade remedy laws to be as strong as possible.

We are not debating the Brown-Portman amendment. We are not debating any amendments. We are simply rushing to conclude consideration of this fast-track bill.

We are fast-tracking this whole idea of a fast-track process. Why is that good for our country or our workers or our small manufacturers and the supply chains of all of these big industries? Why is that good for our communities?

We have waited 8 years, and this has to be done today. Eight years we have waited for this. We had one full day of debate. Then the majority leader shut down the debate, after one full day of debate.

What we do in this fast-track bill will have implications for years to come. It will affect the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, both permanent trade agreements that represent more than half the world's economy.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. This will affect both TPP, 40 percent of the world's economy, and then a year or so later, TTIP, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, the United States-European Union agreement—both permanent trade agreements. There is 40 percent in TPP of the world's economy, and 20 percent in TTIP of the world's economy. These are permanent trade agreements that represent a huge part of the world's economy.

This bill will affect global labor standards, it will affect global environmental standards, it will affect international intellectual property standards, and more and more and more. That is why Senator SESSIONS has spoken out so effectively against it. That is why people in both parties are insisting they get these amendments, that they are voting against cloture until they get these amendments—Members of this body who have supported cloture in the past for a whole host of things.

Why we are rushing to end debate before it has truly begun is mystifying. Regardless of whether they support or oppose the underlying bill, I hope my colleagues recognize the importance of getting fast-track legislation right—not getting it done by Memorial Day, some artificial deadline that somebody somewhere set but getting this trade legislation right.

The Senate has not given the underlying bill the attention and deliberation it deserves. It has not given the amendment process the ability to—let alone to work its way through but even to get off the ground. I urge my colleagues to vote against cloture and ensure that a reasonable number of amendments get considered.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I can report there has been an all-night effort to try to work out this issue to bring parties together, particularly around our colleagues being able to offer more amendments, and on the issue of the Export-Import Bank—something I favor very strongly, and Senator CANTWELL makes a very important point that we have trade agreements, but it is also important to have financing tools, which is what the Export-Import Bank is all about. So we have been working throughout the night trying to address both of those issues, Export-Import Bank and the question of our colleagues being able to offer more amendments.

When you hear the words ''TPA'' and ''TPP,'' it sounds like a company that has been through too many mergers,

but the fact is these terms are enormously important to America's economic future. Our markets are basically open. Many countries hit us with double- and triple-digit tariffs on our exports. Export jobs often pay better than the nonexport jobs do because there is a lot of value added in the process.

The vote today will begin the efforts to replace the outdated trade rules of the 1990s with a modern set of trade rules that can help America get more of those good-paying jobs.

When you talk about international trade, the first thing you have to focus on is the estimate is, in the developing world, there are going to be about 1 billion middle-class consumers. Those are middle-class consumers with money—money in their pockets—and they can buy American goods and American services. They can buy our wonderful ag products like Oregon wine. They can buy helicopters and bicycles and planes and computers. There is enormous affection around the world for buying the American brand, for buying the Oregon brand.

With modern trade rules, we can make sure our exporters are able to get the kinds of goods and services that those billion middle-class consumers are going to want to buy, and that is always what drives the modern economy—middle-class consumers buying goods and services. One billion people in the developing world are going to be middle class in 2025.

Chairman HATCH is with me on the floor. What we have sought to do for now about 7 months is replace the old 1990s playbook on trade with a modern one. That is important because in the 1990s nobody had iPhones, nobody was texting. We are talking about a very different time.

Here is an example: Opponents have often, and I think with substantial legitimacy, talked about how there has been way too much secrecy associated with trade. If you believe deeply in trade, as I do, and you want more of it, why would you want to have all this secrecy that just leaves the American people with the view that something is being hidden back in Washington, DC?

So Chairman HATCH and I came together and put in place the most transparent policies on trade in our country's history. For example, by law—by law—before the President of the United States signs the Trans-Pacific Partnership, that document has to be public for 60 days before the President signs it. On top of that, there are probably another 2 months that take place before anybody in the Senate or anybody in the House on the floor of those bodies actually votes. What that means—and I want to give the opportunity to my colleague to make closing remarks—what it means is, as part of the new day on trade policy—in the past a lot of Americans were in the dark about trade policy. Now they will be able to come to a townhall meeting of their elected officials, such as the ones I plan to hold in a few days at home. The American people will be able to come to a townhall meeting, and starting with the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, have that document in their hands for close to 4 months before their elected representative has to vote. That is what Chairman HATCH and I have sought to do in terms of coming up with a modern trade policy.

I think it is appropriate that my colleague—and I appreciate his partnership—will have a chance to wrap this up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I appreciate my partner and his kind comments and his intelligent comments here this morning.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the following amendments en bloc: 1, Boxer No. 1371; 2, Whitehouse No. 1387; 3, Brown No. 1252, to level the playing field; 4, Feinstein No. 1424; 5, Menendez No. 1430; 6, Paul No. 1383; 7, Paul No. 1408; 8, Sullivan No. 1246; 9, Sessions No. 1233; 10, Cruz No. 1384; 11, Cardin No. 1230; 12, Paul No. 1408.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, again, I appreciate the generosity of Senators HATCH and I think WYDEN on this. Some 200 amendments have been filed by 46 Senators. We have had two votes. We have six pending, but the six pending—they have had some interesting adjustments in terms of second-degree amendments, in terms of not being actually called for votes. Now we have an offer of nine more. That is a good step, but the majority leader came to the floor at the end of the first full day of debate to file cloture to shut down debate. We had only two votes all week.

I would like to have more votes. I think all of us on all sides of the discussion on this debate—the pro-free-trade Republicans and the anti-free-trade Republicans, the pro-free trade Democrats and the overwhelming majority of Democrats who don't like the way the rules are under TPA—would be willing to come together and pick out 20 or so amendments of the 200 that have been offered by 46 different Senators and have that debate with time limits. We should do all of that.

Instead, we have nine amendments here. As I said—in case I didn't say it three times—we have had only two votes so far. There are nine amendments here. Most of these amendments—including level the playing field, which seems to have unanimous support—level the playing field is nongermane. So if Senators vote for cloture now, then all of those nongermane amendments are dropped and most of these nine will not see the light of day.

Madam President, I object to the UC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I just want to point out that we tried to bring this bill up Thursday, then Friday. It was objected to. Then we brought it up Monday. We only had two amendments. Then Tuesday, Wednesday, and now today there have been logjams all the way through.

Now, look, I have been as fair as anybody could be. I have tried to accommodate my colleagues on the other side, and we were not making any headway.

So I thought that by calling up these 12 amendments, that would resolve it. But if not, we should proceed with the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I would again reiterate our offer. I don't know that I can do it exactly in a UC request. But I reiterate our offer that we sit down—that the leaders sit down—and discuss 15 amendments a side—15 Republican amendments, 15 Democrat amendments—and that we have a serious negotiation without cloture hanging over our head that will drop all of these nongermane, very serious enforcement amendments.

We had a vote last Tuesday where for the first time in 25 years a trade motion was actually defeated. The whole point of that vote was that we wanted enforcement as part of TPA, TAA. That is what this has been all about.

But in this UC request, most of the enforcement—for instance, level the playing field, but also some other things—will drop because they are nongermane.

I offer to Senator HATCH if there is a way of having this discussion and really moving forward——

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Hatch amendment No. 1221 to 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.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Daniel Coats, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, John Barrasso,

Mike Crapo, Jeff Flake, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Dan Sullivan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the substitute amendment, No. 1221, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, to H.R. 1314, be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 183 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Feinstein	Murray
Barrasso	Fischer	Nelson
Bennet	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Cantwell	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cochran	Isakson	Sullivan
Coons	Johnson	Thune
Corker	Kaine	Tillis
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Cotton	Lankford	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Warner
Cruz	McCaskill	Wicker
Daines	McConnell	Wyden
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	King	Reid
Booker	Klobuchar	Sanders
Boxer	Leahy	Schatz
Brown	Lee	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Sessions
Casey	Markey	Shelby
Collins	Menendez	Stabenow
Donnelly	Merkley	Tester
Durbin	Mikulski	Udall
Franken	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Paul	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 38.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I am very happy the Senate has decided to take another step forward on this very important initiative not only of the President's but of the majority party's as well, and I thank the folks on the other side who are also similarly inclined.

Let me just make it clear. Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN have done a terrific job. They are open to continuing to try to get amendments. We still have the opportunity to do that. As everyone knows, it requires some level of cooperation because anybody can object to somebody else getting an amendment. But Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN are anxious to do additional business, to open it up for more amendments, and with everybody's cooperation, that could be achieved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I think it would be appropriate—we have gotten to where we are—that we have a quorum call so we can find out where we are on amendments. There is agreement out there; we just have to see how we can get it arrived at. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, will the Senator withhold so I can make a short speech, less than a minute?

Mr. REID. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague from Nevada.

Madam President, I thank all our colleagues for their support in helping us get this far. This last vote was a major step forward on this important legislation. We have a few more votes we are going to have to do, and we are getting very close to maybe doing this very important bill. I hope that now that we have taken this step, we can find a way to finish this legislation in short order, and I am willing to work with my colleagues to get us there.

Once again, I thank everyone who supported this today. It means a lot to me personally.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1430 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the time, and 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.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, we are going to be voting, we hope, on an amendment that is called the antidocking amendment. It observes, by reading the Trans-Pacific Partnership, that there apparently is a path for the executive branch to allow another country to become part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership without a vote of Congress.

In other words, as to the world 's second largest economy, China, the administration, this President or the next President, could decide that, well, China should join the 12 countries already part of TPP if we affirm this vote down the road with TPP.

If China could join—the second largest economy in the world—they would backdoor, if you will, because of the administration's willingness to do it, with no input from the public, with no input from the Congress.

Our amendment is really simple. It sets up a process over a 90-day period. If a President wants to bring a country into the Trans-Pacific Partnership, that country would have to meet certain criteria, the same kinds of criteria that we have seen with these 12 countries, including sex trafficking and some labor law and other things.

Then Congress would actually vote. Congress would get 90 days to decide, up or down, whether a country can join TPP after it is up and running. The country that most concerns us, of course, is China. So when you hear this amendment discussed, you will hear China used as an example, because its economy, obviously, is so large. It passed Japan as the world's second largest economy, I believe, a year or so ago.

We just want to make sure that our integrity and the integrity of these 12 countries—12 other countries—is preserved. The way to do that and for the public to be heard is that Congress has to make the decision on whether another country can join.

That is what our so-called docking amendment does. I know Senator FRANKEN is about to take the floor. I want to say a couple of other things. This amendment is in no way meant to kill TPP. It simply spells out the process for future countries to join.

Here is exactly how the process would work. The President would notify Congress about an intent to enter negotiations. It would require certification from the two committees—Ways and Means in the House, Finance in the Senate. Then it would ultimately come to a Senate vote. That is how this would work to protect, I think, the public interest and to give the public input into what countries actually join the TPP. It makes sense, I think, for all countries involved.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. I am a proud cosponsor of this bicameral, bipartisan bill which brings much-needed reform to the Federal Government's surveillance programs, including an end to the bulk data collection program that the intelligence community has said is not necessary, that the public has said they don't support, and that the Second Circuit has ruled as unlawful.

I am particularly proud to have developed the bill's transparency provisions with my friend Senator DEAN HELLER of Nevada. We are greatly indebted to Senator LEE and to Senator LEAHY for their leadership and their tireless work.

Americans understand, as I do, that our job here is to strike an appropriate balance, making sure, on the one hand, that we are safeguarding our national security, without trampling on our citizens' fundamental privacy rights, on the other hand. But the public cannot know if we succeed in striking that balance if they do not even have the most basic information about our major surveillance programs. That is why my focus has been on transparency, because I want to make sure that the American people are able to decide for themselves whether we are getting this right.

I support the USA FREEDOM Act because it moves us in the right direction on all of these fronts. On June 1, several national security authorities will expire. The House acted responsibly and passed USA FREEDOM, a bill that reflects the combined efforts and agreement of Republicans and Democrats, members of the intelligence and law enforcement communities, and advocates for privacy and civil liberties, as well as members of the tech sector and business communities.

This legislation ensures that the necessary authorities continue in force through 2019, and it makes important reforms that will actually improve national security. You do not need to take my word for that. The Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General have told us, in no uncertain terms, that we ought to pass the USA FREEDOM Act and promptly.

Yet some of my colleagues are attempting to present us with a choice between reauthorization of the soon-to-expire authorities with no reform whatsoever or complete expiration of those authorities. That is profoundly unfortunate, because we have a compromise bill that has overwhelming support and was overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives by a vote of 338 to 88.

It draws broad-based support from business, from civil society, and within the government. I believe that the only thing that would stop this bill from garnering similar strong bipartisan support here in the Senate is if Republican leaders who oppose this bill pressure my Republican colleagues to filibuster. I really hope that does not happen. I hope it does not happen because USA FREEDOM's reforms represent real and meaningful progress. The bill ends the old program for the bulk collection of telephone metadata, which, according to reports discussed at a hearing last year, principally gathered call records from landlines. It replaces that program with a more targeted approach that permits the collection of call detail records, including prospective collection of those records. You get a warrant, and you collect those prospectively, based on the government's reasonable, articulable suspicion of a link to international terrorism.

Now, I believe that is a much more sensible approach. I know that some of my colleagues disagree. Last November, one of my colleagues suggested that bulk collection is preferable to a targeted approach because American's privacy would be at risk if the government were ''going to have to go to those companies and ask for the data.''

But of course, no matter what, we have to go to the companies and ask them for the data. The records at issue here are the phone company's business records. That is what they are. I should also note that those companies have both legal and business reasons for why they retain and protect these records as they do, from the potential for billing disputes to commercial analytics to regulatory concerns.

The FCC regulations require them to hold on to telephone call records for 18 months. None of that has changed. It bears emphasizing that the relationship USA FREEDOM calls for between phone companies and the government is nothing new. Our Nation's law enforcement and intelligence agencies have long worked with phone companies to obtain specific records, either historic or prospective records, when conducting domestic criminal investigations or carrying out sensitive national security investigations such as FISA wiretaps.

So we have been doing this for a long time. The intelligence community, national security, law enforcement experts, and American businesses, not to mention the House of Representatives, all understand that we have to strike the right balance. We need to safeguard our national security, but we need to do it in ways that do not unduly tread on privacy and civil liberties.

Leaders across these different public and private sectors have managed to come together to strike that balance in the USA FREEDOM Act. That is where my work with Senator HELLER comes in. We recognized that when the public lacks even a rough sense of the scope of the government's surveillance programs, they have no way of knowing if the government is getting that balance right. So there needs to be more transparency.

Since the Snowden revelations came to light 2 years ago, a steady stream of news reports has provided details about NSA programs that collect information about both foreign nationals and the American people. Despite these disclosures, it remains impossible for the American people to get even a basic sense of the real size and scope of these programs. Americans still don't know the number of people whose information has been collected under these programs. They have no sense of the extent to which U.S. persons are affected and, particularly, have no way of knowing how often the government has searched that information, such as call detail records of Americans. Senator HELLER and I crafted transparency provisions to make sure Americans get that kind of information. That way the American people can better judge the government's surveillance programs for themselves.

Under USA FREEDOM, the government will be required to issue detailed annual reports for each of the surveillance authorities at issue. Importantly, the government will have to tell the public how many people have had their information collected, and for certain authorities—like those permitting the targeted collection of call detail records or the communications of foreigners abroad—the government will also have to say how many times it has run searches for Americans' data.

The USA FREEDOM Act doesn't just require the government to be more transparent. We also make it possible for American businesses to provide their customers with more information about what they are asked to turn over to the government. This is not only good for transparency, it is good for our economy. It has been estimated that the Snowden revelations are costing American companies billions of dollars because people have lost trust in those companies, often assuming that all companies are handing over all of their information to the government.

So by allowing companies to report the size and scope of the government's requests, the public can get a better sense of what information is actually being turned over, and the bill makes clear that a company that has not received any national security requests from the government is free to say so.

All of this will calm fears, both here and abroad, and allow American companies to better compete with their foreign counterparts.

The provisions Senator HELLER and I wrote will expand the options that companies have to issue their own transparency reports and allow companies to issue those reports more quickly. But we also listened to the intelligence community to make sure we were striking the right balance and ensuring that ongoing investigations are not jeopardized by additional transparency.

Now, look, to get the broad, bipartisan support we needed, Senator HELLER and I had to compromise a great deal. We didn't get everything we wanted when we initially negotiated our provisions last year, and we had to compromise further still this year, particularly with regard to government reporting under section 702, which authorizes the collection, for intelligence purposes, of communications of foreign persons abroad. I am disappointed the bill doesn't include all of the requirements we agreed on last year and that were included in the Senate bill last Congress, which had 58 votes.

But I am committed to pressing my colleagues to revisit this issue in the

future—hopefully before the sunset of section 702—in 2017. That, of course, is the Internet traffic of foreign persons abroad who are suspected of being terrorists.

But in the meantime, the good news is that after all the give-and-take, our provisions that did get included in the bill will usher in a new era of transparency about our Nation's surveillance agencies. They will allow the American public to see—on an annual basis—whether the government really makes good on its promise to end bulk collection, and they will give those of us in Congress important tools as we work to continually improve our country's laws.

The transparency provisions are an essential part of USA FREEDOM, and the bill overall is a step in the right direction for reforming our Nation's intelligence laws. It is a step that the House has already taken on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. It is a step that the Senate should take as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on an amendment I have filed regarding a crisis we are experiencing in the H–2B visas.

In North Carolina, we have a very large seafood industry, and we have a crisis that is shared by a number of other States that have the seafood industry with respect to the availability of H–2B visas, and the busy time is just about to start in a couple of weeks. It is the worst possible time for this industry.

We literally have jobs that have been created by people such as Don Cross and his brother and their Pamlico Packing Company in Grantsboro, NC. They simply can't find workers to do this job. It is going to ruin their business, and it is unacceptable. These are jobs these folks have created, like the Crosses, and they can't be filled. The jobs are waiting to be filled.

It is affecting other businesses we have in the shrimp and crab industries, but it is also affecting other businesses—will affect other businesses—such as grocery stores, restaurants, and other industries, like tourism, across the country.

The problem I have—and the nature of the amendment I will speak to briefly—but I have reached out to the Department of Homeland Security to ask a series of questions, and I simply haven't received answers. That is why I decided to offer an amendment—or to file the amendment.

DHS has refused to issue more work visas, even though the statutory cap of used visas has most likely not been reached. DHS claims the cap has been reached, and that is really odd because it is unusually early for them to take that position.

This is what I think the real truth is. Not every business applying for these visas is using them. DHS normally approves more visas so we make it more likely that we reach the cap, but we don't believe they have done that this year.

That is why we have asked for an audit, to make sure we know how many applications were actually approved, how many visas are actually used by the State, within the State, and how many of those visas are actually putting legal, migrant, immigrant workers into these jobs.

This year, they haven't even done an audit. We simply want to know why.

I think DHS is playing games with the numbers, and I demand answers. DHS seems eager to help the illegal population get acclimated, but they don't seem to place a priority on American businesses that need these people to come and work in our seafood processing facilities, not only in North Carolina like Don Cross's Pamlico Packing Company but packing companies across the coast.

I have had a discussion with a number of Members on the other side of the aisle. They share our concerns, and we are all working trying to simply get the answers.

So what my amendment does is—until we get the answers, until we solve the problem, we want to suspend the travel for all DHS employees to government conferences and symposiums until the Agency provides more transparent data as to how the H–2B program is being administered for this fiscal year and for the three previous fiscal years.

I want answers and I want action. We have businesses in North Carolina and across the country in the coastal States that need these workers, and we want answers now.

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. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1381

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor and I, like my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts, am very concerned about the lack of transparency in this whole process of the trade agreement, very concerned.

I saw the TPP text. I went downstairs and I saw that. I have to say the whole process was extremely disturbing to me. Members must go to a classified room. Now, we do go to classified rooms, as a bipartisan group, on many issues that are very important to this country. I had gone down because I wanted to see for myself the transcript of the TPP, what they have dealt with and how far they are along right now in the negotiations.

The viewing of the documents that are very technical in nature, as we all know, is oftentimes without a trade staffer with appropriate clearance. So here I am, I am not able to take staff—or only staff who has had secured clearance, and it might not be the staff on my staff who has the expertise in this, so that takes that equation away.

We are unable to take any notes to consider what we just saw unless we have a photographic memory. Unfortunately, I do not. I have tried the best I can to remember and look for things I knew I was looking for. But still yet, it is almost impossible to walk out of there having the ability to sit down and evaluate what you just saw, and then we are unable to talk to anyone about it—even to my staff, as I would like to get their input, since I have been, basically, looking at the details, and especially the public, too, has no idea about any issues that concern them.

The secretive nature of the largest free-trade deal in America's history truly just lacks common sense. Let me explain. In July of 2001, President Bush at that time released the draft text of the Free Trade Area of the Americas Agreement, the FTAA. He did this months before he was granted fast-track authority. He wasn't afraid to let us see it. He wasn't afraid to let the American public know what was in that. We were able to see it, and it didn't squelch the deal. It didn't harm anything.

They released the text of the FTAA, the different positions of 34 countries in important areas such as intellectual property rights, investor-state dispute settlements, and antidumping duties—all very important to our country and the jobs we have in this country.

Now we have a massive 12-country trade agreement that is currently being negotiated, and the President wants us to grant him the fast-track authority before not only the American people have even seen the text but mostly even our staffs whom we delegate to work on these intricate documents.

Our bill that we will be asking consideration for would simply require the President to release the scrubbed, bracketed text of any trade agreement at least 60 days before Congress would grant the fast-track authority. This is pretty sensible, pretty reasonable. Just release the scrubbed document that you have agreed on so far 60 days before you ask us to give the fast-track authority.

Before any Member of Congress is asked to vote on the most expansive bill in U.S. trade history, the American people deserve to see what is in the bill. That is why they elect us, to make sure we are able to confer with them, have a dialogue, and explain why we are or why we may not be for a certain piece of legislation, especially a trade agreement.

If this bill is as good for the American worker as proponents have claimed, then the administration and anybody else should not find it objectionable to see the details before Congress is forced to grant the President trade promotion authority.

I want to say, in my beautiful little State of West Virginia, as I go through it and we look back through the trade agreements that have already been granted since NAFTA, we have not seen an uptick. In fact, we have lost 31,000 manufacturing jobs. I, for one, am not willing to vote to put one more job in jeopardy in West Virginia.

That is the concern we have. So what we are asking for is a very modest, very sensible, very reasonable, commonsense approach to how we should do the job the people elect us to do and how it should be transparent.

At this time I yield the floor to my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN. I thank him for his leadership. I thank him for his independence. I thank him for his partnership as we push for greater transparency on this very important trade bill.

In the past few weeks, the public has heard a lot about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a massive trade deal the United States is negotiating with 11 other trade companies. The public has heard from supporters that it is the most progressive trade deal in history—a deal that will benefit working families and small businesses—and they have heard from opponents that it will only tilt the playing field further in favor of multinational corporations and leave workers and everyone else behind.

The public has heard a lot, but in all that time they have never actually seen the deal itself. In fact, the press hasn't seen the deal, economists haven't seen the deal, legal experts haven't seen the deal. Most everyone in America hasn't seen the deal. Why? Because the administration has classified the deal, making it illegal for any of those people to read it.

Members of Congress, as Senator MANCHIN said, can read it so long as they go into a secret room and don't leave with any notes. But even Members of Congress are prohibited from talking about the details in public or discussing the details with the people they were sent to Washington to represent. And yet, in the next day or two, the Senate is scheduled to vote on whether to grease the skids to make that secret trade deal—the TPP—the law of the land.

This isn't how democracy is supposed to work. One of our fundamental principles of representative government is transparency. Our government is supposed to keep things secret from the people only if it has a very good reason to do so. So why is this trade deal a secret? I just want to go over the answers I have heard so far, the reasons.

Some say the administration can't release the deal because the deal isn't finished yet. OK, so maybe there are some unresolved issues, but everyone agrees the deal is nearly complete. It is close enough to being done that its supporters can confidently claim it is the most progressive trade deal in history. If you are sure that is right, then show it to us. If some parts aren't finished, then show us the parts that are finished. Don't keep every single word of the deal classified.

Others say releasing the text now would be tipping our hand in continuing negotiations, but that doesn't make any sense either. Our government has already shared the details of our positions with the other TPP countries, and those countries have shared details with us. That is how negotiations work. Publicly releasing what our negotiating partners have already seen couldn't possibly undermine our negotiations because, by definition, our negotiating partners have already seen it.

Here is another argument I have heard. Releasing the text of an unfinished international agreement simply isn't done; it is a breach of protocol. Well, that is not true either. As Senator MANCHIN pointed out, in 2001, President George W. Bush publicly released the scrubbed bracketed text of the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas several months before seeking fast-track authority for that agreement. At the time, his U.S. Trade Representative said that releasing the text ''would increase public awareness and support for the trade deal.'' Guess what. Congress still approved that fast-track deal. Of course it can be done. It has been done, and it should be done.

Still others say that publicly releasing the text would endanger state secrets. Wow. But this agreement is not about nuclear weapons programs or military operations. There isn't any national security information in this deal. This deal is about things such as copyright rules and labor standards. And I know the President doesn't think there is any sensitive national security information in the deal. That is why he has already committed to publicly releasing the entire text. He just won't do it until after Congress has already voted to grease the skids to make it law.

That brings us to the last justification—that we should all be satisfied that the administration will release the text of the deal a few months before Congress has to vote on whether to approve it. But by then, Congress will have lost the ability to amend the deal, to stop the deal, or to slow it down. In other words, by the time you—the American public—can read the deal, your elected representatives will have lost the ability to use your input to help shape that deal. That sounds like a lousy arrangement to me.

So if there are no good reasons for secrecy here, that leaves only a bad reason, and believe it or not, it is a reason I have heard people give multiple times: We should keep the deal secret because if the details were made public now, the public would oppose it. Well, that is how our democracy is supposed to work.

If the TPP is mostly done and the public wouldn't support it if they could see it, then it shouldn't become the law. That is why I have introduced a simple bill with my friend from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN. This bill would require the President to publicly release the scrubbed bracketed text of a trade deal at least 60 days before Congress votes on any fast-track for that deal. That would give the public, the experts, and the press an opportunity to review the deal. It would allow for some honest public debate. It would give Congress a chance to actually step in and block any special deals and giveaways that are being proposed as part of this trade deal before Congress decides whether to grease the skids to make that deal the law.

If this trade deal is so great, if it will work so well for America's workers and small businesses, then make it public. We should pass this bill today and give the American people some time to read the deal before we tie ourselves to fast-track.

Whether you support fast-track or oppose it, whether you support TPP or oppose it, we should all agree that we should have a robust, informed debate on something that is this important. Anything less is a disservice to the people who sent us here to work for them.

So I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 1381, that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, one concern I have heard from opponents of the trade promotion authority is that trade agreements currently under discussion have been negotiated behind closed doors and that by renewing TPA, Congress would be enabling and even encouraging further secrecy.

I am going to talk more on this in a minute, but there are 30 days before the President signs, 60 days after he signs where this will become well known. So I have to object to my dear colleagues' bill—I guess it is a bill at this time. I just have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have heard this concern from opponents of trade promotion authority from time to time—that trade agreements currently under discussion have been negotiated behind closed doors and that by reviewing TPA, Congress would be enabling and even encouraging further secrecy. These arguments are particularly being made about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, which is not

before us. Of course, we need to keep in mind that every Senator complaining about this supposed secrecy associated with TPP has had an opportunity to read through the current text of the agreement. And the agreement is not yet concluded. It won't be unless we pass TPA.

At the same time, I would be very surprised if these same Senators decrying the secrecy of the TPP negotiations also believe that contract negotiations between unions and management should be made public or that it would be a wise negotiating tactic for a private citizen negotiating the sale of their home to post all the offers they have received on the Internet.

My point is that in the midst of any high-stakes negotiation, some level of confidentiality is essential to getting a good deal, and especially in this case.

That said, I certainly understand the concerns about transparency, particularly when our government is negotiating on behalf of our country. Fortunately, our TPA bill strikes a good balance to address these very concerns. Our TPA bill goes further than any previous version of TPA to promote transparency and congressional oversight of the whole trade negotiation process.

First of all, under our bill, the full text of a completed trade agreement must be made public at least 60 days before the President can even sign it, giving the American people unprecedented access and knowledge of all trade agreements before they are signed and well before they are submitted to Congress.

In addition, the President must submit to Congress the legal text of a trade agreement and a statement of administrative action at least 30 days before submitting an implementing bill.

On top of that, our bill ensures that any Member of Congress who wants access to the unredacted negotiated text at any time during the negotiations will get it. In addition, Members of Congress will—once again, at any time during the negotiations—be able to request and receive a briefing from the U.S. Trade Representative's office on the status of the negotiations.

Our bill also creates in statute a transparency officer at USTR who will consult with Congress and advise the USTR on transparency policies. This will help ensure that there are consistent transparency policies across the Agency and promote greater public understanding of trade negotiations.

Now, let's be clear. I, as well as other authors of this legislation, understand the concerns we have heard from both inside and outside Congress about the need for greater transparency in the trade negotiation process. We have really worked hard to address these concerns in this legislation, and in particular the concerns of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is a good friend, whom I admire, and who I think has brought a certain dimension to this Senate that is very important.

In short, any Member of Congress who is concerned about a lack of transparency in trade negotiations should be a cosponsor of this TPA bill—that is, of course, if they are also supporters of expanded markets for U.S. exporters and the creation of high-paying American jobs. Those who oppose TPA and trade agreements outright will likely continue to use this supposed lack of transparency as an excuse to oppose the bill.

Those with genuine concerns will see that this bill is the right approach. And we have tried to make it the right approach. I believe it is the right approach. I believe the administration says it is the right approach. I know the Trade Representative says it is the right approach. He has bent over backwards to inform us and to open his office and to open matters into these not-yet-concluded agreements.

There is plenty of time for us to look at those agreements—any agreement that comes—and make up our own determinations at that time. So I don't believe the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will be deprived of an ability to look into these matters, completely test the transparency, and look at these agreements in ways that I think would please any reasonable person.

With that, I have had to object, but I hope we can pursue this bill and get it through as soon as we can because it will be a banner day for the President, I have to admit. He is my President, but he is not my party; yet, he is right on this. For the life of me, I can't understand why we are having so much difficulty with his and my friends on the other side. We ought to be supporting a President who has bent over backwards, through his Trade Representative and those around him, to be as open as he possibly can on this matter, at least at this particular time and I believe afterwards as well.

I always feel bad when I have to object to a person's unanimous consent request, but I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Will my good friend the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator, I have the utmost respect for you and the job you do here every day for all of us. I appreciate that. But we have a difference here. My difference is that I have to look at the people in West Virginia—fewer than 2 million people—who depend on the opportunity to make a living for themselves, and they have hard, strong feelings about what we have done over the years in trade agreements. They haven't seen an uptick in opportunity for themselves or their families.

With that being said, what we have asked for here, the Senator from Massachusetts and I, is not something that has never been done before. I can't explain why President George W. Bush would have done this. Maybe it was on his own volition, saying: I am going to put out this agreement that has been scrubbed. Basically everything has been agreed on. We will let you see it and discuss it—the American people and the Senate and Congress that represents those people—to see if we have total buy-in and support. If not, we can make some adjustments and changes.

He did that. That is really what we have asked for here. I respect your right to object, and I understand the process here. But the American people don't have input into this, and it has a 51-vote threshold from this day forward. So any of us who have any objections or maybe have something that would enhance this bill don't have that opportunity. That is the reason we have asked for this.

I know the Senator was here and was very much involved in 2001. What was your position or your opinion when President Bush released a draft text of the Free Trade Area of the Americas, the FTAA? Do you recall, by any chance?

Mr. HATCH. I don't personally recall that at this time, other than that it did pass.

Mr. MANCHIN. He let everybody see it months ahead of time before he was granted the fast-track authority. He never even asked for TPA until he released it. And I am sure that you were in the majority at the time, and everyone had to support that position, I would think.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator would yield—yes, we did. We supported the President's position, if I recall correctly. There is nothing that says the President can't do that. But this bill says he must at least do certain things.

Mr. MANCHIN. That is because he hasn't offered it to us.

Mr. HATCH. This is a 6-year bill.

Mr. MANCHIN. It is a 3–3. You are right.

Mr. HATCH. There is going to be another President in 2016, whether Republican or Democrat or otherwise.

So there is nothing that says the President can't do that, but we are making sure he does do that. We have done it because of questions that have been raised by people such as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and you. We think we have put reasonable time constraints in there, especially since you can review the TPP as it exists—although that may or may not be the final agreement. You can review that now, if you want, and that is well in advance of it.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator, again, I know you understand it. I am sure you probably have gone down into the secured room and maybe have looked through some parts yourself. But it is quite an onerous process. I couldn't take my staff person who had expertise in that arena because he did not have that clearance. So I had to go in, and I couldn't take notes out. Then on top of that, I couldn't even speak to him

about what I saw because he didn't have that clearance.

I have never been through something like this. For me to go home to West Virginia and say, with all full knowledge and my ability to make a decision on the facts I have in front of me, that I support or I do not support it for these reasons—I can't really do that. I am not really sure if I could support it. Maybe I can support TPP. But I am really objectionable to TPA by not having that opportunity to have input in TPP.

I think that is where I fall. And with a 51-vote threshold, I am not going to have any input to represent the people of West Virginia. With all due respect, that is where I am on this.

Mr. HATCH. I understand the distinguished Senator. Let me say that we all have to make our own individual decisions here.

I would encourage you to reconsider because I think we have a good bill that is far better than it has been in the past. Frankly, it is your administration that is putting this forward, and I am doing everything I can to help this administration get this through.

Mr. MANCHIN. I understand.

Mr. HATCH. Remember that this is the procedural mechanism that gives Congress the right to really know what is going on and to really look at these matters. That is why we put in these particular provisions, which, as far as I know, are better than they have ever been. So Members of Congress will have an opportunity to know what is in these bills. I don't know fully what is in TPP, myself, and I am going to be one of the most interested people on Earth when that comes, if not the most interested, and when we finally agree. It is still not a completed agreement, as far as I know.

All I can say is I think we provide enough time in this bill for anybody who is sincere enough and dedicated enough to look at it.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator, if you do see something, let's say, as the bill unfolds and comes to its completion, that you really think is going to harm the people of Utah, you are not going to have any input to change that harm. And it is only going to take 51 votes to pass it, even if harm is in there for Utah.

Mr. HATCH. We will have the ability to take this floor, and those in the House to take the House floor, and fight against it if you disagree with it and it starts to get 51 votes.

The administration knows that. They know they can't do a slovenly agreement. They have got to do a good agreement in order to get both sides up here to, in a bipartisan way, accept the agreement for our country.

Mr. MANCHIN. I just feel very strongly that this most reasonable thing that we have asked for is something that was done under President Bush. I think it was in his wisdom to put it out there before. There was nothing to hide.

If we looked into their dialogue back at that period of time, they felt it was necessary, as Senator WARREN mentioned, to get the public's buy-in, to get support from the public. So they were proud of what they put into it.

I am not saying things in here aren't good and won't be good for this country. But there might be some things that could be improved upon that would make it much better for this country.

I have lost 31,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA. It is hard when I go through my State and I look at people struggling. The jobs have not returned. They have not come to our little State. We did not see the uptick.

I am not saying my State represents every State, but I am sure there are parts of every State that have been hit pretty hard by this, and we want to make sure we get this one right. That is all we have asked for.

So I am sorry you had to object. I hope you understand our position on this.

Mr. HATCH. I do, and I appreciate the distinguished Senator and his efforts to represent his State. I know he does a very good job. I know the senior Senator from Massachusetts is doing a very good job. We are friends. This isn't going to change that. All I can say is that we disagree respectfully. I think I have made this as palatable as we possibly could under the circumstances.

The point I have been making is that the agreement is available 60 days before it is even signed. So it isn't as if people will not have a chance to look at it or to fight against it or talk to the President—whoever that might be.

The fact of the matter is that I am not sure that it should be longer than 60 plus 60 plus, I think, another 60.

So all I can say is that I have to object, as manager of this bill. I never feel good about objecting to something my colleagues want. I respect your desire to have as much information as you can. I respect the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANCHIN. Would the Senator be kind enough to yield for a question from the Senator from Massachusetts if I would yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. MANCHIN. I yield for the Senator from Massachusetts for the purpose of a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I just want to say to the Senator from Utah how much I respect his leadership in this Senate and his leadership on so many important issues.

All I want to say about this is that we are just asking for the trade deal to be made public before we have this crucial vote about whether there will be any opportunity in the future to amend the trade deal, to slow down the trade deal or—as the Senator from West Virginia says—if we really find objectionable parts, to be able to block it. We are just asking for some transparency before we have this crucial vote on the TPA. We don't want to see fast-track until the American public can evaluate the deal. That is all we are asking for at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I would like the floor. But I would yield the floor to Senator HATCH, and then ask my friends to stay on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the time during morning business count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

FAST-TRACK AUTHORITY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, Senators WARREN and MANCHIN, because what they tried to do here is to give to the American people the same opportunity they had when George W. Bush was President and a trade deal was being negotiated. Before fast-track came up, everybody saw the deal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor to their bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I appreciate that. I am proud to stand with them on this. And I do respect Senator HATCH. He is my dear friend. But let's be clear. When you go down to that secret room—and I had the same experience as Senator MANCHIN. I couldn't take the proper staffers because they didn't have the clearance.

This isn't about fighting ISIS or the war in Syria or any other very high security matter. It is about a trade deal that is supposed to be negotiated in the best interests of the people of this country.

All my friends are saying is that before we give this President the ability to fast-track this deal, let's look at it. Here is what happens when he gets fast-track authority: Not one Member of this Senate and not one Member of the House can offer any amendment whatsoever.

I think the Senator from West Virginia was very clear on the point. What if we find out that there is something horrible in there for our State?

The Senator from Massachusetts pointed out that there are whole parts of this deal—and I know I am not speaking out of turn here—where it

just says that they are still being negotiated. So how the heck do we know what we are even voting on? And here we have given away the store in this last vote so that we will not have an opportunity to make it better.

When my friend talked about how many jobs were lost in West Virginia after NAFTA, my heart sank. Those are a lot of jobs in a smaller State. My State is a large State. We lost about 80,000-plus jobs. That is a lot. We are a larger State, though.

Percentagewise, you had 2 million and at the time we had about 30 million. So in terms of percentages, your people suffered mightily. But we suffered mightily. More than 80,000 families lost their jobs.

I don't want to keep my colleagues on the floor, but I am only going to speak for 60 seconds more because my colleague from Delaware is such a pal and said I could go before him.

I have a very simple amendment I am fighting to get a vote on. Listen to what it is. It simply says you cannot get fast-track authority to negotiate with any country that doesn't pay at least a $2 minimum wage. I ask the people who are watching this debate here and at home: Do you know that out of the 12 countries we are negotiating with, 7 of them have less than a $2 minimum wage?

Let me be specific. Chile has a $1.91 minimum wage. Malaysia has a $1.21 minimum wage. Peru has a $1.15 minimum wage. Mexico has an 80-cent minimum wage.

Do you remember NAFTA? Let's do NAFTA. It is going to raise the standard of living in Mexico, and the Mexican people won't come across the border. We had all those factory jobs leave. And in this, Mexico is part of this deal.

How about Vietnam? 58 cents. And how about Brunei and Singapore? They have no minimum wage.

What kind of a chance do our workers have? I don't care how productive they are. We have the most productive workers. The people in these countries are very smart. They are terrific.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor on that amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor on that amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely, I am very proud to have Senator WARREN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. What kind of chance do our workers have? Do you think a manufacturer in their right mind is going to stay here when they can go to Vietnam and have some terrific people?

I know the Vietnamese community in my home State is fantastic. They are fantastic leaders. They are fantastic workers. It is sad that the ones who are left behind earn 58 cents an hour. What chance do our workers have?

Now, we have 12 million manufacturing jobs left in this Nation of ours—this greatest of Nations. What kind of chance do they have? Do you know that I cannot get this amendment up for a vote? I think I know the reason. They do not want to have to vote against it. I am still hopeful. I am holding out hope. I am fighting for it. But it seems to me when you are saying to the American people: Do you want your Senator to have to go downstairs to a secure room, give up your electronics to a clerk, be told that if you take notes you have to leave them behind so the clerk can read it, but your staff cannot read it, you cannot discuss it with the people who do not have top clearance for the trade agreement?

Then, you have to have the amendment that Senators WARREN and MANCHIN have offered, which simply says: Make the trade agreement public before we give exceptional fast-track authority to any President. I do not care who it is—Democrat or Republican—this is not a partisan issue.

I have voted for half of the trade agreements, so I have voted for many trade agreements but not with countries that pay slave wages. Let's be clear.

This is a tough day for the U.S. Senate. I know we have been split up every which way on this, but I think there are certain things we have learned from this debate: Secrecy is no good. I respect my President. I have talked to him. I know in his heart he is doing what he thinks is right, but when he says this is not secret and everyone has access to it, I say to my President and I say to my friend Senator HATCH: This is not an open process.

The secrecy is ludicrous. It is ridiculous. It is against the interests of the people we represent. I represent close to 40 million people. As Senator MANCHIN said, those people count on us, but if we do not know what is in an agreement, how can we be wise about what we want to say about it and what we want to do about it?

I want to thank my friends for coming down here this afternoon. I know this is hard on the Senate. We are going to probably be here a very long time. But the fact is that people depend on us, and I am proud to stand with them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

OUR COUNTRY'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to discuss the need to strengthen the transportation system of our country, our roads, our highways, our bridges—our transportation system. A long time ago, the question was asked: What is the role of government? If you ask 500 people, you probably will not get 100 different answers, but you will get a lot of different answers.

Abraham Lincoln was once asked: What is the role of government? This is what he said: The role of the government is to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves. Let me say that again. The role of government is to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves.

Sometimes I go to schools and young students ask me: What do you do? The kids in elementary schools, third, fourth, fifth graders say: What do you do?

I tell them I am a United States Senator.

They say: What do you do?

I tell them I help make the rules for our country. We call them laws. I do that with 99 other Senators, 435 Representatives, the President, and the Vice President.

They say: Well, what else do you do?

I tell them I help people. I help people. The best way to help somebody is to make sure they have a job—to make sure they have a job.

I had the privilege of being Governor of Delaware for 8 years. I am told that in those 8 years, more jobs were created in Delaware than any 8 years in Delaware history. I did not create one of them.

We have seen in the last 6-plus years in this country some 12 million jobs created. I did not create one of them. My colleagues did not create those jobs. The President and the Vice President did not create those jobs.

What we are responsible for doing here is to create a nurturing environment for job creation, access to capital—to money—for businesses that need to raise money, a world-class workforce, public safety, clean environment, public health, a Tax Code that is fair and reasonable, regulations that embody common sense and reflect common sense.

We actually have, believe it or not, on each of our desks on the floor, a book. It is called the ''Senate Manual.'' We do not look at it that often, but if you go to one of the sections about two-thirds of the way through the book, you will find the Constitution. The Constitution lays out who is responsible for what generally in our country, for different responsibilities that do fall on government.

There is a section in the Constitution—I am not going to read it, but Senator JIM INHOFE of Oklahoma has oftentimes referred to it—where it talks about the obligation and responsibility of the Federal Government to post roads—post roads. For years, that has been read and interpreted to mean to build some roads, some highways, and some bridges.

As time goes by, we have more and more people to build transit systems as well. As it turns out, as we go along in time—after being a country for almost 225 years or so, one of the most important things that we do in creating a nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation is to make sure our country has transportation systems—roads, highways, bridges, transit

systems—that are worthy of this great Nation that we are.

As a former Governor—as I like to say, a recovering Governor—but as a former Governor, I have seen the impact roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems have on the economic growth and success in my State, the region in which we live, and across this country. It is how we move people. It is how we move goods. It is the key to an efficient and growing economy.

For more than a decade, however, we have faced funding shortfalls for the Federal highway trust fund. This stop-and-go funding and lack of uncertainty has undermined—has undermined—the potential for economic growth in America for years. That has to stop.

In fact, since 2008, we had to transfer nearly $65 billion out of the general fund—nearly $65 billion out of the general fund—which is far from running a surplus, to patch holes in the highway trust fund.

I like to use the example of the glasses. We have glasses here that the pages are nice enough to fill with water and to bring for us from time to time. I would like for this glass to be the Federal highway trust fund. It is empty. There is another glass here. This is the general fund of the United States. It is empty. We have another glass over here that is full. It is full. When the general fund is empty and the transportation fund, the highway fund are empty, what we do is we go to this glass over here and say: How about some water? How about some money?

We borrow money all over the world—all over the world. One of the places we borrow a lot of it is China. When the Chinese lend us money, they do not want to be bothered when we feel they may have been manipulating their currency.

They will say to us: We thought you wanted to borrow money, so leave us alone on currency manipulation. They may say: Leave us alone when it comes to taking unfair advantage in terms of trade. When the Chinese are pushing around the Vietnamese in the Philippines in the South China Sea—where I used to fly as a flight officer—they would say: You cannot do that.

And the Chinese might respond: Well, we thought you wanted to borrow our money.

We find ourselves in a very difficult position to be obligated to a lender that is doing things that we think are inappropriate or wrong.

Unfortunately, with the example like the one I have just given you, this actually does happen.

We have not had a transportation bill that lasts for more than 2 years for, I think, now 7 years. It used to be commonplace that every 6 years we would pass a fund, a transportation bill, for our country. We call it the highway bill, but it was for roads, highways, and for transit systems—every 6 years, almost like clockwork.

The money provided by the Federal Government provides roughly one-half of all the money that is spent in the State highway budget, State highway transportation budget. Half of that money is Federal money appropriated by the Congress and approved by the President.

Why we have not had a transportation bill that lasted for more than 2 years, since 2008—we have passed some short-term funding provisions and authorization provisions for transportation that lasts as little as a few days—a few days. This undercuts Governors and undercuts mayors around the country. It prevents them from making long-term investments in critical transportation projects.

Let me give a good example. State Route 1 Delaware runs from I–95 to the north, north-south, right past Dover, our State capital, passing Dover Air Force Base, and heads on down to the southern part of our State, where we raise more chickens and soybeans in Sussex County, DE, than any other county in America. It is a county that has more five-star beaches than anywhere else in America.

When I had the privilege of being Governor of Delaware, we actually built, modernized, and expanded State Route 1. We replaced about 40 traffic lights with a four- or five- or six-lane limited access highway that cuts not in half but greatly eliminates bottlenecks and expedites the flow of traffic in my State. It took over a decade—maybe a dozen years—from start to finish.

Why did it take that long? It is because these projects need some things. You have to take some time to plan the project. You have to take some time to fund the project. You have to take time to contract the project through competitive bids. You have to get the permits for the project. Sometimes there is litigation to work through. It is part of what has to be done to build a major road, highway or bridge in a State. It does not take just a few weeks to do this. It does not take just a few months to do this. It can take years.

In the case of State Route 1—in a little State—it took years, roughly a dozen of them. And without the certainty in the future that the Federal funding will be there for a project that is almost impossible to do it well and, frankly, without that kind of certainty, it is really expensive to do these projects. Stop-and-go. ''Stop-and-go'' means stop and pay lot more money for the projects we are trying to build.

Yet even though we know our States, our counties, our cities, and our businesses are counting on us in this body to do our jobs, we let them down time and time again. What is worse is that Congress has known about this problem for just about a decade—for almost a decade.

It was in 2005 that Congress included provisions in transportation legislation to create not one but two blue ribbon commissions. For what purpose? Will it help us to figure out how to pay for highways, bridges, and transit systems which we are not smart enough to figure this out? Why don't we put together some commissions and let the experts come in and they can help us out? We received the reports and the recommendations. We just never acted on them.

In 2008, these two Commissions delivered reports summarizing the advice of countless experts and giving us a roadmap to fixing the problems for good. Among all of their recommendations, one idea was stressed above all the rest: gradually raise transportation user fees and then index them to inflation going forward.

Despite understanding the problem and the smartest solutions for nearly a decade, we have only shirked our responsibility to agree on a solution again and again.

Rather than take advantage of those blue ribbon ideas, we have continued to kick the can down the road, continued to avoid doing what voters sent us here to do; that is, to make decisions, tough decisions, in the best interests of our country.

I stand here today to say it is high time we finally take care of business and do the job the American people sent us here to do.

My concern about this issue should come as no surprise to any of my colleagues. For years I have been outspoken about my desire to fully fund a multiyear transportation bill.

Government does have a clear role in ensuring that our country has modern, high-quality roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems. That is why the Framers of our Constitution had the good sense to as much as say so in that Constitution. Unfortunately, it seems to me that our courage and willingness to fulfill this responsibility continues to escape us. Instead, we avoid tough choices and simply do things such as smooth pensions or steal Customs fees. Sometimes we will steal Customs fees that are not due for maybe 6, 7, 8 years into the future, and we steal that future money and use it to pay for a couple of months' worth of road, highway, and bridge construction today. We borrow mine safety funds. We apply other bandaids as well.

The standard justification for each of these short-term patches has been that we need just a little more time to work out the details of a long-term plan. Just give us a little more time, and we will work this out. But, as usual, during the 10 months we gave ourselves when we passed the last short-term extension, which, as I recall, was early last August—the 12th time we have done this in 6 years, in case anyone has lost count—we have come no closer to a solution.

The Washington Post last summer may have put it best, and here is what they said: ''Congress doesn't need more time, Congress needs more spine.''

Albert Einstein once said that the definition of insanity is doing something over and over again and expecting a different result. Today, I am asking our colleagues to join me and others to help stop this insanity. If we work together, I know we can find a way to invest in the 21st-century transportation system our States, our cities, and our businesses deserve and need in order to compete in a global marketplace. In an effort to do just that, Senator BOXER and I have introduced a measure that would at least get us started, taking a constructive step that would align the expiration of transportation programs with the funding available in the highway trust fund.

What we have right now is that at the end of this month, the authorization for spending Federal money for these roads, highways, bridges, and transit projects—the authorizations to spend that money expires, effectively stopping the use of Federal money for these purposes at the end of this month. We can't let that happen.

The authorization ends at, we will say right here, the end of May, in about 10 days. Meanwhile, the actual funds in the transportation trust fund, the highway trust fund, are good until the end of July. So the legislation Senator BOXER has joined me in introducing says: At least, if we do nothing else, let's align the end of the authorization—now May 31—to the end of the funding so that we can at least continue the work that is being done in States across the country in the meantime. If we work together, I know we can find a way forward.

We have introduced this legislation, and this adjustment will keep the Congress from putting this issue, we hope, on the back burner yet again.

We hope this will increase the likelihood that we can finally sit down and come to a long-term solution not this fall, not next year, but this summer. I know there are some who say: Well, let's just push this off until December. We have done that before and we can do that again. I just say to my friends, we have a way of—we are getting to the elections. We are getting into the election cycle for President later this year. Maybe there are some who feel that will be helpful to us in finding a way to come together and funding a transportation project. I would beg to differ. I think if we don't get it done sooner rather than later, if we don't make those tough decisions now, we are not going to make them when the caucuses are gathered in Iowa and the primary voters are starting to get riled up in New Hampshire and South Carolina. That is not going to help us do our jobs.

There is a friend of mine who likes to talk about stopgap funding and the need to make a long-term commitment to America's growth and success. He says it is something like what we do now. It is something like taking a road trip—maybe a summer road trip across the country—stopping to fill up our cars, our trucks, our minivans with gas 1 gallon at a time. Instead of filling up, we stop at a gas station and we get 1 gallon, and then we go down the road and a little while later we stop at another gas station and we buy another gallon. It is wasteful. It wastes time. It wastes money. It is no way to take a trip across the country with your family, and I can assure my colleagues it is no way to build a transportation system for a world-class power—America.

In any event, as I said earlier, I took two or three ideas away from the elections last year. No. 1, Americans want us to work together; No. 2, they want us to get things done; and No. 3, they want us to do everything we can to enhance and strengthen our economic recovery.

Finally finding an agreement on a way to pass a fully funded 6-year transportation bill would help us do all three. We would demonstrate that we can work together. We would demonstrate that we can get things done for States and cities and counties across America. No. 3, we really would strengthen our economic recovery. We wouldn't just put 600,000 or 700,000 people to work across America building roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems; we would do a lot more than that. That is important. A lot of jobs need to be filled, and a lot of people would love to have those jobs.

As it turns out, the McKinsey Global Institute recently reported that making a major effort to repair and improve our roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems could add about 1.5 percent to our annual GDP growth and create at least 1.8 million jobs. Let me say that again. Making a major effort to repair and improve our roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems could add about 1.5 percent to annual GDP growth. Keep in mind that GDP growth I think in the last quarter was only about 1 percent. This kind of investment could add another 1.5 percent to annual GDP growth and create almost 2 million jobs.

By failing to pass a long-term transportation bill, we are sacrificing this potential growth and job creation. It is a little bit like leaving money on a table—in this case, a lot of it on a table.

The Federal Government shares the responsibility with State governments to make investments in their aging infrastructure. As I said earlier, the Federal Government—when States spend money on roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems, whether it is in New Hampshire or Delaware, roughly half of that money is coming from the Federal Government. Our States are counting on us to be a partner in funding our transportation systems that the families and businesses we represent count on every day. When a Federal policy fails to plan for the future, we leave these people in the lurch.

The highway trust fund has several dedicated revenue streams in the form of various user fees, as we know. These fees haven't been adjusted in over two decades. During that time, the purchasing power of transportation has nearly been cut in half. There have been increases in the price of concrete, asphalt, steel, and labor. The 18.3-cent Federal gas tax that we set up in 1993 is now worth less than a dime. The 24-cent diesel tax is worth less than 15 cents.

The Congressional Budget Office put together the chart here on my left that shows the growing difference between the highway trust fund, the money we put out for transportation projects, and the money we take in from user fees. I would say we were doing reasonably good from 1998 to 2014. Every 6 years, we see it go up and then it drops down, and then it goes up and then it drops down. That is a 6-year transportation authorization bill.

Look what happened starting this year.

I might add that over the last several years, a lot of this money was just transferred out of the general fund, not money we actually raised. Then we borrowed most of that money from around the world.

But we get to the year 2015, and look what happens. At the end of the year, every year up through 2025, this will be the shortfall. I think it adds up to about $140 billion by 2020. One does not have to be an accountant to know we have a problem when what we are spending outpaces what we collect more and more each year.

We need to find a long-term solution that we can agree on to fix this problem, and we need to do it this summer. We don't need to do it this fall. We don't need to do it next winter. We need to do it this summer. Again, I talked about kicking the can into a Presidential election year. If we don't do it this summer, my fear is we won't do it at all—at least not a long-term bill.

Many of my colleagues have said we must wait until we can enact comprehensive tax reform that creates revenues to solve this problem. As a strong supporter of tax reform, I hope we can find a way to reform our Tax Code, find a way to generate some revenues that can be used to invest in the country's roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems. As I understand, this idea has support from not only President Obama but also from the House Ways and Means Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, and that is encouraging.

One thing I know for sure is that this idea is a lot better than kicking the can down the road. Let's be honest—we have been talking about tax reform for years. It is one of the most complicated problems Congress is facing. We can't just wait around letting our highways and transit systems that people count on deteriorate while we negotiate the incredibly tough decisions surrounding tax reform efforts. Furthermore, tax reform only offers one-time revenues that won't fix the long-term problem with the highway trust fund.

I believe we have to have a viable backup plan in case a bipartisan deal on tax reform continues to elude the Congress. That is why I talked to literally a dozen Members of the House and the Senate from both parties and I asked them to share with me their most thoughtful ideas of what I hope could become an ''all of the above'' transportation funding proposal that we expect to unveil at the beginning of next month. I urge any of my colleagues with serious thoughts on how to shore up the highway trust fund to bring us their ideas and join this effort because I hope to present such a plan, as I said earlier, very soon and to make sure that we don't once again kick this can down the road. There is time to act. It is not next year. It is not around Christmastime. It is this summer.

Gas prices this Memorial Day weekend will be lower than any Memorial Day in recent memory and are likely to stay that way for at least a while longer. The prediction is that they are actually going to start dropping again as we move into summer.

There is an amazing coalition of stakeholders from all parts of the community—frankly, all parts of our country geographically—and throughout the business sector and our government as well, and they support a long-term transportation bill. They are businesses, labor groups, construction companies, transits, retail businesses, manufacturing businesses, and a lot of American families. Their message to us is the same: It is time to do the right thing. It is time for us to do our jobs. It is time for us to give America the roads, the highways, the bridges, and transit systems that we can be proud of and that will help our Nation to continue to grow and to be great.

Mr. President, thank you so much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY).

The Senator from New Hampshire.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a very important issue to my State of New Hampshire, and that is American trade and our ability to create more jobs in New Hampshire and in the United States of America by giving our businesses the opportunity to sell to consumers around the world since our businesses are creating the very best products and technology, and their ability to sell to those around the world is going to create more jobs in New Hampshire and in this country.

I also wish to speak about an important financing mechanism to businesses in New Hampshire and to businesses in this country, and that is the Export-Import Bank.

When traveling throughout New Hampshire and meeting with businesses both small and large, what I hear most often is this: In Washington, please make it easier, in terms of the regulatory environment and the tax environment, for us to do what we do best, and that is create jobs and put people to work. I have also heard we want more opportunities to sell what we produce to other countries in the world, and we also want opportunities to make sure financing is available to increase opportunities for New Hampshire businesses to export to other countries around the world.

An important tool for New Hampshire businesses is the Export-Import Bank, which is set to expire next month, at the end of June, and that is why getting the bill pending on the floor is important. I fought to ensure that there is a way forward to secure a path for a vote on the Export-Import Bank reauthorization before it expires at the end of June.

I thank our leader for committing to allow us an opportunity to extend this important financing mechanism to businesses in New Hampshire to ensure that mechanism is still available and that those New Hampshire jobs continue and that we can continue to grow our economy.

In New Hampshire, the Export-Import Bank supports $416 million in exports and has helped 36 New Hampshire businesses over the last 7 years. Its continued existence is not only important to the Granite State economy, but it translates to over 2,300 jobs that are supported by the opportunity to have financing available through the Export-Import Bank to New Hampshire.

I met with New Hampshire exporters from around the State who have been able to grow their businesses and create more jobs by utilizing the Ex-Im financing to export goods and services overseas. In fact, in December I hosted a roundtable in New Hampshire at the Seaport International Forest Products in Noshua. In the past, they have been able to use Export-Import financing. They were gracious enough to hold a roundtable when Fred Hopper, the head of the Export-Import Bank, came to New Hampshire and met with businesses in New Hampshire to allow them to give him feedback as to how the Bank was working and how important it was to their ability to obtain this financing and expand their exports overseas. In fact, one of the participants in that roundtable, Jerry Boyle, who is the leader of Boyle Energy and Technology Services in Concord, explained how he grew his business 75 percent in the past few years because of the opportunity to use Ex-Im financing.

Make no mistake—failure to renew the Bank's charter would cause us to lose jobs in New Hampshire and lose jobs in this country and would hurt the economy at a time when we should be focusing on making it easier for businesses to create jobs and making sure our businesses have opportunity and access to markets overseas to create more American trade.

I will continue to push this body to reauthorize Ex-Im so that New Hampshire businesses can continue to have access to this financing, can continue to grow their opportunities to create more jobs in New Hampshire by using this financing and to sell their goods and services overseas to create jobs.

I want to address the critics of this Bank. I look at this and I wonder—we are competing in a global economy, and so many of our competitors are actually offering even greater financing mechanisms for their businesses. So without this opportunity for our businesses, we would be putting ourselves at a competitive disadvantage. In fact, the Ex-Im Bank actually has a lower default rate than commercial loans and returns money to the Treasury.

If someone asked me about the Ex-Im Bank, I would tell them that it creates American jobs and returns money to the Treasury to help pay down our debt. If every Federal agency were asked that question, that would be an easy question to answer, wouldn't it? We would probably be a lot farther along in dealing with our $18 trillion in debt.

To me, this is a program that allows us to create more New Hampshire jobs and more American jobs. We have to get this done. I am glad we have a commitment to have a vote on it in this body to allow us to reauthorize it before it expires. Again, it returns money to the Treasury and creates American jobs. Imagine if we could say that about every Federal program.

I wish to talk about another issue that is very important to jobs in New Hampshire, and that is trade promotion authority, which we are currently debating and which is pending on the Senate floor. This will have a real impact on New Hampshire's economy and create thousands of jobs in my State.

In 2014, New Hampshire exported $4.4 billion worth of goods and services and exports and supported about 23,000 good-paying New Hampshire jobs. Over the past decade, we have seen Granite State exports increase by 175 percent. As a testament to America's entrepreneurial spirit, almost 90 percent of New Hampshire's exporters are small or medium-sized businesses.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit Mercury Systems, which designs and builds defense and commercial electronics in Hudson, NH. Since opening in Hudson in 2014, Mercury Systems has more than doubled its workforce from 70 employees to now 170 employees—thanks in part to their opportunity to export what they manufacture.

In April, I visited Corfin Industries in Salem. Corfin provides robotic processing services that are used by the defense, medical, and telecommunication industries. Corfin relies on exports and access to international markets, which has helped to create 22 new jobs in New Hampshire, and now they see a growing portion of their sales going to exports—American trade creating jobs.

There are many other important companies in New Hampshire that support trade promotion authority, and

they view this as an opportunity to create more Granite-State jobs, including companies such as BAE Systems in Nashua; Bosch Thermotechnology in Londonderry; Elbit Systems in Merrimack; Globe Manufacturing Company in Pittsfield; General Electric in Hooksett; Goss International Americas in Durham; Intel Corporation, which also has a facility in Merrimack; Medtronic in Portsmouth; and New Hampshire Ball Bearings in Lanconia. In fact, I had a chance to visit New Hampshire Ball Bearings and to talk to them about the importance of not only Ex-Im financing—as a supplier, this is important to them—but also the importance, obviously, of trade. Also, Osram Sylvania in Manchester, Hillsboro, and Exeter; Polartec in Hudson; Texas Instruments has a facility in Manchester; and Velcro USA is in Manchester. These are just a few examples of the many Granite State companies that depend on American trade and an opportunity to sell the great products they produce overseas.

Here is what I have heard from my constituents in New Hampshire about the pending bill on the floor when it comes to creating good-paying jobs in New Hampshire.

Tony Giunta, a city counselor for Franklin's Ward 1, wrote to me and said:

> Our community is working diligently to boost its economic development. Our priority is jobs and attracting new businesses to our city. It is in that regard I am writing to ask for support on the pending trade vote in the U.S. Senate . . . Our President needs the flexibility to handle the details and present a full plan to Congress for final approval.
>
> That precise system has worked for many years and I believe it should be extended for another 5 years. . . . The Wall Street Journal recently reported that our trade deficit rose to its highest level in nearly six and a half years and the trend line is headed in the wrong direction. We need to do all we can to boost free trade in this country.
>
> Our state's economy depends on it. My city's future depends on it as well. . . . Considering nearly one-quarter of our workforce provides goods and services that are exported abroad means this proposal will have a tremendous impact on our state's economy.

Emily Heisig is senior vice president of the New England Council. This council is a very important council for employers in New England and in New Hampshire.

She wrote:

> While interstate commerce among the states remains a significant avenue for business prosperity, The New England Council believes that foreign markets must be cultivated to tap into the buying power of this vast and ever-burgeoning consumer base. Indeed, across New England, more than 24,000 companies export to foreign markets, and in 2014, that supported nearly 265,000 export-related jobs for our region. The value of goods exported from New England last year was $56.5 billion.

Jim Roche is president of the New Hampshire Business and Industry Association. The New Hampshire Business and Industry Association is a very important group in New Hampshire and brings New Hampshire businesses together. He wrote to me and said:

> Nearly 40 million American jobs depend on trade. This is especially true for New Hampshire where trade plays a big role in our economy. Trade supports more than 179,000 jobs in the state and our exports of goods and services last year reached nearly $7 billion. Trade is especially important for New Hampshire's small businesses, more than 2,200 of which are exporters.

Pete McNamara, president of the New Hampshire Automobile Dealers Association, recently visited me in Washington. He also wrote to me and said:

> The New Hampshire Auto Dealers Association supports free trade. In this competitive world market, the U.S. needs the TPA. America drives the world economy, but outside our borders are markets that represent 80% of the world's purchasing power, 92% of its economic growth, and 95% of its consumers.

Texas Instruments has a very good facility in Manchester. I had a chance to visit that facility and meet the workers in these great-paying jobs and also jobs that are very important, with expertise on technology.

Mark Gary is the vice president and manager of the Manchester site. He said:

> Texas Instruments strongly supports TPA–2015 and urges its swift approval. Renewing TPA provides an opportunity for American companies and their workers to secure 21st century rules to govern international trade. Innovation is the Granite State's greatest asset. New Hampshire's high-tech companies, startups, and universities are generating breakthrough innovations and technologies. High tech companies now represent 8.6% of the state's economy and pay 92% more than average wages. TI Manchester is the heart of the largest power management unit . . . TPA is critical for TI to secure market access, maintain a competitive global supply chain, and support our high value-added design jobs here in New Hampshire.

I also heard from Sylvia Linares, director of engineering and New Hampshire site leader at Intel in Merrimack, NH, which is also very important for New Hampshire jobs.

> Passing TPA will arm U.S. trade negotiators with a clear set of principles and objectives that support our nation's economic, social, and technological interests. These rules have never been more important. In Merrimack, NH we have a very specialized design team that stands to benefit from these rules—rules around intellectual property theft, forced technology transfer and compromised encryption standards. At Intel, we conduct roughly three quarters of Intel's advanced manufacturing and R&D right in the U.S., investments which are supported by three quarters of our revenue from sales elsewhere in the world. We are proud to be part of the New Hampshire tech community by spending more than $5 million annually with approximately 50 suppliers in the state.

With 95 percent of the world's customers and 80 percent of the world's purchasing power outside of the United States, we have to do everything we can to ensure that we have more American trade. American trade that supports jobs here allows us to sell the great work we and our workers do here and the products we produce overseas. That is why the bill pending on the floor is so important to creating more American jobs.

Since the 1930s, nearly every President has used trade promotion authority to negotiate foreign trade policy. This bill contains the clearest outline of trade priorities in our Nation's history. It includes almost 150 ambitious, high-standard negotiating objectives that will direct our trade negotiators to break down barriers that hurt American businesses and will allow American businesses to have more American trade to create jobs here.

The bottom line is that trade promotion authority will ensure that in the Granite State, New Hampshire businesses can create more jobs. In fact, the estimate in New Hampshire is that if you look at some of the agreements, such as the current transatlantic and transpacific trade negotiations, those could spur international investment in New Hampshire and create an estimated over 8,200 jobs in New Hampshire if the President is able to go forward and negotiate the right agreements that allow us to create American jobs.

So there are two issues that I have talked about. We need to get the Ex-Im Bank reauthorized before it expires so that employers in New Hampshire that have been able to use this financing mechanism and the many suppliers that also support companies outside of New Hampshire but that create New Hampshire jobs can have an opportunity to continue to use this financing to put more people to work in New Hampshire. We also need to pass trade promotion authority that is pending on the floor. If you look at the list of New Hampshire businesses that will benefit from this opportunity to create more New Hampshire jobs and more American jobs in the United States of America, this is something we need to do to strengthen our economy in the Granite State and to strengthen our country to make sure there are more opportunities for people to work in this country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, shown in this picture I have in the Chamber is Christina from Stratford, CT. She is a small business owner, and she has a story that is becoming pretty familiar all across the country. She left a job a couple of years ago that provided for employer-based health care, and she wanted to start her own business in Bridgeport, CT, right next to Stratford. So she stayed insured through COBRA for a period of time until it expired, and then she had to go out into the individual market. She recalls having to fill out a 15-page questionnaire when she was applying for individual coverage. She said it asked about ''anything that I had even remotely discussed with my doctor.'' Unfortunately

for her, some of those things—preexisting conditions—meant that she was denied health care coverage.

So she had to go into Connecticut's high-risk pool, which meant she was paying $1,200 per month. Anybody who has started up a small business from scratch knows that can be pretty prohibitive. Her salvation came through the Affordable Care Act. When it went into effect and Connecticut's exchange was established, she was able to find a plan that cost her $430 per month, which is frankly on the high end of plans but it was much more affordable than the one she had.

She said: ''I'm thankful that there was a solution for me to be able to keep my business [and] have affordable health insurance'' that can't be taken away.

Similar stories can be told all over the country, but it is not just anecdotes that we have to rely on any longer to talk about the success of the Affordable Care Act.

I know that we are obsessed this week, appropriately so, with the PATRIOT Act, the transportation reauthorization, and the free-trade agreement, or the fast-track agreement. But the Supreme Court is likely upon our return after the Memorial Day recess to rule on one of the most important cases that it has heard during most of our tenures, and that is the King v. Burwell case. It is important to spend some time before we break talking about the subject of that case, the Affordable Care Act. Christina's story is miraculous—somebody who was able to start a business and keep that business open because of the Affordable Care Act. But she is one of 16.4 million people all across this country who now have health care because of the Affordable Care Act—most through Federal and State exchanges but some because they were able to stay on their parents' plan until age 26 or are able to access Medicaid.

Last month's Gallup poll showed that the uninsured rate in this country has declined by 35 percent over the course of the last year and a half, or since 2013. That is a remarkable number. We shouldn't hesitate from noting that it is just absolutely exceptional in the history of this country to have a one-third reduction in the number of people who don't have insurance in such a short period of time. The good news is that most of the folks who have insurance are satisfied, just as is Christina. Opponent after opponent of the ACA tells us this is going to be terrible health care and that there is no way the government could have anything to do with a health care plan that people want. Of course, it is not government-run health care. It is subsidized by tax credits from the government, but it is private health care insurance, with the exception of those Medicaid plans.

J.D. Power surveyed thousands of ACA enrollees and found that they like their exchange plans more than people like their nonexchange plans. So health care on this exchange is more popular than health care off of the exchange.

The good news isn't just about the number of people who have coverage; it is that costs are coming down. For the accountable care organizations, which are an innovation in the Affordable Care Act to try to build big integrated systems of care, the pilot program just came in with their savings numbers, and $384 million were saved just on this one innovation alone. That is $300 per patient. That is a big deal because it speaks to a larger trend line in which we are for the first time in a very long time able to control health care costs. On an annual basis, last year we saw the lowest increase in medical costs, the lowest medical inflation number in a generation.

But costs are coming down in part because of things that we put into place through the Affordable Care Act. My colleague Senator BARRASSO was down here yesterday with a wonderful chart about Connecticut. I appreciate his giving Connecticut a little bit of extra publicity, but his speech really was a wonderful advertisement for the Affordable Care Act. He noted that several insurers in Connecticut just came out with rate increase requests, and he had the numbers up there. They were 8 percent and 10 percent. They were substantial increases. They were not unfamiliar, because prior to the Affordable Care Act, that is what individuals and businesses were facing every single year. They were double-digit increases.

The rate increases that Senator BARRASSO was referring to were completely in line with what those same insurance plans requested last year in Connecticut. Last year Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield requested a 12-percent rate increase. ConnectiCare requested 12 percent. Because of the Affordable Care Act, which allows States to do reviews and amendments to those rate increases, Anthem's request last year went from 12 percent to 0 percent, and ConnectiCare's request went from 12 percent to 3 percent. We had in Connecticut one of the lowest increases in health care premiums on record because of the Affordable Care Act.

So it is right that these health insurers are requesting big rate increases. But now, because of the law we passed, they don't get those rate increases in States such as Connecticut. They actually have their numbers vetted. They have their actuarial analysis reviewed, and they get a better number to the benefit of my constituents.

But this Supreme Court case that is going to come up is important because it puts millions of Americans at risk for losing many of the protections that I just talked about. It basically says that the Affordable Care Act was designed in a way to only provide these subsidies to help people get insurance on State-based exchanges, and if they were on a Federal exchange, they, by design, weren't supposed to get these subsidies.

Well, a lot of people talk about what the intent of the law is, but you don't even have to get into the intent of the law. On its face the text of the Affordable Care Act is absolutely clear, because, yes, there is a reference—one line to the fact that subsidies will flow to the State exchanges. But the plaintiffs' case completely ignores another section of the Affordable Care Act which gives the Secretary the power to establish exchanges in States that don't do it themselves. That is what has happened by the substitution of Federal exchanges for State exchanges. And, of course, the text of the bill just does not work if you believe the plaintiffs' analysis. The plaintiffs say this is supposed to be a penalty. If you didn't set up a State exchange, we are penalizing your constituents by withholding subsidies. Well, there is not a single line in the Affordable Care Act that suggests that this is a penalty. And there is the fact that the Supreme Court has said that if you want to do that, you have to make it explicit and you can't have guesswork involved as to the carrot-and-stick approach afforded to a State.

Doug Elmendorf, who was the head of CBO at the time said:

> I could remember no occasion on which anybody asked why we were expecting subsidies to be paid in all states regardless of whether they established their exchanges or not. And if people had not had this common understanding about what the law was going to do at the time, I'm sure we would have had a lot of questions about that aspect of our estimates.

Finally, the bill doesn't work on its face if you believe the plaintiffs' argument. Why? Because the insurance reforms are national. And yet the subsidies, according to the plaintiffs, are only for States that established their own exchanges. Well, the insurance reforms don't work if everybody doesn't have insurance in those States. You can't say that folks who have preexisting conditions can't be discriminated against if people in those States don't all have insurance. That actuarially doesn't work. So the whole bill falls apart if you believe the plaintiffs' case.

I am, frankly, totally confident that the Supreme Court is going to find in favor of the government because there is no other way to read the Affordable Care Act other than to believe that subsidies go to both State and Federal exchanges. It is plain on the face of the statute, but certainly you have to get to it in the intent as well.

We are starting to see that Republicans are thinking they are going to need to have an answer if—in the unlikely case, as I believe—the Supreme Court decides in favor of the plaintiffs.

But this is a pretty good summary of what the Republicans' plan is to respond to King v. Burwell. The Republicans' plan, if King v. Burwell goes in favor of the plaintiffs, is essentially a shrug of the shoulders.

The predominant bill on the Republican side is offered by my friend Senator JOHNSON from Wisconsin. He

claims that this bill is going to fix the problems in the Affordable Care Act if the King v. Burwell decision is decided in favor of the plaintiffs. But it is nothing except for just another attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It is disguised as a way to address King v. Burwell, but it is simply an effort to repeal the law. You don't have to read too deeply in the bill to figure that out. It preserves the subsidies for about a year and a half, but after that period of time it ends subsidies in the Federal exchanges and then it also ends subsidies in the State exchanges.

Let me say that again. The Johnson bill doesn't just end the subsidies that the Court might rule unconstitutional; it also ends the subsidies in the exchanges that the Court won't rule as unconstitutional if King v. Burwell is decided in favor of the plaintiffs. Thus, it is a repeal of the bill. It goes well above and beyond what would be necessary to address an adverse decision.

It then goes even further. The Johnson bill then repeals the individual mandate. It repeals the employer mandate, and when you do that, the insurance reforms fall apart. Even Senator CRUZ on the floor during his filibuster conceded that you can't protect people with preexisting conditions unless you also require people to get insurance.

Lastly, the Johnson bill ends the essential-benefits packages. So this guarantee, that if you buy insurance you are going to get a basic floor of services, is no longer. The Republican response to King v. Burwell is simply to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and I hope we never get to the point where we have to debate how we address an adverse decision in the King v. Burwell decision, but this is a nonstarter. Everyone inside and outside of this building should understand that. I don't think it is coincidence at all that over 30 cosponsors of the Johnson bill also support repealing the Affordable Care Act.

One cannot deny that it is working. From the New York Times to the Washington Post to the Wall Street Journal, people understand that the Affordable Care Act is changing people's lives—16 million people with insurance, health care costs stabilized for the first time in many of our lifetimes, and quality getting better. The Affordable Care Act works, and I hope that our colleagues will come together, no matter the decision in King v. Burwell, to make sure that it continues to work for Americans all over this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1243

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I want to talk about trade for a minute. Let me start by saying that I believe in free trade. I strongly support swift renewal of the trade promotion authority we are considering today. We all know the benefits of increased market access for U.S. goods and services are good for American consumers and businesses.

Renewal of trade promotion authority will pave the way for future free-trade agreements between the United States and many other nations. Countries around the world are not standing still on trade, and we cannot afford to sit idly by while they move ahead and engage with each other. History has shown that without trade promotion authority, there is virtually no chance that the United States will successfully reach agreement to lower trade barriers with other countries. We have to have this authority.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in these deliberations, with a shared goal of making sure the trade legislation we are considering today ends up on the President's desk. Toward that goal, I want to raise an amendment I filed that is currently pending.

The proposal we are now debating will renew trade promotion authority for 6 years, but it will also renew trade adjustment assistance. This program will be expanded as well. The Flake amendment No. 1243 will strike the trade adjustment assistance title, or TAA, in its entirety from this package. It is unfortunate that Congress has grown accustomed to tying legislation that expands trade opening for U.S. businesses with this costly trade adjustment assistance.

I reject the notion that these trade-offs are necessary. When Congress takes steps to embrace trade liberalization, it is a responsible reflection of the changing realities in the global marketplace. Almost 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of our borders. The export of U.S. goods and services has been and will continue to be a vital part of our economy. Adjusting and modernizing U.S. trade priorities to increase economic opportunity is a realization that there is a necessary shift in our economy. Changing economic trends and conditions are a recurring part of our country's history. Look no further than the emergence of digital technology to see a familiar example. But it is only in the case of trade policy changes that the Federal Government is expected to layer on additional benefits for impacts to the workforce.

When you look at this economy and you look at how we have grown and if you look at the shifts in the economy from the industrial age onward, there have been shifts and there have been dislocations, but this is the only area where we say: All right, we are going to try to account for that with adjustment assistance beyond what we already have with the Federal Government.

Now taxpayers can at least breathe a sigh of relief that an amendment offered earlier this week that would have dramatically increased the program's authorized funding, this TAA funding, was handily defeated.

If this program is approved, we can expect to see $450 million a year spent on training, employment, case management services and job search and relocation allowances alone. In fact, all told, TAA reauthorization will likely cost the U.S. taxpayers about $1.8 billion.

TAA benefits were expanded in the 2009 stimulus bill. Those expanded benefits were, for the most part, continued from 2011 through 2014. Now, this reauthorization will restore much of that benefit expansion from the manufacturing sector to the service sector and will cover any jobs moved overseas, not just those related to countries with which we have free-trade agreements—this is despite the application criteria for Federal adjustment assistance having been notoriously lax, most notably when employees who were laid off after the Solyndra Federal loan guarantee debacle were awarded TAA benefits.

To be clear, it is not as if those who claim to need trade adjustment assistance are somehow turned away from existing Federal unemployment benefits. These trade adjustment allowance benefits provide a weekly payment to those who have already received unemployment insurance benefits. Including unemployment benefits, these payments can last as long as 130 weeks.

Duplication in Federal job-training programs has been highlighted extensively in the past. According to a 2011 Government Accountability Office report, although some of these have been repealed, 79 Federal agencies spent $18 billion to administer 47 programs in fiscal year 2009. Again, some $18 billion was spent to administer 47 programs in fiscal year 2009.

Supporters of trade adjustment assistance claim that the needs of workers impacted by vibrant international trade are somehow special in nature, but when the price tag for all existing and newly authorized training programs and funding reaches into the billions, those arguments wear a bit thin.

There have also been persistent questions related to the program's effectiveness, TAA's effectiveness.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service noted that ''estimating the impact of the program, for example the differences in employment outcomes of TAA beneficiaries versus otherwise identical workers who did not participate in TAA, is extremely difficult.''

A 2012 study by Mathematica Policy Research commissioned by the Department of Labor did a comparison of TAA beneficiaries to those who were not receiving them. They found that after 3 years, TAA recipients actually had lower reemployment rates. However, after 4 years, employment rates for both groups were statistically the

same. So, overall, TAA recipients ended up earning less annually.

At best, the impact of TAA is a multibillion-dollar question mark. At worst, research says it is ineffective and even counterproductive.

While trade adjustment assistance is of dubious value, we certainly know that renewing trade promotion authority is an incredible opportunity for the U.S. economy. It is my fervent hope that Congress will move forward in approving legislation reauthorizing TPA. It is also my hope that one day we can recognize the benefits of trade and the fact that it lifts our economy. I hope we can advance a sound trade policy without these costly adjustment assistance programs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor noting that my friend and colleague from Connecticut was just on the floor talking about the President's health care law. It is interesting that he would do so at a time when we are seeing headline after headline about ObamaCare plan premiums increasing again all over the country.

Remember what the President said. He said: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.

He said premiums would go down by $2,500 for a family of four. What we have seen is premiums go up across the country. Now my colleague from Connecticut says—in spite of all the money being spent on the President's health care law, premiums are still going up. In his home State of Connecticut, they are going up, and they are going up across the country.

There is a headline in the Connecticut Mirror: ''Insurers seek rate hikes for 2016 ObamaCare plans.'' That is in Connecticut.

You know, it is interesting. I heard my colleague talking about the upcoming Supreme Court case of King v. Burwell, the implications of that case. He said the Republicans did not have a plan. Where is the President's plan? He is the guy who made this mess. This is the President's law. This is the law the Democrats voted for.

You know, there is that old sign in the Pottery Barn: If you break it, you bought it. The President broke the health care system in this country. If the Supreme Court rules that he has acted illegally—he is the one who made the mess; he is the one who created the problem.

When my colleague from Connecticut says ''Where is the Republicans' plan?'' I say ''Where is the President's plan?'' It is interesting. The President does have a plan to protect the insurance companies, but he has no plans to protect the American public, the American taxpayers. He has a built-in plan for the insurance companies so that when they wrote the policies this year, there was a decision made by the White House that those policies could be canceled by the insurance companies if the Supreme Court ruled that the President acted illegally. Yet, there is no path, no safe path for those American taxpayers who thought they were obeying the law if the court rules the way I believe they should based on the reading of the law.

So of course people around the country are very concerned when they see once again that the insurance they are mandated to buy by President Obama and the Democrats, the insurance they are mandated to buy by the health care law is going to be even more expensive next year than this year.

In Connecticut—the first paragraph of this article: ''Insurance companies selling health plans through the state's health insurance exchange are seeking to raise rates next year. . . .''

It goes on to say: ''Despite that, the carriers projected increased costs, citing rising claims expenses and a planned reduction in protection against high-cost claims. . . .'' Reduction in protection against high-cost claims. Why? Well, it says ''from a temporary federal program intended to provide stability for insurers during the initial years of the health law.'' This was the bailout of the insurance companies that President Obama and the Democrats built into the President's health care law to get them to go along.

It says, ''The rate filings are proposals, not actual changes.'' Proposals, not changes. It says, ''The insurance department will now analyze the proposals, accept public comments. . . .'' This is the Connecticut Insurance Department. Well, you know, a lot of members of the public in Connecticut filed comments. I have them to share with the Presiding Officer and with our listeners today. These are the constituents of the Senator from Connecticut, who comes here to the floor and says things are working great in Connecticut. These are his constituents who say:

> I am barely making ends meet as it is. I was under the understanding that this was to be AFFORDABLE—

With all the letters of ''affordable'' in capital letters—

> —healthcare. So far it has been nothing but a burden.

This is a constituent in Connecticut—''nothing but a burden.''

He said:

> I was happy with my previous plan. . . .

Weren't so many Americans happy with their previous plan before the President, who told them if they liked it, they could keep it—well, that is why there is so much disappointment out there. And the President's statement was called ''the lie of the year.''

This person was happy with his previous plan, but it was eliminated as of January 1, 2015. ''My health care,'' he says, ''went up $100 for less coverage.''

People are paying more and getting less, and Democrats wonder why this health care law is not popular. All across the country, people are paying more, getting less, and the Democrats are clueless as to why this is so unpopular.

''Please do not allow this increase.''

That is just one of the constituents who wrote to the Connecticut Insurance Department, a public comment. Here is another:

> Please no rate increase. I cannot afford the insurance now. I pay $594.00 a month for myself, a 60 year old female in relatively good health. I have a $5,500 deductible. I cannot afford to have some testing done because I don't have the deductible amount.

But we heard the Senator come to the floor and say all of these people have insurance. This person figures—well, she has insurance, but it is of no value to her with her $5,500 deductible. She can't afford to have testing because of the deductible. She says:

> It is bad enough we have the big security breach and we have to worry about our personal info stolen in the years to come and you now want to increase our rates.

That is what we are seeing happening across the country, that is what we are seeing happening in Connecticut, and that is what the public is telling the Connecticut Insurance Department dealing with these proposed health rate increases.

This is another:

> I am writing to you regarding the . . . rate increase filing in particular and the health insurance filings in general. I am an individual buyer who does not qualify for federal subsidies due to my income level. I have been buying my family plan since before the Affordable Care Act has been passed and implemented.

They had insurance and do not qualify for a subsidy. Continuing:

> Since then—

Since the Affordable Care Act was passed—

> buying a family health plan in CT has become almost financially impossible for me to buy as it has become a real financial burden for me. Currently, I am paying some 22% of my Federal AGI for a high deductible (family deductible of $11,000) HSA plan.

Now, the Senator from Connecticut may say: Hey, great. This person has insurance, insurance they can't afford and they cannot use because of the deductible.

It says:

> As you are certainly well aware before the passing of the Care Act my premium for health care was much more affordable.

Why is it? Well, it is because the President decided he wanted to transfer money from one group to another, and this individual who had insurance that he liked, the family liked, worked for them, they could afford, now cannot afford, cannot use because of the deductible. They are still insured, so I guess the Senator from Connecticut would call that a big win for one of his constituents who is clearly being hurt.

This is another one that has come in from Connecticut:

Are you nuts? This cannot go on. My ''affordable'' insurance has already increased $200/mo and now you want more? My income doesn't even increase this much.

Paying the penalty for no insurance is a better option than this.

DO NOT INCREASE! Learn how to live within your means like the rest of us do.

This is what we are seeing. Is this a surprise that this continues to be a very unpopular law. Should it surprise?

It surprises the Democrats, obviously, when they see that in poll after poll, month after month, the health care law is more unpopular than it is popular, and the reason is people don't see it as good deal for them. They feel, in terms of their own health, their own families, their own communities, this health care law has been a burden on them, in their lives, and has impacted them as a family.

There is another one from Connecticut:

The ACA raised our health insurance expense (both premiums and deductibles) by 67% for similar coverage!

Sixty-seven percent for similar coverage. Remember, the President told a lot of people that what they had coverage on wasn't any good. It wasn't good enough for the President—might have been good enough for that family but not good enough for the President.

So they had to buy, for similar coverage, premiums and deductibles up 67%.

Continuing:

Please do not approve this additional increase.

This person says they would be fine with their own policy, but they weren't allowed to keep it because of the health care law.

I could go on and on. It is astonishing what we are hearing from the Connecticut Insurance Department, with a response, when they were asked, and put out the filings of the requests for higher rates. It is just interesting.

Here is one more comment from Southbury, CT:

The alleged purpose of this pool, and the affordable care act—

Alleged purpose. Remember NANCY PELOSI: First, you have to pass it before you get to find out what is in it.

Continuing:

The alleged purpose of this pool, and the affordable care act, was to get and keep health care costs under control. My (subsidized) monthly premium is more than double what I paid before being forced into this pool. . . . If the ACA is a failure, then why am I being penalized?

People all across the country believe they are personally being penalized because of the failure of the Obama health care plan and this administration who chose to, with one party and one party alone, force a very expensive, unworkable, really unaffordable, unmanageable, unexplainable health care system down the throats of the American public.

So we will see what happens when the Supreme Court rules at the end of next month. Secretary of Health and Human Services Burwell said that the administration has no plan. The President told me personally—and the White House earlier this year—he had no plan to deal with the Supreme Court ruling that says his actions were illegal, and he has no plan to deal with so many people who thought they were following the law, who have been hurt by the law.

But he has a plan to bail out the insurance companies and to protect them because we know where the President is in terms of looking at this. And his proposal, his quintessential piece of legislation—the one named after him—has clearly done a significant amount of damage to families all across the country.

I believe it has harmed the health care system, which has always been the best in the world.

We needed health care reform in the country. We did not need what President Obama forced down the throats of the American people with people across the country saying no.

People knew what they wanted in health care reform. What they knew they wanted was the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost, and they have not received that under the President's health care law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 25, 26, 74, and 107; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session; further, that all time in executive session count postcloture on the TPA bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will not object. I am pleased to see some judges finally moving forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, we expect some of these votes to be by voice vote.

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. WYDEN. 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. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRADE POLICY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I listened to some of the debate earlier this afternoon—in between the effort to make progress toward getting a fair array of amendments for both sides—about this whole question of secrecy surrounding trade policy. A number of Senators were discussing it, and so I just wanted to take a minute to be very clear that I think they have a very valid point with respect to the secrecy that has long accompanied these trade discussions. I would like to discuss how I made it my paramount reform to make sure we would have a new era of transparency, openness, and accountability in the discussion about making trade policy.

I have always felt that if you believe deeply in international trade—the way I do—and you want more of it, why in the world would you be for all this secrecy? That just makes Americans more cynical about the whole topic and makes them think that in Washington, DC, there is something to hide.

I note my friend and partner in all this, Chairman HATCH, is on the floor, and he will recall when we began our discussions—and they went on really for close to 7 months in our effort to forge a bipartisan package—that I wanted to take a very fresh approach with respect to transparency, and I wanted us to be able to say that for the first time in the history of debating these policies, we would no longer have the country and elected officials in the dark with respect to really what is at issue in these discussions.

So here is a short assessment of what really has changed. Of course, right now we are working on the rules for future trade agreements. We are working on the trade promotion act that sets out the rules for future agreements. Obviously, the first one will involve the Trans-Pacific Partnership—what is known as TPP—and there are a variety of others that are under discussion, particularly one with Europe.

If the Congress—the Senate and the other body—adopts this package that Chairman HATCH and I, in conjunction with Chairman RYAN, have put together over these many months, I think we will have achieved our goal of making sure everybody in the Congress and everybody in the United States who chooses to can have the information they need about trade agreements

before a single vote is cast on the floor of the Senate or on the floor of the other body.

Here is how the reform would work: First, it is required by law—in other words, this isn't something that is discretionary—that these trade agreements, starting with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, would be made public 60 days before the President of the United States signs that agreement. That means if you want to come to a townhall meeting in Colorado, held by the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate—even before the President signs it—a citizen in Colorado can come with the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement—the entire agreement—in their hands and ask questions of the Presiding Officer of the Senate or any one of our colleagues in the Senate and the House.

After that 60-day period of sunshine and exposure, the President can sign it, and then there would be close to 2 additional months—2 additional months—before the voting on the floor of the Senate and the House begins.

So when I heard my colleagues—Senators whom I respect greatly—talk earlier today about secrecy and that secrecy was no good and why couldn't this be changed and why couldn't that be changed, it made me want to come to the floor—and I will do an overview of all of the progressive reforms that have been made to this package; reforms I thought were important for a new era of what I call trade done right—to make sure we corrected the suggestion that somehow everybody is going to be in the dark before the Congress and the country saw voting begin in the Senate and the House.

Chairman HATCH is here, and he remembers all of our negotiations on this point. It is really going to mean—with the 60-day requirement for sunlight before the President signs the agreement and then probably 2 more months after it has been signed, before we start voting—that a citizen can come to a townhall meeting in Colorado, Utah or any part of the country and have that Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement in their hands in order to be able to ask questions about it.

I certainly think that puts our trade negotiators and everybody else kind of on their toes because they know the American people and the Congress are going to have that document. That is going to start with the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

Now, Chairman HATCH and I made a number of other changes. In the future, it would be possible for the discussion of negotiations—summaries of the negotiations—to be made public so people would also have more information about the process as it was going forward. We have lifted a number of the restrictions in terms of Members having access to the materials and staff having access to the materials.

Because the chairman is here, I want to express my thanks to him especially on this point. We spent a lot of time on a whole host of issues: How you could put the brakes on a flawed agreement. I am glad the chairman can smile about our discussions on that point today, but suffice it to say they were pretty spirited. We had discussions on a host of these topics. I am especially pleased we made these very substantial changes on the issue of sunlight, transparency, openness, and accountability because I think my colleagues—who discussed it on the floor and many others who have been concerned about secrecy in the past with respect to these agreements—when they get a chance to actually see the details that are in the reforms Chairman HATCH, Chairman RYAN, and I put together, are going to see we have made some very dramatic changes.

Now, I think some specific changes here are areas that I would like to outline. I am going to go to the question of major changes in workers' rights and environmental protections because I know that a number of my colleagues, when they talked earlier, were concerned about these issues as well.

Suffice it to say, on workers' rights and environmental protections, if we go back to the 1990s, back to the NAFTA era, these vital priorities basically were just shunted to the side. It would be almost inflationary to say they got short shrift. They basically got no shrift. They just got shunted to the side. They were in unenforceable side deals, which meant that the United States in effect had to take it on blind faith that our partners would live up to their commitments. It was my view that many of my colleagues, particularly on the Democratic side of the aisle, were spot-on in saying that wasn't good enough.

This trade package will say in clear terms that the United States is done allowing labor and environmental protections to be pushed aside and disregarded. Our partners will be required to adopt and maintain core international labor standards. Core international labor standards are going to be required of our trading partners. They will have to adopt them, and they will have to maintain them. That is not something that is to the side and is unenforceable. That is real. It has got teeth.

Also, our partners would be required to adopt what are really common multilateral environmental agreements, and these would be backed by the threat of trade sanctions. So these are major changes that certainly contribute to what I think makes the most progressive approach with respect to trade policy in the future.

And for the first time, the President is directed under this piece of legislation to make sure our trading partners adopt and maintain key laws. That is why, for example, I mentioned labor standards. And here is what those are: freedom of association, the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor, the effective abolition of child labor and a prohibition on the worst forms of child labor, and the elimination of discrimination with respect to employment and occupation.

Now, those are the keys with respect to the labor side.

Here are the key protections on the environmental side, which I have again highlighted here at the outset. The bedrock protections here are that there has to be recognition to ensure that there is compliance with the Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species Act, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Depletes the Ozone Layer, the Protocol on Prevention of Pollution from Ships, the Convention on Wetlands, the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Resources, the Convention on Whaling, and the Tropical Tuna Convention.

This, again, is not stuck in a side deal but is fully enforceable, and not just rearranging inadequate policies of the past, sort of rearranging sinking deck chairs. This is better than anything that has existed before—better than the North American Free Trade Agreement, better than the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

With these changes, our country is saying that we will no longer take it on blind faith that other countries are going to adopt stronger standards for protecting workers and the environment. This is the first time the United States is setting the standard and demanding that trading partners hit that mark. That is very real progress.

I will close with just this point. Many colleagues who have been skeptical about trade agreements always raise the issue about whether trade is somehow going to be a race to the bottom. What I have just described is a concrete way to have a new force for raising standards up and getting the standards up, because my colleagues are right that they have been inadequate in the past.

So whether you are for this bill or not, I hope my colleagues will take a look at the new sunshine provisions, because the American people are not going to be in the dark about what is in a trade agreement before anybody votes on that agreement here in the Senate and the House.

I hope my colleagues will especially look at the new provisions with respect to labor rights and environmental rights, because the day is over when those considerations are going to be shunted to the side. They are going to be front and center, and they are going to have teeth. And instead of a race to the bottom that my colleagues have been concerned about, the United States will be where it always is, where we are at our best—forcing standards up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to personally thank the distinguished

Senator from Oregon for the work he has done on this bill. It couldn't have been done without him. A number of other people on his side have been very contributory and helpful.

We are not there yet, but we are going to work at it. I just have to say how much I have enjoyed working with him on the floor so far. I just hope everything will go smoothly so we can get this bill up and out and get the President what he needs to conclude these negotiations and also especially for our Trade Representative. Mr. Froman has done a very good job, as far as I can see. We will have to see what the TPP is like, but we will all have a chance to look at it for a considerable period of time before we have to vote on anything regarding that.

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. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JILL N. PARRISH TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

NOMINATION OF JOSE ROLANDO OLVERA, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

NOMINATION OF PATRICIA D. CAHILL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

NOMINATION OF MARK SCARANO TO BE FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON OF THE NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL 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 Jill N. Parrish, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah; Jose Rolando Olvera, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas; Patricia D. Cahill, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020; and Mark Scarano, of New Hampshire, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Northern Border Regional Commission.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we are finally voting on the nomination of Jill Parrish to serve as a Federal district judge in the District of Utah and Jose Olvera to serve as a Federal district judge in the Southern District of Texas. Five and a half months into this new Congress, these are just the third and fourth judicial nominees that we will vote to confirm. That is simply unacceptable.

Both of these individuals were nominated last September—more than 8 months ago. After receiving a hearing in January, they were voted out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote in February. Their nominations have now been on the Executive Calendar for nearly 3 months. There is no good reason why these nominees should have waited this long for a vote. The vacancy Jose Olvera will fill in the Southern District of Texas has been designated a judicial emergency. In fact, he will fill just one of six district court emergency vacancies in the State of Texas, which currently has a total of eight district court vacancies.

The Senate has a duty to fill judicial vacancies no matter which party holds the majority. When I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee during the Bush administration, I worked quickly to schedule confirmation hearings for judicial nominees and moved them through the confirmation process without unnecessary delay.

In the 17 months I chaired the Senate Judiciary Committee during President Bush's first 2 years in office, the Senate confirmed 100 Federal circuit and district court judges. I also served as chairman during the last 2 years of the Bush administration and continued to hold regular hearings on judges. We confirmed 68 district and circuit court judges in those last 2 years.

Now, this Republican majority has taken 3 months to schedule a confirmation vote for a single district court judge, and after today's votes only 4 district court judges will have been confirmed this year. In contrast, when the Democrats were in an equivalent position in 2007, the seventh year of the Bush administration, we had confirmed 18 circuit and district court judges after 5 months. That's 18 judges under a Democratic majority compared to 4 under the Republicans.

Nevertheless, the Republican majority continues to make excuses for their continued obstruction and delay on confirming judicial nominees. Their excuse is that the Democratic majority was only able to confirm those 18 judges in 2007 because those nominees were held over from the previous year. What the Republicans failed to note is that half or nine of the judges confirmed in the first 5 months of 2007, were not among those left pending on the Senate Executive Calendar at the end of 2006.

The justifications offered by the Republican majority also miss the bigger picture. The Republican majority is simply holding up judicial nominations for no good reason. Since the beginning of 2015, the number of circuit and district court vacancies has jumped from 40 to 51 vacancies after today's confirmations. The number of judicial emergencies has doubled, from 12 to now 24 after today's confirmation of Judge Olvera. The Republican majority is failing to govern responsibly and to fill judicial vacancies where they are needed.

It is unfortunate that as we head into Memorial Day recess the Senate Republicans are allowing confirmations votes on only 2 of the 10 noncontroversial judicial nominees pending on the Senate Executive Calendar. There is nothing keeping the Senate from confirming all 10 nominees—nothing, except for the mindset of delay for delay's sake, which is unfortunately the hallmark of the majority's leadership on nominations.

There are nominees that remain pending on the calendar that will fill a vacancy on the Federal Circuit as well as a nominee to serve in the Western District of Missouri who were first nominated last year, had a hearing more than 2 months ago, and were reported favorably out of committee 1 month ago by voice vote.

In addition, there are five U.S. Court of Federal Claims nominees who were first nominated a year ago. These five CFC nominees had hearings 10 months ago, were favorably reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote last Congress, and again earlier this year. We have heard no opposition to any of these nominees, yet they have been in limbo for months and months. The CFC is where our citizens go to seek redress against the Federal Government for monetary claims. The cases this court hears include claims of unlawful takings of private land by the U.S. Government without proper compensation under the 5th Amendment, claims of veterans seeking disability benefits for combat related injuries, and vaccine compensation claims.

We are debating trade policy in the Senate, yet the nomination to fill one of four current vacancies on the U.S. Court of International Trade has sat idle on the Senate Executive Calendar for months. Like the CFC nominees, the CIT nominee had a hearing last year, was favorably reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote last Congress, and again earlier this year.

I urge the Republican leadership to clear the Executive Calendar of the many consensus executive and judicial nominations before we break for the Memorial Day recess. Let us show respect for our co-equal branches of government and put these nominees in place to get to work for the American people.

PARRISH NOMINATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate will soon be voting to confirm Justice Jill Parrish's nomination from the Utah Supreme Court to the U.S. District Court for the District of Utah.

Justice Parrish, who currently sits on the Utah Supreme Court, is extraordinarily well-prepared to fill this vacancy, and I hope and expect that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support her nomination.

Justice Parrish is a well-known and highly regarded leader in the Utah legal community, who has served with honor and distinction on the Supreme Court of Utah. Her sharp legal mind, breadth of experience, and impressive judicial temperament prepared her to serve on the Federal bench. I cannot think of a more qualified nominee to fill this vacancy at this time. I support Justice Parrish's nomination in the strongest possible terms, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

As a former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I have long worked to secure confirmations for the most qualified judicial nominees. In fact, I have participated in the appointment of three-quarters of the judges who have ever served on the U.S. District Court for the District Utah. That experience has given me a sense, both personally and professionally, of the kind of individual who will serve well on the Federal bench. That experience gives me every reason to strongly recommend Justice Parrish for this appointment.

Justice Parrish is a talented jurist with an impressive background. After graduating from Yale Law School, she distinguished herself in private practice before appointment to the Utah Supreme Court. During her 30-year service, she has established a record of excellence both before and behind the bench, in both State and Federal courts, in both the private and public sector, and in both trial and appellate courts.

The American Bar Association gave Justice Parrish a ''well-qualified'' rating—a distinction the organization only awards to experienced nominees with the most remarkable legal ability and the highest reputation for integrity. Federal nominees who receive the ''well-qualified'' rating are also known for their breadth of experience, their success in the legal community, and their capacity for judicial temperament.

Not only does Justice Parrish match the ABA's requirements, but in every respect, she exceeds them. The United States has the most respected judiciary in the world, and we expect our nominees to the Federal bench to have a record of accomplishment in their chosen area of legal expertise. Justice Parrish is remarkable in that she has not just one but multiple areas of expertise, bringing keen judgment to an appointment that requires a broad range of experiences.

I have every confidence that Justice Parrish will serve admirably as a district judge, just as she has served honorably on the Utah Supreme Court. I might say, in supporting her confirmation, I wish to thank Senator LEE, who is not only my colleague on the Judiciary Committee but also my partner in representing our great State and in recommending the best candidate for judicial appointment. We agree that Justice Parrish is a well-qualified nominee, and we strongly recommend her swift and unanimous confirmation. I call on my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats alike—to support her nomination.

I know this woman personally. I know her very, very well. All of the qualities I have been speaking about I have personally observed.

I think everybody here knows how seriously I take appointments to the Federal bench. In this particular case, I feel very, very good about this nomination. I ask my colleagues to vote for her.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we will have the opportunity in a few moments to vote on a friend and colleague, Jill Parrish, who serves currently on the Utah Supreme Court. She has been nominated by President Obama to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Utah, replacing Federal Judge Dee Benson, with whom I have clerked.

I can think of no one better to replace Judge Benson than Justice Parrish. She is a friend, she is a respected jurist, and she is a dedicated citizen. She is a friend to all who know her.

I am honored to have the opportunity to vote for her today, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jill N. Parrish, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 184 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Donnelly	Manchin
Ayotte	Durbin	Markey
Baldwin	Enzi	McCain
Barrasso	Ernst	McCaskill
Bennet	Feinstein	McConnell
Blumenthal	Fischer	Menendez
Blunt	Flake	Merkley
Booker	Franken	Mikulski
Boozman	Gardner	Moran
Boxer	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Brown	Graham	Murphy
Burr	Grassley	Murray
Cantwell	Hatch	Nelson
Capito	Heinrich	Paul
Cardin	Heitkamp	Perdue
Carper	Heller	Peters
Casey	Hirono	Portman
Cassidy	Hoeven	Reed
Coats	Inhofe	Reid
Cochran	Isakson	Risch
Collins	Johnson	Roberts
Coons	Kaine	Rounds
Corker	King	Rubio
Cornyn	Kirk	Sanders
Cotton	Klobuchar	Sasse
Crapo	Lankford	Schatz
Cruz	Leahy	Schumer
Daines	Lee	Scott
Sessions	Thune	Warren
Shaheen	Tillis	Whitehouse
Shelby	Toomey	Wicker
Stabenow	Udall	Wyden
Sullivan	Vitter	
Tester	Warner	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON OLVERA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jose Rolando Olvera, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas?

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 185 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Ayotte	Franken	Paul
Baldwin	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blumenthal	Grassley	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Reid
Booker	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boxer	Heller	Rounds
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sanders
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Scott
Casey	King	Sessions
Cassidy	Kirk	Shaheen
Coats	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Corker	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McCaskill	Udall
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Fischer	Murray	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am sure everybody is interested in the state of play. Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN are meeting off the floor to try to identify a path forward. We would like to get more amendments pending and set some votes for later this evening.

I hope we will have an update from the bill managers here shortly, but I want to remind everybody, we are going to finish this bill before we leave. We are going to deal with FISA and we are going to deal with highways. There is a path forward, if people want to take it, that could complete all of this work at a reasonable time—probably sometime tomorrow—or we could make it difficult, but the end won't change. So I would just encourage at least some level of cooperation here because

we are doing TPA and we are doing FISA and we are doing highways.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON CAHILL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Patricia D. Cahill, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SCARANO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mark Scarano, of New Hampshire, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Northern Border Regional Commission?

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 action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, free trade is very important to our country and to our future economic prosperity. Anyone who does not believe that is in denial, in my opinion. We live in a global economy and we need to lead on the issue of free trade.

We must not make excuses and cower away from the opportunity in front of us.

The trade promotion authority legislation we are considering is a critical tool for the advancement of our economic interest throughout the world.

This legislation is also proof that Congress and the administration can work together to increase economic opportunity for Americans across all 50 States.

Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN have worked for months to get us to this point. I commend them for this effort and I look forward to working with them to finish this process.

We know that 80 percent of the purchasing power in the world is located outside the United States, along with 95 percent of the world's consumers.

As the middle class expands in regions such as Asia, we have to make sure our businesses and workers have the ability to take advantage of the opportunity that growth presents.

Some estimates predict the middle class in Asia is going to swell from half a billion people to over 3 billion people in just the next 15 years. Are we going to sit on the sidelines while other countries gain preferential access to those consumers?

Governor Branstad of Iowa, recognizing the benefits of trade, sent a letter to me this week outlining his support for trade promotion authority. The letter was signed by 74 other Iowans who represent businesses and associations that also believe it is critical that Congress pass TPA.

The letter states:

> Quite simply, international trade is important to Iowa's businesses, workers and farmers. A vote for leveling the playing field in international trade is a vote for Iowa.

I couldn't agree more with Governor Branstad on that point.

Last year, U.S. exports equaled $2.35 trillion and supported nearly 12 million jobs. Can any of us imagine our unemployment rate without trade supporting 12 million jobs?

In Iowa alone, 448,000 jobs are dependent on trade, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. And those jobs pay 18 percent higher wages on average because they are tied to trade.

Americans know the benefits of trade. And we know that American businesses and workers are some of the most efficient and productive in the world. We just need to make sure they have the opportunity to succeed.

That is why we are considering this bill—to expand economic opportunities for American businesses and workers.

Free-trade agreements that lower trade barriers in other countries can do an amazing thing—they can stimulate our economy through exports without requiring additional spending.

During testimony to the Senate Finance Committee, Trade Representative Froman pointed out that the U.S. is already an open marketplace with tariffs that average just 1.6 percent, some of the lowest in the world. Yet at the same time, our companies face very high tariffs in other markets. Some agricultural products face tariffs up to 400 percent, machinery can be up to 50 percent.

We cannot let the status quo on trade, where we have an open marketplace while our businesses face extremely high tariffs, continue. Trade agreements set the stage for long-term opportunity. The citizens in Iowa who may benefit the most from more trade with Pacific rim countries are probably still in school. We can help their future today.

Iowa exported $15.1 billion in 2014. That represents a 135 percent increase compared to a decade earlier. $9 billion, or 60 percent of the exports went to TPP countries under current trade rules. Imagine what is possible just in Iowa if we reduce barriers in that region.

Roughly, $3.6 billion worth of machinery assembled by Iowa workers alone was exported last year. The goal of the legislation before us is to increase that number.

According to the Department of Agriculture, fiscal years 2010–2014 represent the strongest 5 years of agricultural exports in the history of our country. We exported $675 billion worth of agricultural goods during that period.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would create more opportunities for our farmers and ranchers in a region of the world that represents 39 percent of global GDP. You heard me correctly, we have a chance to give our farmers, ranchers, and businesses better access to markets that represent over one-third of global GDP.

And while I support and believe in the immense benefits of free trade, I also oppose countries tilting the field in their favor through actions like undervaluing their currency. An undervalued currency makes export goods cheaper from the country with the cheaper currency and also makes it harder for consumers in that country to purchase foreign goods, like our agricultural products.

I support addressing currency manipulation in our trade agreements. I have watched administrations of both parties put their heads in the sand on this issue. Everyone opposes currency manipulation, yet little ever gets done.

This TPA bill represents the modern realties we face from the global economy that need to be addressed by our trade negotiators.

The bill includes clear negotiating objectives for standards on sanitary and phytosanitary regulations that must be science-based. Having science-based standards will help limit disruptions to U.S. agricultural exports and even open up some new markets for our producers.

Negotiating objectives are offered related to digital trade in goods and cross-border dataflows that are new and unique issues for the time we now live in.

Clear guidance from Congress is also given for localization barriers and intellectual property rights. More transparency and consultations are also required of the administration.

This is a good bill that we need to pass so we can finish the free trade agreements we have been working on for years.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership and other trade agreements like the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, known as TTIP offer tremendous opportunity for our country and my home State of Iowa.

Throughout the world, there are an estimated 260 preferential trade agreements, the United States is only involved in 20 of them.

We must embrace our role in the world as the competitive economic powerhouse that we are. America is a country that leads, we have a chance to enter into a trade agreement that will set new rules and standards for one-third of the global economy.

Getting TPA through Congress and completing more free trade agreements in the future can unleash economic

prosperity that leads to more jobs, more economic growth, and more opportunity for our workers.

I will end by asking what our alternative is for future competiveness. Other countries are working on preferential agreements. Are we going to sit idly while other countries enter into strategic agreements?

Should we let China start setting the rules of trade throughout the world?

Should we allow other countries to continue blocking our agricultural products with nonscientific excuses?

Should we watch the growing middle class in Asia get their food and products from other countries without trying to compete for their business?

The status quo on trade guarantees us a future with less economic opportunity compared to passing TPA and new trade agreements. That is why we must pass TPA and then pass new trade agreements to help ensure America has a brighter economic future.

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. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes today to talk once again about Congress's role in advancing our Nation's trade policies and specifically on the increasingly important issues of digital trade and intellectual property rights.

Let's keep in mind that the last time Congress passed TPA was in 2002. We live in a very different world than we did 13 years ago. Technology is vastly different. Commerce is vastly different. For example, in 2002, less than 700 million people worldwide had access to the Internet. Last year, that figure reached nearly 3 billion—with a ''b''—3 billion people. In 2002, e-commerce platforms such as Amazon and eBay were just beginning to gain widespread use. Special media sites and other platforms that today drive so much Internet traffic and user-generated content—sites such as Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter—did not even exist.

In the last 13 years, an entirely new economy has developed based on these online platforms. Today, Facebook has around 1.4 billion—with a ''b''—active users, with approximately 83 percent living outside of the United States of America and Canada. YouTube has more than 1 billion users, with local interfaces in 75 countries and compatibility with 61 different languages.

Mobile technology has similarly been transformed since 2002, as the term ''smart phone'' has become part of our regular vocabulary. Mobile phones were big and clunky in 2002 and were not good for much more than making phone calls. Today, smart phones perform a myriad of functions, including streaming video from the Internet, video calling, digital photography and videography, and GPS locating, just to mention a few.

The growth of the Internet and mobile technologies has transformed our economy, the products and services we buy, and how we buy them. The advances have significantly reduced the cost of moving products and services across borders and boosted productivity in this country and around the world.

Digitally traded goods and services are growing and are expected to continue to grow. According to a recent study conducted by the International Trade Commission, in 2012, U.S. digitally intensive firms sold nearly $1 trillion or nearly 6 percent of our total GDP in goods and services over the Internet. About one-quarter of those sales were small and medium-sized enterprises. The people behind these numbers are everyday Americans just trying to compete in an increasingly competitive global marketplace.

Fortunately, our TPA bill includes upgraded negotiating objectives that reflect the world in which we now live. To address this new digital economy, our bill for the first time recognizes the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce. It would also extensively update and expand the e-commerce directives from the 2002 TPA bill to require U.S. negotiators to ensure that all trade agreement obligations, rules, disciplines, and commitments apply to digital trade and that digitally traded goods and services receive no less favorable treatment than comparable goods and services and that they are classified to ensure the most liberal trade treatment possible.

The free flow of data across borders is critical to facilitating digital trade, as it allows U.S. companies to identify market opportunities, innovate and develop new goods and services, maintain supply chains, and serve their customers around the world. Unfortunately, an increasing number of governments are considering or imposing restrictions on cross-border dataflows, including requirements that U.S. companies store and process data locally. Our bill directs U.S. negotiators to ensure that our trading partners refrain from such restrictions and requirements.

It also includes several new and expanded negotiating objectives to address common regulatory issues faced by U.S. companies in the digital economy. For example, the bill directs U.S. negotiators to seek greater openness, transparency, and convergence of standards, development processes, and to encourage the use of international and interoperable standards.

I would urge any of my colleagues who oppose this bill to explain how they plan to give American workers and businesses in the digital economy an opportunity to thrive in an increasingly competitive marketplace—global marketplace, really. They talk about wanting to preserve jobs and protect Americans, but existing trade rules were written for a time long since passed.

Beyond transitioning our country into this increasingly competitive world of technological growth, our TPA bill also takes a bipartisanship, bicameral approach to improving intellectual property rights protections. Protecting intellectual property is critical to the development of the digital economy, just as it is critical to overall economic growth.

Our Founding Fathers believed intellectual property to be so fundamental to America's future prosperity that they explicitly granted Congress the congressional authority to protect it. Since Jefferson's moldboard plow and Eli Whitney's cotton gin, American intellectual property has spurred on American job growth and prosperity, creating more competitive businesses here—right here in America. Intellectual property, be it for mechanical products, software, or semiconductors, creates value for individuals and American businesses. In turn, these businesses create jobs, spur economic growth, and enrich our culture.

The simply truth is, the countries that strengthen intellectual property rights enjoy great economic benefits. They attract more investment, technology transfers, increased immigration, and ultimately more prosperity for their citizens. Yet, despite these fundamental truths, intellectual property protections around the globe are often fundamentally deteriorating and continually at risk.

Our economic and strategic competitors are well aware that the United States leads the world in innovation, but all too often they fail to understand why. Instead of fostering policies to advance innovation, they seek shortcuts to undermine and even steal American intellectual property. The tools they employ are numerous and very sophisticated. Some of these tools include nontransparent reimbursement and licensing regimes, unfair standard setting, and burdensome regulations.

All of these mechanisms are designed specifically to pry away some of the most innovative and productive parts of our economy, tearing away the competitive edge our American businesses have worked so hard to create and stunting what could be a much more liberal playing field. If enacted, our bill would represent a significant step forward in strengthening the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights around the world.

It calls for robust intellectual property rules, building on the strong intellectual property standards found in the prior 2002 TPA law. This includes requiring that trade agreements meet the same high standards found in U.S. law. Our bill also requires countries to fully implement the TRIPS Agreement, particularly the enforcement obligations.

To address the challenges and opportunities created by the digital economy, our bill would ensure that right holders are able to keep pace with technological developments by controlling and preventing unauthorized use of their works online.

A growing problem around the world is that foreign governments are stealing valuable technology from U.S. businesses. This type of trade-secret theft threatens to diminish U.S. competitiveness around the globe. It puts American jobs at risk and poses threats to U.S. national security. To address this problem, our bill calls for an end to government involvement in intellectual property rights violations, including piracy and cyber theft of trade secrets.

The bill also ensures that governments limit the unnecessary collection of trade-secret information and protects any information they do collect from disclosure. This is the first time TPA legislation has addressed these issues—these very important issues.

The bill also requires the elimination of the price controls and reference pricing, which are used by many countries to deny full market access to innovative pharmaceuticals and medical devices.

The bill further includes a new provision to direct the U.S. negotiators to ensure that regulatory reimbursement regimes that make pricing and reimbursement decisions are transparent, provide procedural fairness, are nondiscriminatory, and provide full-market access for innovative pharmaceuticals and medical devices.

Our bill also calls for the elimination of measures that require U.S. companies to locate their intellectual property abroad as a market access or investment condition. Finally, this legislation includes an expanded capacity-building objective, directing the administration to work with U.S. trading partners to strengthen not only their labor laws, as was provided for in 2002, but also their intellectual property rights laws.

Once again, we live in an economic and technological environment that is very different from the one that existed in 2002. Advances in Internet and mobile technologies have transformed whole sectors of our economy. Our bill positions our country to take advantage of the opportunities and face the challenges presented by the 21st century economy, and that is one of the many reasons why it should pass.

I urge each of my colleagues to work with me to help move this bill forward so we can negotiate strong trade agreements that serve today's economy as well as set the stage for America's next generation of entrepreneurs and innovators.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Nebraska.

BUILD USA ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise this evening to speak about our Nation's infrastructure. In just a few days, authorization for our Nation's transportation programs will expire. By August, the highway trust fund will run out of money. Our States and citizens will face the consequences of inaction in Washington.

Americans depend on our Nation's roads every day as they travel to work, bring their children to school, and transport goods to consumers. Transportation infrastructure is an essential component of our daily lives and for the national economy. As such, it must be efficiently maintained. But today, all across America, our highways and bridges languish in disrepair. Our citizens are no strangers to potholes, road closures, and ''expect delays'' signs. Moreover, as America's population continues to grow, expansion projects for our crumbling highways remain caught in bureaucratic redtape.

For decades, it has been apparent that excessive regulations, coupled with inadequate funding and financing, have delayed badly needed road projects. I have firsthand knowledge of the challenges facing our Nation's transportation system. In my home State of Nebraska, roads and bridges connect vibrant, urban communities with our open country.

Before arriving in the Senate, I served as chairman of the transportation and telecommunications committee in the Nebraska Legislature. And while there, I spearheaded a bill that eventually became law.

What is now known as the Federal Funds Exchange Program provides the State of Nebraska with the ability to voluntarily exchange Federal transportation funding for State transportation financing at 80 cents on the dollar. In exchange for giving up this Federal funding, counties and cities receive State transportation dollars with more reasonable regulatory requirements.

This program has been a great success in my State of Nebraska. For example, in Buffalo County, federally exchanged funding made a longstanding bridge replacement possible. A major arterial street in South Sioux City is up and running because of the program. In Scottsbluff, a city in the Nebraska Panhandle, they are using our State program to conduct important maintenance on city streets, and the program has also enabled Adams County to construct several bridges and a large culvert project.

Despite these accomplishments in Nebraska, States across the country suffer from very rigid, regulatory requirements and a shortage of transportation funding options. Our current system is broken. States not only need more options, but they need some relief as well.

In fact, the Congressional Research Service estimates that a lack of flexibility has caused major highway projects to take as many as 14 years to plan and to build.

The time has come to bring successful practices from Nebraska to Washington.

For this reason, I have introduced the Build USA Act. This bill will create a new funding structure for State transportation projects. Specifically, the Build USA Act establishes the American Infrastructure Bank. The bank will allow States to remit Federal transportation dollars.

States would then be able to receive 90 percent of this money back and retain control over the environmental, construction, and design aspects of highway projects. This new strategy will infuse more dollars into our transportation system, and it is going to provide States with greater flexibility so they can build and maintain their roads.

The revenues that are generated from State remittance agreements with this bank would also help fund other local infrastructure projects. Currently, the Federal Government only offers large-scale financing options for States seeking core infrastructure funding. So, as a result, smaller communities are often ineligible to receive Federal assistance for their projects, while major metropolitan areas benefit from easier access to financing.

Under the Build USA Act, bank loans would not be subject to a minimum project cost or size. The revenue from these loans could help local governments apply for core infrastructure financing at a rate that is going to be more competitive than the private sector.

The Build USA Act provides additional funding flexibility for those immediate transportation needs that we see all across this country. And, what is more, it accomplishes it without raising taxes.

Under this proposal, a voluntary 3-year repatriation holiday would be implemented to generate seed money for the bank's revolving fund operations. Recent estimates by the Joint Committee on Taxation suggest that the first 3 years of a similar repatriation plan could raise as much as $30 billion.

Although some Members of Congress wish to save these revenues for an overhaul of the Tax Code, most of us do acknowledge that tax reform is unlikely to come to fruition in the near future. Meanwhile, our Nation's transportation needs are immediate. We better address them now. These dollars should go toward solving problems that our citizens experience every single day. As such, revenue should help provide a long-term solution to highway funding, not just a one-time jump-start or a shot in the arm, as some people have suggested.

This proposal is a long-term solution. It is a solution to issues that have plagued our Nation's roads for decades. Individual States must have the flexibility to address the unique needs of their local communities.

In order to address the transportation challenges facing our Nation, we need to have more options available. Although this plan does not address the immediate challenges facing the

highway trust fund, it does represent a way to infuse new money into our Nation's transportation system, while it is offering States new solutions to get transportation projects up and running.

It looks to the future. This is a proposal for the long term. It is time that we start thinking outside the box. It is time to offer Nebraska's best practices to help the Federal Government help itself.

Our Nation needs to get moving, so I encourage all of my colleagues to look at this proposal, to consider this proposal, because it moves us forward into the future.

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.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we have been talking over the past several days about trade. I wish to add a little discussion here about some of the specific amendments that may come up over the next day or two. I am hopeful that we will have a vote on some of these amendments later this evening.

It is incredibly important for us to expand opportunities for our workers and our farmers by knocking down barriers to trade. That is why more export promotion is a good thing. These are not only more jobs for America, for my State of Ohio, for the Presiding Officer's State of Arizona, but these are better-paying jobs as well. There is no question that not having trade promotion authority over the last 7 years has been detrimental to us in terms of losing market share for our workers and our farmers.

Other countries are negotiating agreements. In fact, there have been well over 100 agreements negotiated without the United States being a party and that cuts us out.

But as we do that, as we expand exports—which is a good thing—we must be sure that playing field is also more level and fairer, so that our workers and our farmers, and our service providers have the opportunity to compete.

That is all we are asking for.

There are a couple of amendments likely to come up again this afternoon and over the next couple of days. One is with regard to this issue of when somebody dumps a product or when a country has a policy of subsidizing a product, there should be the ability for American companies to respond on behalf of their workers.

When products are dumped or when there is a subsidy on an import, there is a process by which you go to the International Trade Commission and seek help, show that you were materially injured, that damage was done to you, your company, and your workers because of these unfairly traded imports. You then go to the Commerce Department's International Trade Administration and make the argument as to what the countervailing duty ought to be, what the tariff ought to be to combat this. The problem is that in that system today, it is so hard to show material injury and to get that relief that often by the time you can get that relief, it is too late.

We certainly found this in Ohio with regard to many of our industries, and a lot of them, therefore, are very interested in this amendment. One is steel. Right now, there is a lot of tube and pipe coming into this country from overseas. We believe some of it is being sold at below its cost here in America. That means it is being dumped. We believe some is being subsidized. That means it should be subject to countervailing duties. Yet, by the time you can get that relief, find that remedy, often it is just too late. You have lost your market share. You have lost the American jobs.

So this amendment, which is bipartisan and which is backed by over 80 American companies and trade associations and many companies in my home State of Ohio, such as U.S. Steel, Timken Steel, ArcelorMittal, is a commonsense measure that says: Look, workers shouldn't have to lose their jobs before they can get relief.

Seventy-eight of our colleagues backed this amendment in the Customs bill last week. In fact, Senator HATCH, chairman of the committee, who has done a good job shepherding this process through, included this amendment in his mark in the Committee on Finance, which demonstrates how much support it has. However, we feel it is very important that it be in this legislation, in the trade promotion authority bill, which is the bill we are now debating on the floor. We can't let it get left behind.

It is interesting because other countries do have provisions in their laws to keep our exports out if they believe they are unfairly traded or for other reasons. Let me give an example of this by going to AK Steel, which is a company that is based in West Chester, OH. It has 4,000 workers in the State of Ohio. AK Steel produces a high-tech steel called grain-oriented electrical steel. It is a silicon alloy used in the power generation and transmission industry and is more commonly referred to as GOES. GOES steel is a specialty steel. It is an incredibly important product for AK Steel because it is one they are able to export. They are so efficient at producing it and it has such high value that they are exporting it to a number of countries around the world. They produce this steel with 250 United Auto Workers—members of the UAW—in Zanesville, OH.

Back in 2010, China imposed antidumping and countervailing duties on GOES from the United States, including this product from AK Steel made in Zanesville, OH. They claimed U.S. producers had received subsidies through the ''Buy American'' provisions in the stimulus bill. They didn't, by the way, but that is what China claimed. It was really retaliation that had to do with some other products that had been coming from China to here—tubular products for the oil and gas industry—and they were retaliating. Anyway, that was China's claim.

So our company, AK Steel, said: Look, this is not accurate. But these duties were put in place anyway by China. It reduced the exports by 92 percent from Ohio to China. So the United States—rightfully so—took China to the World Trade Organization and won the case because the facts were on our side. We won the case, but China appealed it—without removing the duties.

So this all takes time. Meanwhile, you are losing market share. Instead of immediately removing the duties, when they lost the appeal, China chose to run out the clock, only dropping their tariff a couple weeks before the WTO forced them to do it. So American-made GOES was kept out of China for 5 years. This process took 5 years and cost American workers millions of orders.

Meanwhile, the U.S. domestic producer sought relief from their government by going to the ITC as well as the ITA—the International Trade Commission and the International Trade Administration—and they found the domestic industry was not injured in a case against producers from several countries, including Japan, Germany, China, and Poland, despite surging imports and dropping prices. So on the one hand, they were not able to sell in China for 5 years and lost a lot of market share and millions of dollars. On the other hand, when they went to their own government to ask for a little relief on this product coming in, they were not able to show injury despite surging imports and dropping prices.

The provisions we have simply clarify that when a producer—a U.S. company—is injured, when it is material injury as was defined in the statute, they shouldn't have to wait until after the factory is closed and workers are laid off for us to stand up for our workers.

By the way, just last month these GOES producers were cut out of another large international market. The European Union announced it would be imposing duties on this same electrical steel from the United States, again putting millions of dollars of exports at risk.

So our provision is an attempt to help level this playing field. It is WTO-consistent; in other words, it doesn't violate our international obligations. It simply clarifies what ''material injury'' means. It goes back to the original statutory language and makes it easier for American companies to seek

the relief they deserve. This is going to help protect millions of American jobs that otherwise could be at risk because our trade laws haven't kept up with international commerce.

This is an example of one of the amendments we would very much like to offer on the floor. I know there is discussion right now in another room in this Capitol about whether we will be able to offer this amendment. It is an amendment by Senator BROWN and me. It is an example of what—if we included it in the trade promotion authority legislation—would make this a bill that is truly balanced, one that expands exports, which is incredibly important, as I said earlier, to the people I represent—our farmers, our workers—and to our State and our economy, but that also ensures that there is a more level playing field, that there is fairness in this underlying legislation.

The second amendment we hope to offer is with regard to currency manipulation. We have talked a lot about this on the floor this week, and I would just say three things.

One, this is something a lot of Members in this Chamber have already looked at because 60 Members of the Senate in 2013 sent a letter to the President of the United States saying that with regard to trade agreements, there should be enforceable currency manipulation prohibitions—60. Some of those Senators are still in this Chamber. Most of them are. I would hope we again would have a strong message from the Congress, which is what trade promotion authority is, that in the context of trade negotiating objectives—and there are about 20 different trade negotiating objectives in TPA—one of them should be that we have a prohibition on currency manipulation, and it should be enforceable.

Second, there will be an alternative amendment offered that agrees with our amendment in terms of the definition of currency manipulation. Specifically, it does not affect monetary policy. It does not affect what the United States has been doing with QE2, QE3, QE1.

By the way, for those who think that kind of monetary policy is export-oriented, look at the value of the dollar. It has certainly not been effective at lowering the price of our currency. In fact, our currency has gone up in value. It is about stimulus. We can argue about the merits or demerits of that monetary policy, but it is not affected at all by this amendment, and the amendment specifically clarifies that.

So just to be clear, No. 1, 60 Senators have already signed this letter; No. 2, this is consistent with the International Monetary Fund definition, which says this is not about monetary policy. It is about real intervention. It is about intervention in currency markets to be able to affect exports, to lower the price of exports unfairly and to increase the cost of our exports to other countries unfairly.

Finally, I would just say this is about the balance we talked about earlier. The American people want to know that while we are expanding exports, we are also ensuring that we get a fair shake—our farmers, our workers, our service providers.

There is a quote by a former Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Paul Volcker, that I think is telling. As a former Chairman of the Federal Reserve, he said that, ''In five minutes, exchange rates can wipe out what it took trade negotiators ten years to accomplish.''

As a former U.S. Trade Representative, I agree with that. Currency manipulation takes away so much of the value of what we are trying to do on this floor. Those who support trade should be in favor of prohibitions on currency. This is a distortion. If you are a market-oriented fiscal conservative, if you are someone who believes we ought to let markets work, then you should be against currency manipulation because it does distort the market. If you are someone who believes we should be expanding exports but it should be fair, you should be for this prohibition on currency manipulation and making it enforceable. And we should have the courage of our convictions. If we really do believe that, we should be sure there is some ability to make this enforceable.

The countries of the Pacific region that are currently negotiating with us on the Trans-Pacific Partnership do not currently manipulate their currency, but a couple of them have in the past. Notably, Japan has over 300 times before 2012. Malaysia has. It doesn't make sense to put in place this provision to say: In the future—once we have completed this agreement with you, we have knocked down these trade barriers in the United States and in your country to enable us to have more trade—you would not be able to manipulate your currency under this agreement.

There is some polling data out there that indicates 9 out of 10 Americans agree with that, by the way. And of course they do because it is just common sense. All we are looking for is the ability to compete fairly.

Wouldn't it be great if we could do both of these things—expand exports but also be sure we are getting a fair shake for the people we represent, the AK Steels of the world that have their products blocked in China and their products blocked in the EU and yet can't receive the relief here or the companies in my home State that work hard to bring some business back from China?

In one case, there is a small manufacturer in Cleveland, OH, that told me about this. It is a company that makes highly valuable steel products, and these are products that help hold up speakers at major concerts. They brought some of that business back from China.

One day I was in their shop talking to them, and they said: Well, we are going to lose this order. Why? Currency manipulation. That made the Chinese imports into our country less expensive because they manipulated their currency and lowered their value and made it much more difficult for them, therefore, to be competitive. They were concerned that they were going to lose that order despite the fact that they had done everything to make their plant more efficient and that the workers had made concessions. They had done everything right and played by the rules. That is what we are asking, that everybody be asked to play by the rules.

So I hope the underlying legislation passes, but I hope it passes with these improvements to ensure that we do have a balance here; that we are able to tell our farmers and our workers and our service providers: You are going to have the opportunity now to access 95 percent of the consumers who are outside the borders of the United States of America. That is a good thing. It will mean more jobs and higher paying jobs, paying on average 15 to 18 percent more, and better benefits. But also, by entering into these agreements, we are going to have more fairness for you so you can get a fair shake and be able to do what you want to do, which is to be able to compete in this global marketplace and be assured that competition will be fair.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the trade promotion authority bill which has been debated on the Senate floor the last few days.

I begin, though, by complimenting my good friend and colleague from Ohio—one of the most well-respected Members of this body, I think an example of a true American statesman, and certainly one of our best U.S. Trade Representatives who knows a lot about the topic that we have been debating. So I thank him for his tremendous service for the people of Ohio and of our country.

The TPA bill we have been debating is going to be good for the country. It will help move our country forward, provide tremendous opportunities for growth and expansion—for our farmers, ranchers, businesses, fishermen, workers, and those in the high-tech sector.

As Senator PORTMAN mentioned, 95 percent of all global consumers lie outside of the United States—95 percent. What we need to do is access those consumers to have more opportunity.

Currently, it is estimated that over 38 million jobs in the United States are tied to trade. The trade agreements we are talking about on the Senate floor that would come after TPA will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs and new opportunities for Americans. These are good jobs, and we need more jobs.

This has been one of the weakest recoveries of any major recession in American history. We are barely growing at 1.5 percent, 2 percent GDP growth. These are not traditional levels of American growth. Why? Why has our growth been so slow?

Well, there are many reasons. But I think the overregulation of our economy by the Federal Government clearly is one of the major reasons, and trade agreements are exactly the kind of boost we need. What do trade agreements do? They reduce regulations, they cut redtape, they reduce taxes on goods coming in to American families. We need this kind of policy, in terms of less regulation and more freedom for our domestic economy and internationally. That is how we are going to get

moving again. That is how we are going to get this economy moving again. That is how we are going to get Americans working again. That is why TPA is so important to begin this process. But TPA is also about American leadership—bipartisan U.S. American leadership.

Since the end of World War II, every administration—Democratic, Republican, it doesn't matter—has wanted to lead on trade, has wanted to obtain trade promotion authority, and that has been critical to American leadership, global leadership, and helping our businesses and workers.

It is also critical to make sure we have a seat at the table, to set the rules for the global trading regime as we have traditionally done—again, bipartisan, Democrats and Republicans for decades have been doing this—and to help make sure we are leveling the playing field for our workers.

The American workers—the American fisherman, the American rancher, the American farmer—can compete against anyone in the world with a level playing field. We have done that for decades. That is the American way, but we have to be in the game. We need to be the country setting the rules. We need to be the country that lays out trade agreements that have strong intellectual property rights protection, that open markets, that get rid of state-owned enterprises, that have strong enforcement provisions—so when countries cheat in global trade, we have the ability to enforce rules and strike back if we need to, to protect our economy, our workers, our farmers, our fishermen.

I wish to talk a little bit about free trade as it relates to my home State of Alaska.

Here are some facts about trade in Alaska: Already, in my State of Alaska there are over 90,000 jobs tied to trade. That is more than one in five of all jobs in the Alaska economy tied to global trade, particularly trade to the Asia-Pacific region.

We are also a huge recipient of foreign direct investment—foreign direct investment that employs Alaskans. These are good jobs. Fourteen thousand Alaskans are directly employed by foreign companies, and there are tens of thousands more who are indirectly benefited. So many Alaskans count on these important jobs.

In terms of exports, of course we are a very large State with a relatively small population—a little over 700,000 citizens. But in 2013, the State of Alaska exported over $6 billion in goods and services. Per capita exports, we are a powerhouse. We are one of the strongest exporters in the country. And in terms of fish and seafood, we are the superpower of exports—not per capita but absolute exports. In 2013, we exported roughly $2.3 billion in seafood and fish.

The fishing industry is a very important industry for a lot of States in our country, but more than half of all seafood harvested in America comes from Alaska's waters. It is also one of the biggest employers in my State. In fact, it is the biggest employer in my State, even more than some of the resource industries. There are 78,000 Alaskans employed in this industry, and these are the epitome of small businesses.

Every fishing vessel, when you look at one, is a small business. What do they do? They take risks. I am sure some have seen ''The Deadliest Catch.'' A lot of times they are family-owned. They work hard, and they produce a great product—a great product—king crab, fresh Alaska salmon—a great product. These are classic American small businesses, which brings me to my amendment.

As my colleague from Ohio mentioned, there are a lot of discussions right now. We sure hope Members of this body are going to have opportunities to present amendments to make the TPA bill stronger.

The amendment I have filed, that I want to offer, is a simple amendment to make a principal negotiating objective under TPA focusing on making sure members of the fishing community—American Fish, American Seafoods—have opportunities for more open markets overseas. This will benefit the hard-working fishing families all across America.

This amendment will ensure that of the many TPA objectives, this one will be in there—more access to markets, more opportunities for these great American small businesses.

As I mentioned, not only in terms of Alaska is this an important industry, this is a hugely important industry for the United States. In 2013, our country exported over $5.5 billion worth of fish and seafood. The commercial fishing industry in the United States in 2013 employed over 1 million Americans, with an income of $32 billion. Let me repeat that: Over 1 million Americans in this industry nationwide and $32 billion in income—and, again, most of these are classic American small businesses. This is who TPA should be focused on.

As I mentioned, the current TPA bill has negotiating objectives for a lot of important industries in our great country—textile, agriculture, services, manufactured goods. There are about 20 specific trading negotiating objectives that the TPA bill directs the U.S. Trade Representative to get in terms of the free-trade agreements he will try to seek once TPA has been passed, and this is the way it should be. Those are all great sectors. Agriculture is hugely important to our country. But we should also have a similar negotiating objective for another very important industry in this country—our seafood industry, the fishing industry.

This is a simple amendment. It asks that the U.S. trade negotiator focus as a principal objective to make sure this industry has opportunities just like all the other industries do and, importantly, particularly as we are trying to work through this bill to see what amendments we can get on it, this is a very bipartisan amendment.

Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts, on the other side, has a lot of hard-working fishing families. So from Alaska to Massachusetts, this is a very bipartisan bill that will help small businesses, and it help coastal communities that rely so much on fishing.

Finally, I want to talk about TPA and go back to the issue of American leadership. TPA, open trade, and free-trade agreements can work for America. They can work for our workers, farmers, businesses, ranchers, fishermen. I know. I have had the opportunity of seeing this firsthand.

I worked as an Assistant Secretary of State under Condoleezza Rice on economic issues, on trade issues, and a number of the free-trade agreements we currently have in force were ones I had an opportunity to work on with many members in the Federal Government.

Let me give two examples: the free-trade agreement we had with Singapore and the free-trade agreement we had with Australia. Once these were passed and the barriers to our exports came down, American exports skyrocketed to these countries. As I mentioned, American workers can compete with anyone. Give us a level playing field, and we will take advantage of it.

U.S. exports, in terms of goods to Australia, rose 33 percent between 2004 and 2009. U.S. goods exports to Singapore were up $21 billion—31 percent—from 2003 to 2009.

I met with the Singapore Ambassador today. He reminded me that we actually have a trade surplus with Singapore, as I believe we do with Australia, because of these free-trade agreements.

So free-trade agreements are a win-win for our country economically, but they also importantly deepen the economic ties that bind our country and our citizens to some of our most important friends and allies—such as the country of Singapore, such as the country of Australia, and that is happening.

Finally, though, trade is also about American leadership, it is about American confidence, the ability to say: Open the markets and we can compete with anyone. We need that confidence back.

For too long under this administration we have been disengaged from the world. For too long we have allowed other countries to be in the driver's seat globally—where we have not been driving events, we have been reacting to events internationally. For too long we have been withdrawing, for too long we have been leading from behind, and for too long we have not been showing confidence globally; we have been showing weakness. Weakness is provocative, and you see that all over the world.

Now, I have been critical of this administration's approach to foreign policy in a whole host of areas—its foreign

policy of global disengagement, its lack of confidence, and American leadership in the world. But I applaud the President for what he is doing now. I applaud the President for his strategy of rebalancing the focus of military forces and trade in the Asia-Pacific.

I applaud the President for doing the hard work of seeking TPA. These are never easy votes. These are never easy votes. But we should support what he is doing because it means America is back. We are engaging again. We are not leading from behind. We are leading the way countless administrations in the past have done with regard to global trade.

This will enable us to determine our future, to drive it, not react to it. I urge my colleagues to vote for this TPA bill because it is a vote for American leadership.

I also urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment that is going to help many small businesses throughout the United States and coastal communities and our strong fishing communities.

My amendment will strengthen the TPA bill, and I encourage all my colleagues to support that amendment as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SMALL BUSINESS AND TRADE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I appreciate the chairman's leadership on the trade promotion authority, TPA, legislation. As he has said, this bill creates the process by which the administration can negotiate trade agreements that have the potential to enhance trade opportunities for American businesses. The ability to reach new markets is critical for ensuring that American businesses can compete in a global marketplace.

Trade has become increasingly vital for small businesses looking to diversify and grow. And yet, even though 95 percent of the world's customers live overseas, less than 1 percent of small- and medium-sized businesses in the United States sell to global markets. By comparison, over 40 percent of large businesses sell their products overseas.

As ranking member of the Small Business Committee, one of my priorities is narrowing that gap. I believe that, as we consider expanding trade relationships, we must make sure that small businesses have a seat at the table and the support they need to reach global markets and compete internationally.

Does the chairman agree?

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. Yes, I agree wholeheartedly. Small businesses are a vital part of promoting international trade.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the chairman. To that end, I have filed an amendment, amendment No. 1227, that would take a number of steps to ensure that our small businesses benefit from international trade and potential new trade agreements.

Although I understand that we will not have an opportunity to amend the TPA legislation, I hope to work with the chairman to ensure that this amendment is included in H.R. 644 or a similar bill as reported by a conference committee to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has my commitment to work with her to do so.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the chairman. I appreciate his support for this amendment.

Does the ranking member agree that we should ensure that small businesses are supported as part of our trade agenda?

Mr. WYDEN. I do, and I support the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire that would make sure that we engage small businesses as part of our efforts on international trade. I also look forward to working with her to do everything possible to get this amendment included in H.R. 644.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO BOB SCHIEFFER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later this month, a man we have all become accustomed to welcoming into our living rooms will leave behind a decades-long journalistic career and embark on a new journey with his wife, Pat.

Bob Lloyd Schieffer has been a Pentagon reporter. He has served as a State Department reporter. He has covered the White House. And he has roamed the halls of the Capitol as a congressional reporter.

It is rare to see any journalist serve in all four of the big DC national assignments. But Bob Schieffer has.

Bob has interviewed every President since Nixon. He has moderated debates between Kerry and Bush, between Obama and McCain, and most recently between Obama and Romney. He has won just about every award possible in broadcast journalism, including a few Emmys. And he has turned out chart-topping hits, like ''TV Anchorman,'' as the front man for a honky-tonk band.

Perhaps that is the passion Bob will follow in retirement. We will see.

But here is one thing we do know: Bob Schieffer is one of the most famous Horned Frogs ever to graduate from his beloved TCU. It is no wonder Bob Schieffer's alma mater elected to name its School of Journalism after the man who hosts CBS' ''Face the Nation'' every Sunday.

I have been a guest on his show many times. He can ask tough questions. But he is fair.

The last time I appeared with Bob, we talked about the new majority's drive to restore the Senate. He later shared his view on our efforts with his audience.

''What's happening is by no means on the scale of an Old Testament miracle,'' he said.

''But,'' he noted, ''Every journey begins with a first step.''

I agree with him. It is not like we are parting the Potomac. But we are getting the Senate moving again, debating again, amending again, and working again. I think it is good for our country.

Perhaps Bob might take some of his own advice as he looks to the future too.

Because every journey does begin with a first step.

So whatever it is Bob ultimately chooses to do in retirement, whether it is penning a memoir or cutting more honky-tonk hits, it all begins with that first step. He will take it on May 31, when he signs off for the last time.

I am sure it will be a bittersweet moment for him. But it is a step he is likely to ultimately welcome after so many years in the spotlight. The Senate wishes him all the best in retirement.

CELEBRATING RABBI YOCHEVED MINTZ OF CONGREGATION P'NAI TIKVAH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of Rabbi Yocheved Mintz' 10th anniversary with Congregation P'nai Tikvah in Las Vegas, NV. Through her dedication to serving others, Rabbi Mintz has helped further Congregation P'nai Tikvah's commitment to providing an inclusive and open environment for spiritual development. I am appreciative of her tremendous efforts on behalf of the Jewish community and the city of Las Vegas.

Rabbi Mintz' many leadership roles demonstrate the seriousness with which she takes her duties as a spiritual leader, as well as her compassion and willingness to devote much of her time to helping others. Within the Jewish community, her responsibilities include president of the Mintz Family Foundation for Creative Jewish Education and serving on numerous boards, such as the Jewish Family Services Agency and Rabbis for Religious Freedom and Equality in Israel. Rabbi Mintz also brings her years of experience in Jewish education to the community through her work as founding board chair for the Florence A. Melton School for Adult Jewish Education. As the first female president of

the Las Vegas Board of Rabbis, Rabbi Mintz is an inspiration to many young Jewish girls and women who aspire to become Rabbis and leaders within their communities. In line with Congregation P'nai Tikvah's commitment to fostering a welcoming environment for religious life, Rabbi Mintz is a board member of the Interfaith Council of Southern Nevada and the Clark County Ministerial Association.

For decades, Rabbi Mintz has provided opportunities for religious education to Jews of all ages, and I am pleased to stand today in celebration of the 10 years she has devoted to Congregation P'nai Tikvah in Las Vegas. I congratulate Rabbi Mintz and Congregation P'nai Tikvah on this important anniversary.

LEGISLATION PROTECTING VICTIMS OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. Presudent, on the floor yesterday, the majority leader claimed that last Congress, Senate Democrats ''failed to bring any trafficking legislation to the floor.''

I do not normally do this, but I must correct the record. The facts are exactly the opposite, and the Senate's history must be clear on this.

Last Congress, despite the opposition of the majority of Senate Republicans, including Senators MCCONNELL and CORNYN, Senate Democrats reauthorized our Nation's two cornerstone pieces of legislation that protect victims of sexual violence and human trafficking—the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, and the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, TVPA. Combined, these two bills reauthorized nearly $1 billion a year in funding for survivors of these horrible crimes. As we updated and modernized these landmark laws, we listened to the survivors and the advocates who work with them every day to make sure that our legislation responded to the real needs of real people. We were not looking for gimmicks or shortcuts. Instead, we dedicated hours of time learning about what was working and what needed to be improved in order to best meet the needs of survivors.

The end result was two bills that did more to prevent sexual assault and human trafficking and to reach more victims than ever before. Because of our comprehensive and inclusive approach, these bills had the strong and vocal support of more than 1,400 local, State and national organizations.

In addition to the successful reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act and the Trafficking Victims Protection Act last Congress, I later moved a comprehensive package of legislation to address the issue of human trafficking here in the United States, which included critical support programs directed at runaway and homeless youth to prevent trafficking in the first place. Last year that package, which included the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, as well as the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, the Bringing Missing Children Home Act, and the Combat Human Trafficking Act, was reported out of the Judiciary Committee, which I chaired. I then sought the unanimous consent of the Senate to pass that bipartisan package, and every single Democratic Senator agreed. But Republicans blocked it. They objected to it. Senator MCCONNELL failed to mention any of this yesterday.

So if such assertions are going to be loosely made on this floor, let the record be clear about who, in fact, stood in the way of protections for trafficking victims last year. Look to see which Members voted against the reauthorizations of the Violence Against Women Act and the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. Those two laws were passed with the votes of every Senate Democrat. And last year, it was Republicans who obstructed passage of the subsequent comprehensive domestic antitrafficking package, supported by every Democrat, that included critical trafficking prevention legislation. On top of all that, under Democratic leadership of the Senate Appropriations Committee, total appropriations for trafficking victims' services more than doubled in fiscal year 2015, rising from $28.1 million to $58 million.

When we look at the facts, it is simply outrageous and laughable to suggest Senate Democrats did not support antitrafficking efforts last Congress. These facts matter and I cannot allow revisionist history to muddy the accomplishments we and so many advocates fought for in the last Congress.

Regrettably, the newly empowered Senate Republicans have not continued the same survivor-led approach we took in the last Congress to pass VAWA and the TVPA. Instead they sought to use a new antitrafficking bill, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, JVTA, to expand the reach of the Hyde amendment and its restrictions on health care for these women who are survivors of trafficking crimes. In doing so, the same Senators who voted against VAWA and TVPA in the last Congress inserted unnecessary and destructive politics into what was otherwise a bipartisan antitrafficking bill. The result was to needlessly tie the Senate in knots for weeks over this legislation. More importantly, Senate Republicans' effort to expand the Hyde amendment undermined what should be the very goal of antitrafficking legislation—to help return dignity and self-determination to the lives of survivors of human trafficking. That was certainly the goal of our successful effort to expand the scope of VAWA and TVPA to reach all victims.

It is also the goal behind the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act that I reintroduced with Senator COLLINS this Congress. This bill, which was a critical part of the debate last Congress and should remain a critical part of the debate in this Congress, aims to prevent young people from becoming victims of trafficking in the first place. We know runaway and homeless children are exceptionally vulnerable to human traffickers. These children literally have nowhere to go. And traffickers prey on this vulnerability. That is why Senator COLLINS and I fought so hard to add this legislation to the JVTA. The runaway and homeless youth programs supported by our bill keep kids safe, save lives, and prevent human trafficking in the first place.

I was very disappointed when our amendment failed to pass by just four votes. What was most disheartening was that the principal objection was the inclusion of an important nondiscrimination provision to ensure that no child, including those who identify as LGBT, faces discrimination by service providers. But I am not giving up. I will keep fighting to see this legislation passed because it is so important. As the Polaris Project, a leading antitrafficking advocacy organization, recently told the New York Times:

> Successful efforts to combat modern slavery must address the root causes that make people vulnerable in the first place . . . Until critical funding is reauthorized through the Runaway and Homeless Youth [and] Trafficking Prevention Act to support critical services, such as shelter beds for homeless kids, this population will face increased risk.

Senator MCCONNELL and I may differ in our opinions, but I think it is important to get it right when it comes to facts. To say that Senate Democrats failed to move antitrafficking legislation last Congress rewrites history and does a tremendous disservice to all of those victims and advocates who so recently dedicated years of their lives to the successful reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act and the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, and to crafting a bipartisan package of antitrafficking legislation that was ultimately blocked by Senate Republicans.

RECOGNIZING THE J. WARREN AND LOIS MCCLURE FOUNDATION ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize the J. Warren and Lois McClure Foundation on the celebration of its 20th anniversary. For two decades, the selfless philanthropy of the McClure family has allowed scores of deserving Vermonters to pursue financial stability and academic success.

Established in 1995, the foundation was built upon Lois and her late husband Mac's concept of ''giving with warm hands.'' Inspired by the idea of collaborative philanthropy, the McClures set out to give with the hope it would encourage benevolence among future generations.

For 20 years, the foundation has collaborated with private and public partners to support low-income and first-

generation students, adult learners, and veterans. From providing transition services for homeless youth, to promoting single parents' education programs and mental health services for veterans, there are no bounds to the McClure family's encouragement of life-long success.

Institutions such as the Vermont State Colleges, the American Red Cross of Vermont, the Vermont Department of Libraries, the Vermont Vet to Vet Program, and hundreds more have expanded innovative learning programs as a result of the foundation. From cancer patients to legislators, the foundation has touched countless lives, while inspiring those to follow their dreams.

The foundation has also been instrumental in supporting historical preservation projects at the Leahy Center for Lake Champlain and the Lake Champlain Maritime Museum. The McClures' vision to inspire a lifelong cultural and historical education for all Vermonters, meanwhile maintaining a commitment to environmental sustainability, has enhanced multiple facets of our State's diverse landscape for generations to come.

As someone who has met many leaders and legends within public service, I am continually humbled by the McClure family's boundless charity and true dedication to supporting the common good.

Marcelle and I are proud to call Lois our dear friend, and we were blessed and honored to know Mac. We are forever proud of the McClures' undying commitment to Vermonters, and we are thrilled to congratulate the foundation on 20 wonderful years of extraordinary and selfless service.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing May as National Mental Health Awareness Month. Sadly, mental health is a subject that often does not receive the attention it deserves in our society, despite the fact that mental illness touches the lives of tens of millions of Americans each year. Nearly 50 percent of American adults will develop at least one mental illness in their lifetimes, and in a given year, one in four American adults, more than 60 million people, experiences some form of mental illness. Of that number, approximately 5.8 percent suffer from a serious mental disorder like schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, or major depression.

Mental illness can have a devastating impact on an individual's overall health and quality of life. Those suffering from serious mental illnesses are not only at increased risk for chronic medical conditions, but they also die, on average, 25 years earlier than other Americans, due in large part to treatable medical conditions. Adults with severe mental disorders are also much more likely to be impoverished, further limiting their access to health care services needed to help manage their illnesses. A 2012 study published in the Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics found that the presence of a household member with a severe mental illness was shown to increase the likelihood of poverty in a home by more than three times.

Mental illness also has a significant impact on our country's economy. According to the CDC, the economic cost of mental illness in the United States was a staggering $300 billion in 2002.

The good news is that high-quality, evidence-based treatment for mental illnesses can be very effective. However, fewer than half of those in need receive any mental health care in the United States. This is simply unacceptable. Stigma, cost, and other barriers, such as limited capacity in some areas to serve all those in need, prevent many individuals from receiving necessary mental health care. It is imperative that we act to improve access to high-quality, evidence-based mental health care services in our country.

Several weeks ago, I had the opportunity to attend the ribbon-cutting ceremony for the Mosaic Integrated Healthcare Center, a state-of-the-art facility in Baltimore that will provide essential mental health services, substance abuse treatment, and primary care services to the community. Mosaic Community Services is the largest community-based behavioral health service provider in Maryland, serving thousands of children, adolescents, and adults annually. The new Integrated Healthcare Center will allow full implementation of Mosaic's integrated care model, which addresses patients' physical and behavioral health needs in a comprehensive, coordinated, and cost-saving manner. A pilot program based on this model, supported by a 2010 grant from Maryland's Community Health Resources Commission, resulted in an impressive 78 percent reduction in emergency room visits and urgent inpatient care. Mosaic's innovative system is a perfect example of the ways in which integrated care can improve quality of care, result in better health outcomes, and help generate long-term cost savings.

I am also excited to be working on an initiative to improve access to, and quality of, mental health care in our country by facilitating the integration of mental health care services into the primary care setting through the collaborative care model, developed by the late Dr. Wayne Katon, at the AIMS Center at the University of Washington.

In the collaborative care model, primary care providers treat patients with common mental health disorders, such as depression or anxiety, with help from a care manager and a psychiatrist who acts a consultant, reviewing patients' progress, making treatment recommendations and sharing his or her expertise with the primary care provider and care manager. The collaborative care model not only improves patient care experiences and outcomes, it has also been shown to reduce overall health care costs. One large trial, which focused on depression care in primary care clinics in five States, found substantial reductions in overall health costs, with an overall rate of return on investment of $6 in health care costs saved for each $1 spent on depression care.

Mental illness affects the lives of so many Americans. This May, in honor of National Mental Health Awareness Month, let us commit to working together to improve mental health care in our country by building on the success of integrated care models like the collaborative care model and the innovative system at Mosaic's Integrated Health Center.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY ARFT

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and salute Larry Arft, the city manager for Beloit, WI, on the occasion of his retirement. It has been my pleasure to work closely with Larry since he started in this role in 2003. Throughout that time, he has been a tireless and effective leader of the community. He has been a model public servant, and his talent and passion will be missed by all who have worked with him.

A Missouri native, Larry served in the U.S. Army in Vietnam. Following his military service, he graduated magna cum laude from the University of Missouri—St. Louis. It was there that his interest in local government was sparked by an internship with a St. Louis-area municipality. Since then, Larry has served with distinction in multiple communities in three States for more than 40 years.

As Beloit city manager, Larry Arft has been the driving force behind extensive economic development. During his tenure, Beloit has experienced strong and sustained revitalization of its downtown, in the Gateway Business Park, and along its riverfront. He has always been an enthusiastic partner with the business community, and Larry proved that Beloit was—and continues to be—a good place to do business. He also engaged other government leaders in the area, around the State, and in the Federal Government. He set an example of how things should be done and how people could come together to address challenges.

I had the privilege of working closely with him in efforts to secure Federal funding for the construction and improvement of local roads and bridges, allowing for safer and more rapid transport and economic development. In addition, I had the pleasure of working with him as he led efforts to create good jobs and attract visitors to the area through the development of a Beloit casino.

Larry's work extended well beyond the city limits. He actively engaged other communities in the region and

served as the president of the Wisconsin League of Municipalities, advocating for issues important to cities and villages.

I am grateful for Larry Arft's contributions to the people of Beloit and to the people of Wisconsin, and I thank him for his service. I know his presence and personal commitment will be missed. I wish him and his wife Karen all the best in the years ahead.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATIONAL SEERSUCKER DAY

• Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today I rise in appreciation of seersucker manufacturers and enthusiasts across the country. I extend a Happy Seersucker Day. This uniquely American fashion has a storied history dating back to 1909. Louisiana is proud to have played an important part in introducing the country to seersucker apparel. The first seersucker suit was designed by Joseph Haspel at his Broad Street facility in New Orleans, LA.

This lightweight cotton fabric, known for its signature pucker has been enjoyed by Americans from all walks of life during our hot summer months. Mr. Haspel said it best, ''hot is hot, no matter what you do for a living.'' In the 1990s, Seersucker Day was established by members of this chamber to honor this unique American fashion. I proudly resumed this tradition last year in the U.S. House of Representatives by designating Wednesday, June 11 as National Seersucker Day. I wish to continue this tradition in U.S. Senate by designating Thursday, June 11 as National Seersucker Day once again. I encourage everyone to wear seersucker on this day to commemorate this iconic American clothing.•

RECOGNIZING THE OPENING OF THE UCI-FRED HUTCH CANCER CENTRE

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I want to congratulate the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and the Uganda Cancer Institute for officially opening the UCI-Fred Hutch Cancer Centre in Kampala, the first comprehensive cancer center jointly constructed by U.S. and African cancer institutions in Sub-Saharan Africa.

The 25,000-square-foot regional cancer center is a state-of-the-art-facility that can treat up to 20,000 patients a year and includes an adult and pediatric outpatient clinic, a specimen repository, training center, conference rooms, and a pharmacy.

Uganda has a substantial cancer burden, and 6 out of 10 of the most common cancers there are caused by infectious diseases. To address this unique health need, Uganda has invested in cancer research, training, and clinical care. The UCI-Fred Hutch Cancer Centre will significantly increase patient access to cancer diagnosis and treatment while furthering study of cancers in Uganda, particularly those that are infection related.

This alliance brings together two international leaders in the field of oncology care, training, and research and is ideally positioned to provide American and Ugandan physician scientists with indepth training in the treatment of infection-related malignancies in both the United States and Sub-Saharan Africa.

The relationship between Fred Hutch and the UCI dates back to 2004, and the UCI/Hutchinson Center Cancer Alliance was formally established in 2008. The program was formed to support the development of a strong biomedical infrastructure in Uganda that would contribute to the prevention, early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer and related health concerns.

In 2008, Uganda had just one oncologist who treated more than 10,000 patients a year. In response, Fred Hutch spearheaded an extensive medical training program that has trained more than 300 Ugandans and Americans to date in the treatment of infection-related cancers, including physicians, nurses, laboratory technicians, pharmacists, data specialists, and experts in regulatory affairs and fiscal management. Today, the number of practicing oncologists in Uganda has increased twelvefold.

The UCI-Fred Hutch Cancer Centre is funded in part by two grants for which I was proud to advocate totaling $1.4 million from the U.S. Agency for International Development (through the American Schools and Hospitals Abroad Program), as well as an $8.6 million investment from Fred Hutch. The Ugandan Government has supported the collaboration through donations of land, provision of funding for personnel and equipment, and technical support.

I am proud to work with Fred Hutch in their effort to bring cutting-edge cancer care to patients and families all around the globe. This joint venture with UCI has the potential to drastically improve the lives of many people, both in Uganda and worldwide. I am proud that my State of Washington is home to Fred Hutch, and I applaud them and the Uganda Cancer Institute for their cross-national effort to effect this critical change.•

LEONARD SCHOOL OF MUSIC 70TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate and honor the Leonard School of Music in North Charleston, SC, for their 70th anniversary. In 1945, the Leonard School of Music was founded by Mr. Patrick Leonard, who became a Charlestonian early in his life. He was a tromobonist for the prestigious Armco Band and the Circus Corporation of America. After traveling to Charleston with the circus, he fell in love with the city and ultimately started the Leonard School of Music. Mr. Patrick Leonard eventually retired from his leadership role at the school and passed it on to his son, Dan Leonard.

Mr. Dan Leonard is a recognized expert in the field of music education. His work has received State, national, and international acclaim. He has taught and directed bands of all levels: elementary, junior high, high school, and college. Many of Mr. Leonard's students are accomplished musicians and teachers. His specialized rhythm approach has inspired Leonard School instructors' teaching strategies.

The Leonard School of Music became a nonprofit organization in 2010. The school's mission is to provide solid music education for all Lowcountry youth regardless of race, creed, or financial standing. On May 23, 2015, the Leonard School of Music will celebrate 70 years of music excellence. I applaud Patrick and Dan Leonard for their expertise in music education, and therefore recognize the Leonard School of Music's accomplishment.•

REMEMBERING SID McDONALD

• Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Sid McDonald of Arab, AL, who passed away on May 15, 2015. He will be remembered as a skilled businessman who was committed to bettering his community and State through public service.

Sid was born in Springfield, AL. He earned a degree from the School of Commerce and Business at the University of Alabama in 1961. However, his time at the University of Alabama goes well beyond his days as a student. He was a member of the University of Alabama board of trustees from 1992 to 2008, and served as the pro tempore of the board from 1999 to 2002.

Sid began his career in public service when he was named to the Alabama Commission on Higher Education in 1970, the year that it was created. He had a passion for education and was instrumental in establishing the Arab City School system where he became the first board chairman. Sid served the people of Marshall County in the Alabama House of Representatives for two terms and also served in the Alabama Senate from 1975 to 1979. He later served as Alabama's finance director under Governor Fob James from 1980 to 1982.

After graduating from the University of Alabama, Sid began his successful business career. He became president of Brindlee Mountain Telephone Company, which he managed until it was sold in 2000. In 1983, he founded DeltaCom, a statewide long-distance telephone company, serving as its chairman until it was sold in 1996. He was one of the first outside members of the board of directors of Intergraph Corporation from 1997 until 2006. Most recently, he led the start-up of CBX Holding, LLC (Cold Box), an Arab producer and marketer of temperature

controlled cargo containers. In addition to his many business adventures, he was very active in commercial and residential real estate development.

Sid's accomplishments and contributions to the State of Alabama have not gone unnoticed. He was elected in 2001 to the Alabama Academy of Honor's One Hundred Living Alabamians and was elected to the Alabama Business Hall of Fame in 2010. The University of Alabama also dedicated a facility on campus in his honor, Sid McDonald Hall.

I offer my deepest condolences to Sid's wife Jane Plunkett McDonald, and to all of their loved ones as they celebrate his many life accomplishments and mourn this great loss.●

RECOGNIZING DOWNS ENTERPRISE, LLC

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, in order to pursue the American dream in today's regulatory climate, small businesses owners and entrepreneurs require a variety of administrative and support services. Often, they are able to offer a helping hand to each other, building important relationships and creating economic opportunity across the board. Small Business of the Week, Downs Enterprise of Bastrop, LA, is providing these crucial services to fellow small businesses, entrepreneurs, and veterans throughout northeast Louisiana.

Troy Downs, founder of Downs Enterprise, LLC, has been assisting small business owners in northeast Louisiana for nearly 14 years. In 2001 Downs opened his namesake consulting business, focusing on managing, consulting, and developing local small businesses through financial, real estate, and logistical services. After nearly 10 years of success, Downs visited the Louisiana Small Business Development Center, LSBDC, at the University of Louisiana-Monroe, located in Monroe, LA, with a financial management and business development and expansion plan. Downs took advantage of all the LSBDC had to offer, attending every seminar and networking event available to him, even if not directly related to his business. Downs believed that just his being there would put him in a position to learn, and it worked—a sentiment that he now passes along to the businesses he consults. Through Downs Enterprise, LLC, Troy and his team have assisted in starting and managing over 25 successful businesses, created 50 jobs, and counseled over 100 individuals in the process of starting and maintaining a healthy business.

After years of successfully guiding individuals through the hoops of starting and maintaining a business, Downs, a 25-year serviceman of the U.S. Army, saw the need for such a consulting service geared towards our Nation's brave servicemen and women. After experiencing the difficulties servicemen and women have in adjusting back to a civilian lifestyle, the Downs Foundation was born. Today, the Downs Foundation continues their original goal of assisting veterans in small business development, while also providing services in credit restoration, preparation for jobs, and counseling services. Down's work in northeast Louisiana has earned him the distinguished honor of being recognized as the 2015 Veteran Small Business Champion by Louisiana Economic Development and the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Congratulations again to Downs Enterprise for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your continued commitment not only to your community, but also to your fellow brothers and sisters of the military.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 880. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit.

H.R. 1806. An act to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 202(a) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Care: Mr. David P. Blom of Columbus, Ohio, Mr. Darin Selnick of Oceanside, California, and Dr. Toby Cosgrove of Cleveland, Ohio.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mrs. TORRES of California.

The message also announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker reappoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:05 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:

S. 178. An act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 2:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2496. An act to extend the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, to make certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

At 6:28 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 bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1735. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1806. An act to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2353. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1735. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for

military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 21, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 178. An act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Special Report entitled ''Report on the Legislative Activities of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation During the 113th Congress'' (Rept. No. 114–50).

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 143. A bill to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–51).

S. 808. A bill to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–52).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 615. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–53).

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2028. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–54).

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016'' (Rept. No. 114–55).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 335. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans (Rept. No. 114–56).

By Mr. KIRK, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2029. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–57).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 87. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater cooperation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 802. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1417. An original bill to reauthorize the United States Grain Standards Act, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Paul A. Folmsbee, of Oklahoma, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

Nominee: Paul A. Folmsbee.

Post: Mali.

The following is a list of all members of my Immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions; amount; date; and donee:

Self: 0.

Spouse: 0.

Children and Spouses names: 0.

Parents Names: 0.

Grandparents Names: 0.

Brothers and Spouses Names: 0.

Sisters and Spouses Names: 0.

---

*Cassandra Q. Butts, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

Nominee: Cassandra Q. Butts.

Post: The Bahamas (Commonwealth).

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions; amount; date; and donee:

1. Self: $250.00; 2004; Barack Obama (Senate); $250.00; 2006; DCCC.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Mae A. Karim: $500.00; 2008; Barack Obama (President).

5. Grandparents: N/A.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Deidra & Frank Abbott: $200.00; 2008; Barack Obama (President).

---

*Stafford Fitzgerald Haney, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Costa Rica.

Nominee: Stafford Fitzgerald Haney.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Republic of Costa Rica.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: $5,200, 2014, Kaine for Virginia; $10,000, 2014, Democratic National Committee; $2,600, 2014, Menendez for New Jersey; $49,000, 2013, Presidential Inaugural.

Committee 2013: $2,000, 2012, Democratic Party of Virginia; $1,104, 2012, Democratic Party of Wisconsin; $644, 2012, Colorado Democratic Party; $1,380, 2012, Democratic Executive.

Committee of Florida: $920, 2012, Iowa Democratic Party; $920, 2012, Nevada State Democratic Party; $276, 2012, New Hampshire Democratic.

Party: $2,208, 2012, Ohio Democratic Party; $276, 2012, Pennsylvania Democratic Party; $40,000, 2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; $30,800, 2012, Democratic National Committee; $644, 2012, N Carolina Democratic Party; $2,500, 2012, Menendez for Senate; $5,000, 2011, Obama for America; $35,800, 2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012; $30,800, 2011, Democratic National Committee; $5,000, 2011, Gillibrand for Senate; $5,000, 2011, Kaine for Virginia; $2,500, 2011, Menendez for Senate; $30,400, 2010, Democratic National Committee; $500, 2010, Ben Chandler for Congress.

2. Spouse: Andrea R Haney: $5,000, 2011, Kaine for Virginia; $30,400, 2010, Democratic National Committee.

3. Children and Spouses: Asher D. Haney—none; Nava S. Haney—none; Eden N. Haney—none; Shaia A. Haney—none.

4. Parents: Sandra Haney Hogan—deceased; William Chester Haney—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Della Mae Scott—deceased; James D Brabson—deceased; Oliver Joseph Haney—deceased; Grace Tuggelle—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Joseph M. Haney—deceased.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

---

*Charles C. Adams, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Finland.

Nominee: Charies C. Adams, Jr.

Post: Ambassador to the Republic of Finland.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to Inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $32500, 2009, Democratic Nat'l Committee; $1000, 2009, Evan Bayh Committee; $500, 2009, Eric Massa for Congress; $30400, 2010, Democratic Nat'l Committee; $1000, 2010, Bennet for Colorado; $2400, 2010, Friends for Harry Reid; $30800, 2011, Democratic Nat'l Committee; $5000, 2011, Obama for America; $9200, 2011, Swing State Victory Fund; $5000, 2011, Kaine for Virginia; $2500, 2011, Akin Gump PAC; $30800, 2012, Obama Victory Fund; $1000, 2012, Gillibrand for Senate; $600, 2012, Clyde Williams for Congress; $5000, 2012, Akin Gump PAC; $1000, 2012, DSCC; $1000, 2012, Andrei Cherny for Arizona; $1000, 2014, Mark Warner for Virginia; $2000, 2014, Common Ground PAC; $500, 2014, Nunn for Georgia; $2600, 2014, Friends of Don Beyer; $1000, 2014, Democrats Abroad; $1000, 2014, DSCC; $5000, 2014, Akin Gump PAC.

2. Spouse: Vera Risteski-Adams: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Matthew Andrew Adams: $5000, 2011, Kaine for Virginia; $1000, 2011, Obama for America; $9000 2012 DNC; $13000, 2012, Obama Victory Fund; Maya Adrian Adams, None.

4. Parents: Charles C. Adams: Deceased. Florence Adams: Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Charles C. Adams: Deceased. Nellie M. Adams: Deceased. David Schneider: Deceased. Mary Schneider, Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Andrew M. Adams: Deceased. Kenneth A. Adams: None. Joanne K. Adams: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Adrian Adams Sow: Deceased. Diabé Sow: None. Christine Adams: None. Peter De Bolla: None.

*Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Sudan.

*Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years.

*Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators .

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nomination of Douglas A. Koneff.

Foreign Service nomination of Judy R. Reinke.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Brian C. Brisson and ending with Catherine M. Werner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Peter J. Olson and ending with Nicolas Rubio, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 2015.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Craig A. Anderson and ending with Henry Kaminski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 2015.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Anthony S. Amatos and ending with Elena Zlatnik, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 2015.

*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.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1409. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to suspend, rather than terminate, an individual's eligibility for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan while such individual is an inmate of a public institution; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1410. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve the treatment of substance use disorders; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1411. A bill to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958'', with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. KING):

S. 1412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve compliance in higher education tax benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1414. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 1415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of large employer for purposes of applying the employer mandate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEE, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1416. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to limit the authority to reserve water rights in designating a national monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 1417. An original bill to reauthorize the United States Grain Standards Act, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1418. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide an Inspector General for the judicial branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1419. A bill to promote the academic achievement of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children with the establishment of a Native American language grant program; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1420. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to provide for the collection of information on critical energy supplies, to establish a Working Group on Energy Markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1421. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize a 6-month extension of certain exclusivity periods in the case of approved drugs that are subsequently approved for a new indication to prevent, diagnose, or treat a rare disease or condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1422. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a comprehensive program to improve education and training for energy- and manufacturing-related jobs to increase the number of skilled workers trained to work in energy and manufacturing-related fields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1423. A bill to designate certain Federal lands in California as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1424. A bill to prohibit the sale or distribution of cosmetics containing synthetic plastic microbeads; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

S. 1425. A bill to promote new manufacturing in the United States by providing for greater transparency and timeliness in obtaining necessary permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1426. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 1427. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to facilitate increased coordination and alignment between the public and private sector with respect to quality and efficiency measures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1428. A bill to amend the USEC Privatization Act to require the Secretary of Energy to issue a long-term Federal excess uranium inventory management plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COCHRAN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to agricultural research organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1430. A bill to improve the ability of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Coast Guard, and costal States to sustain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems by maintaining and sustaining their capabilities relating to oil spill preparedness, prevention, response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1431. A bill to provide for increased Federal oversight of prescription opioid treatment and assistance to States in reducing opioid abuse, diversion, and deaths; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1432. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study on the technology, potential lifecycle energy savings, and economic impact of recycled carbon fiber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1433. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to improve highway safety and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 1434. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish an energy storage portfolio standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1435. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote awareness of organ donation and the need to increase the pool of available organs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1436. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1437. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize and provide flexibility for the use of the National Guard for support of civilian firefighting activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. BURR, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1438. A bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective contraception; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 1439. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States that provide foster care for children up to age 21 to serve former foster youths through age 23 under the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1441. A bill to prevent the militarization of Federal, State, and local law enforcement by Federal excess property transfers and grant programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1442. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to strike a provision relating to the budget neutrality of any renegotiated Standard Reinsurance Agreement; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1443. A bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax regarding the taxation of distilled spirits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1445. A bill to improve the Microloan Program of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1446. A bill to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1447. A bill to provide for the implementation of a Sustainable Chemistry Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1448. A bill to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1449. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to add certain medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles to the advanced technology vehicles manufacturing incentive program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1450. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to modify the hours of employment of physicians and physician assistants employed on a full-time basis by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1451. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adjudicate and pay survivor's benefits without requiring the filing of a formal claim, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1452. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for reimbursements for emergency medical treatment and to require that the Department of Veterans Affairs be treated as a participating provider for the recovery of the costs of certain medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1453. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply deemed enrollment to residents of Puerto Rico and to provide a special enrollment period and a reduction in the late enrollment penalties for certain residents of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1454. A bill to enhance interstate commerce by creating a National Hiring Standard for Motor Carriers; 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. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 183. A resolution calling for suspension of construction of artificial land formations on islands, reefs, shoals, and other features of the Spratly Islands and for a peaceful and multilateral resolution to the South China Sea territorial dispute; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 184. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that conversion therapy, including efforts by mental health practitioners to change the sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression of an individual, is dangerous and harmful and should be prohibited from being practiced on minors; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. REID, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 185. A resolution recognizing the significance of May 2015 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. Res. 186. A resolution designating the week of May 17 through May 23, 2015, as ''National Public Works Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Res. 187. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the month of May 2015, as ''National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 171

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 171, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel in connection with certain special disabilities rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

S. 197

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) 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. 241

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 241, a bill to amend title 38, United

States Code, to provide for the payment of temporary compensation to a surviving spouse of a veteran upon the death of the veteran, and for other purposes.

S. 280

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 280, a bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 423

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 453

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 453, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to States to streamline State requirements and procedures for veterans with military emergency medical training to become civilian emergency medical technicians.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) 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. 626

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1126, a bill to modify and extend the National Guard State Partnership Program.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to increase the participation of women, girls, and underrepresented minorities in STEM fields, to encourage and support students from all economic backgrounds to pursue STEM career opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1252, a bill to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 1381

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to require the President to make the text of trade agreements available to the public in order for those agreements to receive expedited consideration from Congress.

S. 1382

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1382, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1389

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1389, a bill to authorize exportation of consumer communications devices to Cuba and the provision of telecommunications services to Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 1393

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1393, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to include in each regulatory impact analysis for a proposed or final rule an analysis that does not include any other proposed or unimplemented rule.

S. 1400

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1400, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses.

S. CON. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 17, a concurrent resolution establishing a joint select committee to address regulatory reform.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

S. RES. 176

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 176, a resolution designating September 2015 as ''National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1246

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1246 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a

bill 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1273

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1273 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1299 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1343

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1343 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1371

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1371 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill 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.

At the request of Ms. WARREN, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1371 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 1387

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1387 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1414. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, along with my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE, I am introducing the Rhode Island Fishermen's Fairness Act of 2015.

This legislation seeks to extend simple fairness to our State's fishermen by giving Rhode Island voting representation on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery-Management Council MAFMC. The council manages stocks, like squid, which are critically important to the fishing industry in my State. Rhode Island's commercial fishing industry depends more on MAFMC-managed stocks than those managed by the New England Fisheries Management Council, where Rhode Island is a member. More than that, Rhode Island has a larger stake in the Mid-Atlantic fishery than many of the states that currently hold seats on the MAFMC.

This is not a new proposal, nor is it unprecedented. North Carolina was added to the MAFMC through an amendment to the Sustainable Fisheries Act in 1996. In addition, the last reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act required a report on this issue. Now it is time to make this change.

I was pleased in the last Congress that this legislation was included in the Commerce Committee's discussion draft for the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as well as in the reauthorization bill introduced by then-Oceans Subcommittee Chairman Mark Begich at the end of last year. I hope that in this Congress we can take this commonsense step to bring fairness to Rhode Island's fishermen.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1418. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide an Inspector General for the judicial branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Judicial Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act, a bill that would establish within the judicial branch an Office of Inspector General to assist the Judiciary with its ethical obligations as well as to ensure taxpayer dollars are not lost to waste, fraud, or abuse. This bill will help ensure that our Federal judicial system remains free of corruption, bias, and hypocrisy.

The facts demonstrate that the institution of the Inspector General has been crucial in detecting, exposing and deterring problems within our government. The job of the Inspector General is to be the first line of defense against fraud, waste and abuse. In collaboration with whistleblowers, Inspectors General have been extremely effective in their efforts to expose and help correct these wrongs.

That is why, during my many years in Congress, I have worked hard to strengthen the oversight role of Inspectors General throughout the Federal government. I have come to rely on IGs and whistleblowers, to ensure that our tax dollars are spent according to the letter and spirit of the law. When that doesn't happen, we in Congress need to know about it and take corrective action.

During the past fiscal year, Congress appropriated nearly $7 billion in taxpayer money to the Federal judiciary. To put this in context, the Small Business Administration and the Corporation for National and Community Service each received a similar or less amount than the judiciary. Yet both of these entities have an Office of Inspector General. If we in Congress believed that these entities could use an Inspector General, I cannot see why the Judiciary wouldn't deserve the same assistance.

But there is an additional reason why the Judiciary needs an Inspector General. The fact remains that the current practice of self-regulation of judges with respect to ethics and the judicial code of conduct has time and time again proven inadequate. I would point out to my colleagues two recent events here in the Senate that support this conclusion.

In the past 6 years, the Senate received articles of impeachment for not one but two Federal judges. In the first case, former Judge Samuel B. Kent, although charged with multiple counts of sexual assault, pled guilty to obstruction of justice. Who did he obstruct? Who did he lie to? He did this to his fellow judges, who were assembled to investigate the allegations of his obscene and criminal behavior. But it took a criminal investigation by the Department of Justice to uncover his false statements to his colleagues as well as substantiate the horrendous claims made against him.

In the second case, the Senate found former Judge G. Thomas Porteous, Jr. guilty on multiple articles of impeachment, including accepting money from attorneys who had a case pending before him in his court and committing perjury by falsifying his name on bankruptcy filings. Once again, this Judge's misbehavior came to light through a Federal criminal investigation, after which another judicial committee had to be organized to investigate their fellow judge.

What's more, in each case the disgraced judge tried to game the system in order to retain his $174,000 salary. Rather than resign their commissions, each first tried to claim disability status that would allow each to continue to receive payment, even if in prison. Then both played chicken with Congress daring us to strip them of their pay by impeaching and convicting them. I am pleased that we put our foot down and said ''No.''

This bill would establish an Office of Inspector General for the judicial branch. The IG's responsibilities would include conducting investigations of

possible judicial misconduct, investigating waste fraud and abuse, and recommending changes in laws and regulations governing the federal judiciary. The bill would require the IG to provide the Chief Justice and Congress with an annual report on its activities, as well as refer matters that may constitute a criminal violation to the Department of Justice. In addition, the bill establishes whistleblower protections for judicial branch employees.

Ensuring a fair and independent judiciary is critical to our Constitutional checks and balances. Judges are supposed to maintain impartiality. They are supposed to be free from conflicts of interest. An independent watchdog for the federal judiciary will help its members comply with the ethics rules and promote credibility within the judicial branch of government. Whistleblower protections for judiciary branch employees will help keep the judiciary accountable. The Judicial Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act will not only help ensure continued public confidence in our Federal courts and keep them beyond reproach, it will strengthen our judicial branch.

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. 1418

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 ''Judicial Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE JUDICIAL BRANCH.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND DUTIES.—Part III of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''CHAPTER 60—INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

''Sec.
''1021. Establishment.
''1022. Appointment, term, and removal of Inspector General.
''1023. Duties.
''1024. Powers.
''1025. Reports.
''1026. Whistleblower protection.

''§ 1021. Establishment

''There is established for the judicial branch of the Government the Office of Inspector General for the Judicial Branch (in this chapter referred to as the 'Office').

''§ 1022. Appointment, term, and removal of Inspector General

''(a) APPOINTMENT.—The head of the Office shall be the Inspector General, who shall be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States after consultation with the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives.

''(b) TERM.—The Inspector General shall serve for a term of 4 years and may be reappointed by the Chief Justice of the United States for any number of additional terms.

''(c) REMOVAL.—The Inspector General may be removed from office by the Chief Justice of the United States. The Chief Justice shall communicate the reasons for any such removal to both Houses of Congress.

''§ 1023. Duties

''With respect to the judicial branch, the Office shall—

''(1) conduct investigations of alleged misconduct in the judicial branch (other than the United States Supreme Court) under chapter 16 that may require oversight or other action within the judicial branch or by Congress;

''(2) conduct investigations of alleged misconduct in the United States Supreme Court that may require oversight or other action within the judicial branch or by Congress;

''(3) conduct and supervise audits and investigations;

''(4) prevent and detect waste, fraud, and abuse; and

''(5) recommend changes in laws or regulations governing the judicial branch.

''§ 1024. Powers

''(a) POWERS.—In carrying out the duties of the Office, the Inspector General shall have the power to—

''(1) make investigations and reports;

''(2) obtain information or assistance from any Federal, State, or local governmental agency, or other entity, or unit thereof, including all information kept in the course of business by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the judicial councils of circuits, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the United States Sentencing Commission;

''(3) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, which subpoena, in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, shall be enforceable by civil action;

''(4) administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit;

''(5) employ such officers and employees, subject to the provisions of title 5, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates;

''(6) obtain services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5 at daily rates not to exceed the equivalent rate for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; and

''(7) the extent and in such amounts as may be provided in advance by appropriations Acts, to enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, and to make such payments as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Office.

''(b) CHAPTER 16 MATTERS.—The Inspector General shall not commence an investigation under section 1023(1) until the denial of a petition for review by the judicial council of the circuit under section 352(c) of this title or upon referral or certification to the Judicial Conference of the United States of any matter under section 354(b) of this title.

''(c) LIMITATION.—The Inspector General shall not have the authority to—

''(1) investigate or review any matter that is directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling by any judge, justice, or court; or

''(2) punish or discipline any judge, justice, or court.

''§ 1025. Reports

''(a) WHEN TO BE MADE.—The Inspector General shall—

''(1) make an annual report to the Chief Justice and to Congress relating to the activities of the Office; and

''(2) make prompt reports to the Chief Justice and to Congress on matters that may require action by the Chief Justice or Congress.

''(b) SENSITIVE MATTER.—If a report contains sensitive matter, the Inspector General may so indicate and Congress may receive that report in closed session.

''(c) DUTY TO INFORM ATTORNEY GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties of the Office, the Inspector General shall report expeditiously to the Attorney General whenever the Inspector General has reasonable grounds to believe there has been a violation of Federal criminal law.

''§ 1026. Whistleblower protection

''(a) IN GENERAL.—No officer, employee, agent, contractor, or subcontractor in the judicial branch may discharge, demote, threaten, suspend, harass, or in any other manner discriminate against an employee in the terms and conditions of employment because of any lawful act done by the employee to provide information, cause information to be provided, or otherwise assist in an investigation regarding any possible violation of Federal law or regulation, or misconduct, by a judge, justice, or any other employee in the judicial branch, which may assist the Inspector General in the performance of duties under this chapter.

''(b) CIVIL ACTION.—An employee injured by a violation of subsection (a) may, in a civil action, obtain appropriate relief.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part III of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''60. Inspector General for the judicial branch ..... 1021''.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1430. A bill to improve the ability of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Coast Guard, and costal States to sustain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems by maintaining and sustaining their capabilities relating to oil spill preparedness, prevention, response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today the U.S. Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are responding to yet another oilspill in the water. In a moment, I will bring out a photograph which shows the fresh crude oil on the beach of Refugio State Park in California. This oilspill brings back the images from 5 years ago of the oil-coated pelicans and tar-stained beaches, which were once sugar white, covered with gooey mats of oil from the Deepwater Horizon oilspill. Although the spill happened in 2010, a lot of that oil is still sloshing around out there in the gulf.

Last week, the Department of the Interior told us that the oil leaking in the gulf since 2004 from Taylor Energy wells could continue for a century or more ''if left unchecked.''

This is the oilspill that just happened in the last few days. It is fresh crude, and it is on the beach in California. Of course, when I see this kind of picture, it brings me back to that experience all of us on the gulf coast had 5 years ago, and we wouldn't wish that upon anybody. Remember, to begin with, they said, Oh, it is just a few hundred barrels of oil, even though it was ruptured 1 mile beneath the surface of the water.

Then we got the streaming video. We actually put that video on my Web site. The chairman of the environment committee, Senator BOXER, put it up on her committee Web site. Once scientists could see how much was flowing, they could calculate, and then they saw that it wasn't going to be a few hundred or even a thousand barrels of oil a day; it was approaching something like 50 times that.

We know what, in fact, happened. Almost 5 million barrels of oil was spilled. The court in Louisiana—the Federal court that is hearing this case against BP—indeed has concluded that those who are going to be held responsible under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 will be responsible for somewhere around 4 million barrels. That is court-decided.

A lot of that oil is still out there. Yet, appallingly, today the economy and the environment of the State of Florida are again under attack. I have just been informed that Senators from Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas are seeking to invite oil rigs within 50 miles of Florida's coastline.

Now, of course, that goes against all logic. It is certainly not what the people of Florida want and it is not what the Department of the Interior has said is appropriate or necessary under the next 5-year leasing plan.

Florida is a unique State. This is a photo of a dead dolphin covered with oil that is just another casualty of what we are seeing that is happening this week.

The reason I am here today with these Senators who are threatening Florida is because in 2006, in a bipartisan way, the other Senator from Florida, Mr. Martinez, a Republican, and I, a Democrat, joined together to put in law that the Outer Continental Shelf off Florida is off-limits to oil drilling. We were successful in doing that, even though no other Outer Continental Shelf off the United States is off-limits. In the administration's 5-year plans, they have complied with that because the off-limits to oil drilling is until the year 2022. Therefore, in the next 5-year plan, from 2017 to 2022, the administration honored that. It is, after all, the law.

But why is Florida different than others? Well, in the first place, there is no oil off of Florida. People think of where the oil is. It is off of Louisiana. The sediment came down the Mississippi River for millions of years and was compacted by the Earth's crust, and that formed these oil deposits. There is a lot of oil in the central Gulf of Mexico and, indeed, that is what is happening. A lot of oil is being produced there. That is the first reason. There is not oil off of Florida.

But there are other reasons, not the least of which is of all the Gulf Coast States, Florida has the most beaches and, therefore, the economy is directly charged with the fact of having those pristine, sugary white beaches as such an attraction for our guests to come to Florida and enjoy nature's seaside.

Well, we found out, as a result of the gulf oilspill, that even though just a little oil reached Florida—Pensacola Beach was blackened, tar mats came into Pensacola Bay, Destin got oil on the beach, and some tar balls got as far east as Panama City Beach. So people saw those pictures of oil covering the beach and they thought that was the entire State of Florida and they didn't come. For a whole season, the guests, the visitors, the tourists did not come. So the motels were not filled and the restaurants were not filled and the dry-cleaners, and all the ancillary businesses associated with a tourism economy on the coast, they did not come.

Now, there is also, obviously, the environmental interests because we do have a lot of the bays and estuaries and marsh grasses where critters spawn so much of the marine life in the Gulf of Mexico, and it starts in these bays and estuaries. That is obviously a reason as well. But there is a special reason why we have kept oil off our shores. Bottlenose dolphins in the gulf have been dying at unprecedented rates over the last 5 years. This is one of those sick dolphins. So from the BP spill, science is showing, in fact, what we intuitively knew. And just yesterday, a team of scientists confirmed the Deepwater Horizon oilspill contributed to the highest number of dead bottlenose dolphin strandings on record in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

So it certainly makes little sense that we would seek more drilling in even riskier areas when we are still picking up the pieces from the last major oilspill.

Today, I am introducing legislation that implements many of the hard lessons learned in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon BP oilspill. This legislation is going to make sure that NOAA and the Coast Guard have the tools to prevent, to prepare for, and to respond to marine oilspills.

The bill is going to give gulf coast communities a seat at the table in the decisions about oil drilling that affects their way of life. It will strengthen State-level planning for oilspills or seismic exploration. But, most importantly, the bill will protect Florida from Big Oil's reach by keeping the eastern Gulf of Mexico off-limits beyond 2022 and in statute until 2027.

Back in 2006, we passed the bipartisan Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. In that act, that is what we did in establishing this off-limits in law. But now, some of our neighboring States, at the behest of Big Oil, are trying to drill again and to drill off of Florida.

We are going to do everything we can to make sure we don't lose another tourism season. We are going to do everything we can to make sure we don't lose an entire year for our recreational fishermen, charter boat fishermen, as well as the commercial fishermen. Drilling off the coast is not what the people of Florida want. We want fishing vessels hauling in prize catches, not Coast Guard vessels skimming oil. We want dolphins rolling in the waves, not washing ashore, and we want sunbathers on the beaches, not HAZMAT workers.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1436. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. REID. 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. 1436

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 ''Nevada Native Nations Land Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE FORT MCDERMITT PAIUTE AND SHOSHONE TRIBE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation Expansion Act'', dated February 21, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 19,094 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as ''Reservation Expansion Lands''.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE SHOSHONE PAIUTE TRIBES.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Mountain City Administrative Site Proposed Acquisition'', dated July 29, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 82 acres of land administered by the Forest Service as generally depicted on the map as ''Proposed Acquisition Site''.

(c) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE SUMMIT LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this section, the term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Summit Lake Indian Reservation Conveyance'',

dated February 28, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 941 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as ''Reservation Conveyance Lands''.

(d) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE RENO-SPARKS INDIAN COLONY.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Reno-Sparks Indian Colony Expansion'', dated June 11, 2014, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 13,434 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as ''RSIC Amended Boundary''.

(e) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE.—

(1) MAP.—In this subsection, the term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation Expansion'', dated April 13, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 6,357 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as ''Reservation Expansion Lands''.

(f) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE DUCKWATER SHOSHONE TRIBE.—

(1) MAP.—In this subsection, the term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Duckwater Reservation Expansion'', dated January 12, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 31,269 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as ''Reservation Expansion Lands''.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust for each Indian tribe under section 3.

(b) USE OF TRUST LAND.—

(1) GAMING.—Land taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or considered to have been taken into trust, for class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

(2) THINNING; LANDSCAPE RESTORATION.—With respect to the land taken into trust under section 3, the Secretary, in consultation and coordination with the applicable Indian tribe, may carry out any fuel reduction and other landscape restoration activities, including restoration of sage grouse habitat, on the land that is beneficial to the Indian tribe and the Bureau of Land Management.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, most of us have heard the metaphor that small businesses are the engines that power our economy. What we don't hear people talk about as much is the fuel that feeds the engines: capital. Without capital, entrepreneurs cannot see their ideas to fruition, successful business owners cannot expand to meet the needs of the market, and eager job seekers must take their skills elsewhere. Without capital, Main Street falters.

Today, more than 7 years after the start of the Great Recession and many policy reforms later, access to capital remains a challenge that stands in the way of small business growth, economic development and job creation in Oregon and across the country. Despite this, government regulation continues to tie the hands of many potential lenders; namely, credit unions. According to some estimates, credit unions could lend an additional $16 billion to small businesses, helping them create nearly 150,000 new jobs in just 1 year if Congress loosened restraints on credit union business lending.

With this in mind, I am pleased to introduce today the Credit Union Residential Loan Parity Act, which would increase access to capital by exempting certain loans from the member business lending cap imposed on credit unions. Currently, loans made for one- to four-person, non-owner occupied housing are treated as business loans when they are made by credit unions. As such, these types of loans count against a credit union's business lending cap, and thereby limit a credit union's ability to provide loans to small businesses. My legislation would address this issue by allowing credit unions to treat these types of loans as residential loans—as they are when they are made by other financial institutions—therefore exempting these loans from the business lending cap. In doing so, this legislation would increase the availability of business capital, providing greater opportunities for small businesses to receive credit union loans to help them continue to grow and expand, create jobs and support our local economies.

I am hopeful that this legislation will be received by colleagues for what it is: a simple step to help ensure America's small businesses have access to the fuel they need to power our economy. It is my hope that the Senate will pass this legislation swiftly.

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. 1440

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 ''Credit Union Residential Loan Parity Act''.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF A NON-OWNER OCCUPIED 1- TO 4-FAMILY DWELLING.

(a) REMOVAL FROM MEMBER BUSINESS LOAN LIMITATION.—Section 107A(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(1)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''that is the primary residence of a member''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendment made by this Act shall preclude the National Credit Union Administration from treating an extension of credit that is fully secured by a lien on a 1- to 4-family dwelling that is not the primary residence of a member as a member business loan for purposes other than the member business loan limitation requirements under section 107A of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a).

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1448. A bill to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to honor my friend Frank Moore, an Oregonian, World War II veteran, husband to Jeanne, father, avid fly fisherman, and tireless conservationist.

Frank Moore can be found standing in the North Umpqua River in Oregon, wearing waders and casting his fly fishing reel, for hours. He is a legendary presence on the River, even at 91 years young. A pastime he picked up from his father, fly fishing has been a business and a hobby for Frank for nearly his entire life. Not only has he enjoyed the fishing and scenery on Oregon's rivers for decades, Frank's love of Oregon and his tireless work to conserve our state's fish habitats and rivers adds up to a rich legacy that sets the standard for generations to come. Frank served on the State of Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission and has received the National Wildlife Federation Conservationist of the Year award and the Wild

Steelhead Coalition Conservation Award.

Frank's commitment to the health and vitality of Oregon's rivers and fish habitat over the years is inspiring and he deserves countless thanks for his work and dedication. The Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary will serve as a tribute to the many outstanding accomplishments of Frank, both on and off the river.

It is my honor to introduce this bill today with my colleague from Oregon Senator MERKLEY on behalf of this extraordinary Oregonian.

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. 1448

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 ''Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary Designation Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Frank Moore has committed his life to family, friends, his country, and fly fishing;

(2) Frank Moore is a World War II veteran who stormed the beaches of Normandy along with 150,000 troops during the D-Day Allied invasion and was awarded the Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor for his bravery;

(3) Frank Moore returned home after the war, started a family, and pursued his passion of fishing on the winding rivers in Oregon;

(4) as the proprietor of the Steamboat Inn along the North Umpqua River in Oregon for nearly 20 years, Frank Moore, along with his wife Jeanne, shared his love of fishing, the flowing river, and the great outdoors, with visitors from all over the United States and the world;

(5) Frank Moore has spent most of his life fishing the vast rivers of Oregon, during which time he has contributed significantly to efforts to conserve fish habitats and protect river health, including serving on the State of Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission;

(6) Frank Moore has been recognized for his conservation work with the National Wildlife Federation Conservationist of the Year award, the Wild Steelhead Coalition Conservation Award, and his 2010 induction into the Fresh Water Fishing Hall of Fame; and

(7) in honor of the many accomplishments of Frank Moore, both on and off the river, approximately 104,000 acres of Forest Service land in Oregon should be designated as the ''Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary''.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map entitled ''O&C Land Grant Act of 2014: Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary'' and dated November 3, 2014.

(2) SANCTUARY.—The term ''Sanctuary'' means the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary designated by section 4(a).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Oregon.

SEC. 4. FRANK MOORE WILD STEELHEAD SANCTUARY, OREGON.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The approximately 104,000 acres of Forest Service land in the State, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as the ''Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary''.

(b) MAP; LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Sanctuary.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Sanctuary shall be administered by the Secretary—

(1) in accordance with all laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest System; and

(2) in a manner that—

(A) protects, preserves, and enhances the natural character, scientific use, and the botanical, recreational, ecological, fish and wildlife, scenic, drinking water, and cultural values of the Sanctuary;

(B) protects and seeks to enhance the wild salmonid resources of the Sanctuary;

(C) maintains or enhances the watershed as a thermal refuge for wild salmonids; and

(D) preserves opportunities for primitive recreation.

(d) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this section affects the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(e) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—Nothing in this section creates any protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Sanctuary.

(f) PROTECTION OF TRIBAL RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section diminishes any treaty rights of an Indian tribe.

(g) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land within the boundaries of the Sanctuary river segments designated by subsection (a) is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(h) USES.—The Secretary shall only allow uses of the Sanctuary that are consistent with the purposes and values for which the Sanctuary is established.

(i) USE OF MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the use of motorized vehicles within the Sanctuary shall be limited to roads allowed by the Secretary for the use of motorized vehicles.

(2) OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary may allow off-road vehicle use in designated portions of the Sanctuary if the use is consistent with the purposes and values for which the Sanctuary was designated.

(j) ROADS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall decrease the total mileage of system roads that are operational in the Sanctuary to a quantity less than the quantity of mileage in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall prioritize decreasing the mileage of the road network in the Sanctuary to reduce impacts to water quality from sediment delivered to streams by forest roads.

(3) TEMPORARY ROADS.—If the Secretary constructs a temporary road as part of a vegetation management project, the Secretary shall close and decommission the temporary road not later than the earlier of—

(A) the date that is 2 years after the date on which the activity for which the temporary road was constructed is completed; and

(B) the date that is 1 year after the date on which the vegetation management project is completed.

(4) NO NEW ROADS.—The Secretary shall prohibit—

(A) any new system or nonsystem road within the Sanctuary and key watersheds under the plan entitled ''Northwest Forest Plan 1994 Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl'' after the date of enactment of this Act, except as the Secretary determines to be necessary, if the Secretary determines that no practicable alternative exists, and subject to the availability of appropriations; and

(B) the construction of any new road in any roadless area in the Sanctuary.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 183—CALLING FOR SUSPENSION OF CONSTRUCTION OF ARTIFICIAL LAND FORMATIONS ON ISLANDS, REEFS, SHOALS, AND OTHER FEATURES OF THE SPRATLY ISLANDS AND FOR A PEACEFUL AND MULTILATERAL RESOLUTION TO THE SOUTH CHINA SEA TERRITORIAL DISPUTE

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 183

Whereas the United States Government strongly supports the peaceful resolution of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea;

Whereas the South China Sea includes critical sea lines of communication and commerce between the Pacific and Indian oceans;

Whereas the United States Government has a national interest in freedom of navigation and overflight in the South China Sea, as provided for by customary principles of international law;

Whereas the United States Government is also committed to upholding internationally lawful uses of the high seas and the Exclusive Economic Zones as well as to the related rights and freedoms in other maritime zones, including the rights of innocent passage, transit passage, and archipelagic sea lanes passage consistent with customary international law;

Whereas the United States has an interest in encouraging and supporting the nations of the region to work collaboratively and diplomatically to resolve disputes without coercion, intimidation, threats, or the use of force;

Whereas the United States further supports the efforts of states to resolve their disputes in accordance with international

law, including through internationally recognized legal dispute settlement mechanisms, and urges the full implementation of any decisions rendered by the relevant courts and tribunals which are binding on them;

Whereas the South China Sea potentially contains great natural resources, and their stewardship and responsible use offers immense potential benefit for generations to come;

Whereas Brunei, Malaysia, China, Taiwan, Vietnam, and the Philippines have overlapping territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional claim to all or some of the Spratly Islands;

Whereas, on January 23, 2013, the Philippines launched an arbitration process under an existing international mechanism challenging China's claim of a 'nine dash line' around the South China Sea;

Whereas, although the United States does not take a position on competing territorial claims over land features and maritime boundaries of the Spratly Islands, it does have a strong and long-standing interest in the manner in which disputes in the South China Sea are addressed and in the conduct of the parties;

Whereas, even while the Government of the People's Republic of China has refused to participate in formal arbitration with the Government of the Philippines, it should comply with any international ruling on competing territorial claims with the Philippines in the South China Sea;

Whereas, in recent years, the Government of the People's Republic of China has engaged in unilateral land reclamation and construction activities in the Spratly Islands that undermines regional stability and is counter to multilateral efforts for peaceful resolution of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea;

Whereas, although other claimants to the Spratly Islands have built small outposts and have engaged in minor maintenance on features they already occupy, in less than one year the Government of the People's Republic of China has rapidly exceeded all preceding activities and acted on a much larger scale;

Whereas, on November 4, 2002, the governments of the member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Government of the People's Republic of China signed a Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea that, among other things, declared, ''The Parties undertake to exercise self-restraint in the conduct of activities that would complicate or escalate disputes and affect peace and stability including, among others, refraining from action of inhabiting on the presently uninhabited islands, reefs, shoals, cays, and other features and to handle their differences in a constructive manner.'';

Whereas China's land reclamation is estimated to cost the region's littoral states $100,000,000 a year due to damage to the ecosystem and the degradation of fish stocks;

Whereas, on March 23, 2015, satellite imagery showed the Government of the People's Republic of China building a concrete runway on the Fiery Cross Reef that is expected to be 10,000 feet long and give the Chinese military the capability to land fighter jets and surveillance jets, which is destabilizing to regional peace and stability;

Whereas satellite imagery also showed the Government of the People's Republic of China unilaterally constructing island territory on Subi Reef that, if connected, would support an additional airstrip;

Whereas satellite imagery also showed that Woody Island and Duncan Island have grown significantly due to Chinese land reclamation activities;

Whereas, a March 16, 2015, image published by the Center for Strategic and International Studies showed that the Government of the People's Republic of China constructed a chain of artificial land formations, new structures, fortified sea walls, and construction equipment along Mischief Reef, an area claimed by the Philippines and within its Exclusive Economic Zone;

Whereas, in April 2015, the United States Office of Naval Intelligence published a report on the Chinese People's Liberation Army Navy showing that the Government of the People's Republic of China has reclaimed hundreds of acres of land at the seven features it occupies in the Spratly Islands throughout 2014 and stated that China ''appears to be building much larger facilities that could support naval operations.'';

Whereas, on April 6, 2015, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter noted deep concerns regarding some of the activities of the Government of the People's Republic of China, including ''its behavior in places like the East and South China Seas.'';

Whereas, on April 9, 2015, President Barack Obama stated, ''Where [the United States gets] concerned with China is where it is not necessarily abiding by international norms and rules, and is using its size and muscle to force countries into subordinate positions. And that's the concern we have around maritime issues.'';

Whereas, on April 16, 2015, the Commander of United States Pacific Command, Admiral Locklear, stated that Chinese land reclamation activities in the South China Sea ''would give them de facto control in peacetime of much of the world's most important waterways''; that China could place ''long-range detection radars'' on the outposts in order to place more warships there; and that Southeast Asian nations are increasingly worried that China's new capabilities will allow it take de facto control of the surrounding waters;

Whereas adding a military dimension to the territorial dispute exacerbates the risks of misperceptions, accidents, and other dangerous incidents in the Spratly Islands;

Whereas, on April 9, 2015, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman, Hua Chunying, was quoted as saying, ''After the construction, the islands and reefs will be able to provide all-round and comprehensive services to meet various civilian demands besides satisfying the need of necessary military defense.'';

Whereas ASEAN has promoted multilateral talks on disputed areas without settling the issue of sovereignty, and committed with China in the 2002 Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea to ''reaffirm their respect for and commitment to the freedom of navigation in and over flight above the South China Sea as provided for by the universally recognized principles of international law'' and to ''resolve their territorial and jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means, without resorting to the threat or use of force'';

Whereas the reclamation activities of the Government of the People's Republic of China threaten ASEAN unity and its multilateral efforts to promote peaceful reconciliation of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the Spratly Islands and the broader South China Sea; and

Whereas, on January 28, 2015, Philippine Foreign Secretary Alberto del Rosario urged ASEAN ''to consider reaching out to the international community to say to China that what it is doing is wrong—that it must stop its reclamation activities at once'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of the People's Republic of China's unilateral construction of artificial land formations in the disputed Spratly Islands;

(2) strongly urges all parties to maritime and territorial disputes in the region to respect the status quo, exercise self-restraint in the conduct of activities that would undermine stability or complicate or escalate disputes, refrain from inhabiting or garrisoning presently uninhabited islands, reefs, shoals, and other features, and refrain from unilateral actions that cause permanent physical change to the marine environment in areas pending final delimitation;

(3) urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to clarify the meaning of its ''nine dash line'' claim and the maritime areas it claims within that space;

(4) further urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to clarify its intentions with respect to establishing ''necessary military defense'' on reclaimed features and condemns the militarization of disputed features;

(5) supports efforts by parties to maritime and territorial disputes to handle their differences in a constructive manner and pursue their claims through peaceful, diplomatic, and legitimate regional and international arbitration mechanisms;

(6) reaffirms the strong support of the United States for the member states of ASEAN as they seek to develop a code of conduct of parties in the South China Sea with the People's Republic of China, and urges China to enter into such negotiations in a serious manner;

(7) supports efforts to strengthen regional maritime domain awareness;

(8) supports efforts to strengthen maritime partner capacity, including through the sale and transfer of technology that promotes maritime domain awareness; and

(9) supports the continuation of operations by the United States Armed Forces in support of freedom of navigation rights in international waters and air space in the South China Sea.

SENATE RESOLUTION 184—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONVERSION THERAPY, INCLUDING EFFORTS BY MENTAL HEALTH PRACTITIONERS TO CHANGE THE SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, OR GENDER EXPRESSION OF AN INDIVIDUAL, IS DANGEROUS AND HARMFUL AND SHOULD BE PROHIBITED FROM BEING PRACTICED ON MINORS

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 184

Whereas being lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or gender nonconforming is not a disorder, disease, illness, deficiency, or shortcoming;

Whereas the development of all children and adolescents into healthy and productive adults is a priority of the United States and

ending prejudice and injustice based on sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender nonconformity is a human rights issue;

Whereas the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Counseling Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association, the American School Counselor Association, the National Association of School Psychologists, and the National Association of Social Workers, together representing more than 480,000 health and mental health professionals, have all taken the position that homosexuality is not a mental disorder and thus is not something that needs to be or can be ''cured'';

Whereas the American Psychological Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the National Association of Social Workers, the American Counseling Association Governing Council, and the American Psychoanalytic Association have not found conversion therapy to be safe or effective;

Whereas several States have enacted or are considering legislation and other measures to prohibit conversion therapy in children and adolescents; and

Whereas enacted State legislation to prohibit conversion therapy in children and adolescents has been upheld as constitutional: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the ''Stop Harming Our Kids Resolution of 2015''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CONVERSION THERAPY DIRECTED AT MINORS.

(a) CONVERSION THERAPY DEFINED.—In this resolution, the term ''conversion therapy''—

(1) means any practice by a licensed, certified, or registered mental health provider, health care provider, or counselor that seeks or purports to impose change of the sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression of an individual, including reducing or eliminating sexual or romantic attractions or feelings toward an individual of the same gender and efforts to change behaviors, gender identity, or gender expression; and

(2) does not include counseling—

(A) that—

(i) provides acceptance, support, and understanding of an individual;

(ii) facilitates the coping, social support, and identity exploration and development of an individual;

(iii) provides developmentally appropriate counseling for an individual undergoing gender transition; or

(iv) provides sexual orientation- and gender identity-neutral interventions to prevent or address unlawful conduct or unsafe sexual practices; and

(B) that does not seek to change sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that conversion therapy directed at minors is discredited and ineffective, has no legitimate therapeutic purpose, and is dangerous and harmful.

(c) STATE ENCOURAGEMENT.—The Senate encourages each State to take steps to protect minors from efforts that promote or promise to change sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression based on the premise that being lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or gender nonconforming is a mental illness or developmental disorder that can or should be cured.

SENATE RESOLUTION 185—RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MAY 2015 AS ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH AND AS AN IMPORTANT TIME TO CELEBRATE THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF ASIAN AMERICANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS TO THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 185

Whereas the people of the United States join together each May to pay tribute to the contributions of generations of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders who have enriched the history of the United States;

Whereas the history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States is inextricably tied to the story of the United States;

Whereas the Asian American and Pacific Islander community is an inherently diverse population, comprised of more than 45 distinct ethnicities and more than 100 language dialects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, the Asian American population grew at a faster rate than any other racial or ethnic group in the United States during the last decade, surging nearly 46 percent between 2000 and 2010, a growth rate that is 4 times the rate of the total population of the United States;

Whereas, according to the 2010 decennial census, there are approximately 17,300,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Asian and approximately 1,200,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, making up approximately 5.5 percent and 0.4 percent, respectively, of the total population of the United States;

Whereas the month of May was selected for Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month because the first immigrants from Japan arrived in the United States on May 7, 1843, and the first transcontinental railroad was completed on May 10, 1869, with substantial contributions from immigrants from China;

Whereas section 102 of title 36, United States Code, officially designates May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and requests that the President issue an annual proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities;

Whereas Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, such as Daniel K. Inouye, a Medal of Honor and Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient who as President Pro Tempore of the Senate was the highest-ranking Asian American government official in United States history, Dalip Singh Saund, the first Asian American Congressman, Patsy T. Mink, the first woman of color and the first Asian American woman to be elected to Congress, Hiram L. Fong, the first Asian American Senator, Daniel K. Akaka, the first Senator of Native Hawaiian ancestry, Norman Y. Mineta, the first Asian American member of a presidential cabinet, Elaine L. Chao, the first Asian American woman member of a presidential cabinet, and others have made significant contributions in both the Government and military of the United States;

Whereas the year 2015 marks several important milestones for the Asian American and Pacific Islander community, including the—

(1) 50th anniversary of the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-236), landmark legislation that reversed restrictive immigration policies against immigrants from Asia;

(2) 40th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War;

(3) 40th anniversary of the Southeast Asian diasporic communities in the United States;

(4) 30th anniversary of the mission aboard the Space Shuttle Discovery of Ellison Shoji Onizuka, the first Asian American in space; and

(5) 25th anniversary of the date of enactment of Public Law 105-225, signed by President George H. W. Bush, designating May to be Asian Pacific American Heritage Month;

Whereas the actions of the Hmong in Laos in support of the United States during the Vietnam War saved the lives of countless people of the United States;

Whereas as a result of Hmong support of the United States, the Hmong were forced to leave Laos when the new communist regime seized control of Laos;

Whereas May 14, 2015, marks the 40th anniversary of the forced exit from Laos of Hmong people, many of whom later resettled in the United States, following the withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam;

Whereas, in 2015, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, a bicameral caucus of Members of Congress advocating on behalf of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, is composed of 48 Members, including 13 Members of Asian or Pacific Islander descent;

Whereas in 2015, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are serving in State and territorial legislatures across the United States in record numbers, including the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and the territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

Whereas the number of Federal judges who are Asian Americans or Pacific Islanders doubled between 2001 and 2008 and more than tripled between 2009 and 2015, reflecting a commitment to diversity in the Federal judiciary that has resulted in the confirmations of high-caliber Asian American and Pacific Islander judicial nominees;

Whereas there remains much to be done to ensure that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have access to resources and a voice in the Government of the United States and continue to advance in the political landscape of the United States; and

Whereas celebrating Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month provides the people of the United States with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, and history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and to appreciate the challenges faced by Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of May 2015 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; and

(2) recognizes that the Asian American and Pacific Islander community enhances the rich diversity of and strengthens the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 186—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 17 THROUGH MAY 23, 2015, AS ''NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK''

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 186

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas the public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safety, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 17 through May 23, 2015, as ''National Public Works Week'';

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the United States; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 187—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE MONTH OF MAY 2015, AS ''NATIONAL BLADDER CANCER AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 187

Whereas 500,000 families in the United States live with bladder cancer;

Whereas more than 74,000 people are expected to be diagnosed with bladder cancer and 16,000 will die due to the disease in 2015 alone;

Whereas bladder cancer affects people of all ages and backgrounds and is among the top 10 cancers with the highest incidence rates in the United States;

Whereas bladder cancer is known as one of the most expensive cancers to treat on a per patient basis with a recurrence rate of approximately 50 to 80 percent, requiring lifelong surveillance;

Whereas bladder cancer symptoms, such as blood in the urine, are easily recognized, however, many are unaware of the threat of bladder cancer, often prolonging the time to diagnosis;

Whereas if diagnosed early, bladder cancer is treatable;

Whereas military veterans are twice as likely as nonveterans to be diagnosed with bladder cancer;

Whereas women are often diagnosed at a later stage in the development of bladder cancer, and when diagnosed at the same stage as men, women have a worse prognosis;

Whereas if diagnosis and treatment are delayed, the life expectancy of an individual with bladder cancer decreases;

Whereas the quality of life of a person with bladder cancer will depend on future treatment and diagnosis developments, which will rely on research advancements;

Whereas there have been no new treatments approved by the Food and Drug Administration for bladder cancer in over 10 years;

Whereas research advancements for bladder cancer are limited by lack of awareness about the disease within the medical community and general public;

Whereas increased awareness will promote early diagnosis and increase the chances of survival;

Whereas increased awareness will bolster public support of the disease and thus increase funding for innovative research and the development of new treatment options and diagnostic tools;

Whereas traditionally on the first Saturday in May each year, survivors, caregivers, and loved ones walk together throughout the United States to raise awareness of bladder cancer;

Whereas the Bladder Cancer Advocacy Network and its community of patients, caregivers, and specialists seek—

(1) to foster a community of hope and support;

(2) to fund and conduct research for innovative treatments and diagnostic tools; and

(3) to increase public awareness and understanding of bladder cancer; and

Whereas May would be an appropriate month to designate as ''National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2015, as ''National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month'';

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interested groups, and affected persons—

(A) to promote awareness of bladder cancer and to foster understanding of the impact of the disease on patients and their families and caregivers;

(B) to take an active role in the fight to end bladder cancer; and

(C) to observe National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1436. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1437. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. SCHATZ) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 109, acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific led to World War II.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1436. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, line 9, insert before the end period the following: '', and does not violate the requirements of chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Buy American Act') or section 313 of title 23, United States Code, or weaken or undermine those requirements by allowing for waivers that would cause the closure of a domestic manufacturer''.

SA 1437. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. SCHATZ) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 109, acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific led to World War II; as follows:

The preamble is amended—

(1) in the 10th whereas clause, by striking ''March 30, 1935'' and inserting ''March 20, 1935'';

(2) in the 13th whereas clause, by striking ''proclaimed'' and inserting ''established'';

(3) in the 25th whereas clause, by striking ''distracted by'' and inserting ''otherwise focused on''; and

(4) in the 27th whereas clause—

(A) by striking ''Jarvis and Enderbury'' and inserting ''Enderbury and Jarvis''; and

(B) by striking ''on February 9'' and inserting '' from February 7 to 9''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room 328A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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 May 21, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Financial Regulatory Improvement Act of 2015.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 9:15 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Understanding America's Long-Term Fiscal Picture.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in the President's Room of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my counsel detailee, Samantha Chaifetz, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Amanda Clinton, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the calendar year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 115 through 122, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) John D. Alexander
Rear Adm. (1h) Ronald A. Boxall
Rear Adm. (1h) Robert P. Burke
Rear Adm. (1h) Matthew J. Carter
Rear Adm. (1h) Christopher W. Grady
Rear Adm. (1h) Michael E. Jabaley, Jr.
Rear Adm. (1h) Colin J. Kilrain
Rear Adm. (1h) Andrew L. Lewis
Rear Adm. (1h) DeWolfe H. Miller
Rear Adm. (1h) John P. Neagley
Rear Adm. (1h) Patrick A. Piercey
Rear Adm. (1h) Charles A. Richard
Rear Adm. (1h) Hugh D. Wetherald
Rear Adm. (1h) Ricky L. Williamson

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Eugene H. Black, III
Capt. Dell D. Bull
Capt. William D. Byrne, Jr.
Capt. Edward B. Cashman
Capt. Moises Deltoro, III
Capt. Stephen C. Evans
Capt. Gregory J. Fenton
Capt. John V. Fuller
Capt. Michael P. Holland
Capt. Hugh W. Howard, III
Capt. Jeffrey W. Hughes
Capt. Thomas E. Ishee
Capt. Stephen T. Koehler
Capt. Yancy B. Lindsey
Capt. Francis D. Morley
Capt. Cathal S. O'Connor
Capt. Jeffrey E. Trussler
Capt. William W. Wheeler, III

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jeffrey G. Lofgren

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Michael G. Dana

IN THE ARMY

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Matthew P. Beevers

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. John N. Christenson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Shoshana S. Chatfield

The following named officer for appointment as the Judge Advocate General of the Navy and for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while serving as the Judge Advocate General under title 10, U.S.C., section 5148:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. James W. Crawford, III

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN95–2 AIR FORCE nomination of RHYS WILLIAM HUNT, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN248 AIR FORCE nominations (5) beginning JAMES D. BRANTINGHAM, and ending GEORGE T. YOUSTRA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2015.

PN249 AIR FORCE nominations (429) beginning RANDALL E. ACKERMAN, and ending CLINTON R. ZUMBRUNNEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2015.

PN426 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning JOSHUA D. BURGESS, and ending JAMES R. CANTU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN427 AIR FORCE nomination of Michael I. Etan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

IN THE ARMY

PN428 ARMY nomination of Erik D. Masick, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN429 ARMY nominations (3) beginning MUHAMMAD R. KHAWAJA, and ending NIKALESH REDDY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN80 MARINE CORPS nomination of Henry C. Bodden, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN82 MARINE CORPS nomination of William E Lanham, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN115 MARINE CORPS nomination of Rebecca L. Wilkinson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN122 MARINE CORPS nominations (42) beginning MATTHEW F. AMIDON, and ending JOHN A. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN151 MARINE CORPS nominations (6) beginning MICHAEL J. CORRADO, and ending CRAIG C. ULLMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN152 MARINE CORPS nominations (211) beginning RORY L. ALDRIDGE, and ending MARK D. ZIMMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

PN110 NAVY nomination of Miriam Behpour, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN111 NAVY nomination of Thomas P. Murphy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN147 NAVY nomination of Todd S. Levant, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN148 NAVY nomination of Jennifer L. Borstelmann, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN150 NAVY nomination of Robert S. Thompson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN181 NAVY nomination of Melissa C. Austin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN438 NAVY nominations (50) beginning ANTHONY S. ARDITO, and ending RODERICK D. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN443 NAVY nomination of Garrett T. Pankow, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN444 NAVY nomination of William M. Walker, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN445 NAVY nomination of Christopher C. Meyer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN446 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JEFFREY G. BENTSON, and ending PAUL N. PORENSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN447 NAVY nomination of Kevin D. Clarida, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN448 NAVY nomination of Brianna E. Jackson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN449 NAVY nomination of Jared M. Spilka, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN450 NAVY nomination of Francine Segovia, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN451 NAVY nomination of Todd W. Mallory, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

COURTHOUSE NAMING BILLS

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1690 and the Senate proceed to its consideration and the consideration of Calendar No. 64, S. 261, and Calendar No. 65, S. 612, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. PERDUE. I further ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOSEPH F. WEIS JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The bill (H.R. 1690) to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the ''Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse,'' was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM J. HOLLOWAY, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The bill (S. 261) to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 261

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

SECTION 1. WILLIAM J. HOLLOWAY, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, shall be known and designated as the ''William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse''.

GEORGE P. KAZEN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The bill (S. 612) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the ''George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 612

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

SECTION 1. GEORGE P. KAZEN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, shall be known and designated as the ''George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

NEW MEXICO NAVAJO WATER SETTLEMENT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 81, S. 501.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 501) to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 501) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 501

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 ''New Mexico Navajo Water Settlement Technical Corrections Act''.

SEC. 2. NAVAJO WATER SETTLEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 10302 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 407 note; Public Law 111–11) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Arrellano'' and inserting ''Arellano''; and

(2) in paragraph (27), by striking ''75–185'' and inserting ''75–184''.

(b) DELIVERY AND USE OF NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT WATER.—Section 10603(c)(2)(A) of the Omnibus Public Land

Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1385) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''Article III(c)'' and inserting ''Articles III(c)''; and

(2) in clause (ii)(II), by striking ''Article III(c)'' and inserting ''Articles III(c)''.

(c) PROJECT CONTRACTS.—Section 10604(f)(1) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1391) is amended by inserting ''Project'' before ''water''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 10609 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1395) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), by striking ''construction or rehabilitation'' each place it appears and inserting ''planning, design, construction, rehabilitation,'';

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''2 percent'' and inserting ''4 percent''; and

(3) in subsection (f)(1), by striking ''4 percent'' and inserting ''2 percent''.

(e) AGREEMENT.—Section 10701(e) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1400) is amended in paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(B), and (3)(A) by striking ''and Contract'' each place it appears.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT THE CHALLENGES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 168.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 168) recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 168) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 5, 2015, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ACKNOWLEDGING AND HONORING BRAVE YOUNG MEN FROM HAWAII

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 109 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 109) acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific led to World War II.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the Schatz amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 109) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1437) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

The preamble is amended—

(1) in the 10th whereas clause, by striking ''March 30, 1935'' and inserting ''March 20, 1935'';

(2) in the 13th whereas clause, by striking ''proclaimed'' and inserting ''established'';

(3) in the 25th whereas clause, by striking ''distracted by'' and inserting ''otherwise focused on''; and

(4) in the 27th whereas clause—

(A) by striking ''Jarvis and Enderbury'' and inserting ''Enderbury and Jarvis''; and

(B) by striking ''on February 9'' and inserting '' from February 7 to 9''.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 109

Whereas in the mid-19th century, the Guano Islands Act (48 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) enabled companies from the United States to mine guano from a number of islands in the Equatorial Pacific;

Whereas after several decades, when the guano was depleted, the companies abandoned mining activities, and the control of the islands by the United States diminished and left the islands vulnerable to exploitation by other nations;

Whereas the Far East during the late 19th century and early 20th century was characterized by colonial conflicts and Japanese expansionism;

Whereas the 1930s marked the apex of the sphere of influence of Imperial Japan in the Far East;

Whereas military and commercial interest in Central Pacific air routes between Australia and California led to a desire by the United States to claim the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, although the ownership of the islands was unclear;

Whereas in 1935, a secret Department of Commerce colonization plan was instituted, aimed at placing citizens of the United States as colonists on the remote islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis;

Whereas to avoid conflicts with international law, which prevented colonization by active military personnel, the United States sought the participation of furloughed military personnel and Native Hawaiian civilians in the colonization project;

Whereas William T. Miller, Superintendent of Airways at the Department of Commerce, was appointed to lead the colonization project, traveled to Hawaii in February 1935, met with Albert F. Judd, Trustee of Kamehameha Schools and the Bishop Museum, and agreed that recent graduates and students of the Kamehameha School for Boys would make ideal colonists for the project;

Whereas the ideal Hawaiian candidates were candidates who could ''fish in the native manner, swim excellently, handle a boat, be disciplined, friendly, and unattached'';

Whereas on March 20, 1935, the United States Coast Guard Cutter Itasca departed from Honolulu Harbor in great secrecy with 6 young Hawaiian men aboard, all recent graduates of Kamehameha Schools, and 12 furloughed Army personnel, whose purpose was to occupy the barren islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis in teams of 5 for 3 months;

Whereas in June 1935, after a successful first tour, the furloughed Army personnel were ordered off the islands and replaced with additional Kamehameha Schools alumni, thus leaving the islands under the exclusive occupation of the 4 Native Hawaiians on each island;

Whereas the duties of the colonists while on the island were to record weather conditions, cultivate plants, maintain a daily log, record the types of fish that were caught, observe bird life, and collect specimens for the Bishop Museum;

Whereas the successful year-long occupation by the colonists directly enabled President Franklin D. Roosevelt to issue Executive Order 7368 on May 13, 1936, which established that the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis were under the jurisdiction of the United States;

Whereas multiple Federal agencies vied for the right to administer the colonization project, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, and the Navy Department, but jurisdiction was ultimately granted to the Department of the Interior;

Whereas under the Department of the Interior, the colonization project emphasized weather data and radio communication, which brought about the recruitment of a number of Asian radiomen and aerologists;

Whereas under the Department of the Interior, the colonization project also expanded beyond the Kamehameha Schools to include Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians from other schools in Hawaii;

Whereas in March of 1938 the United States also claimed and colonized the islands of Canton and Enderbury, maintaining that the colonization was in furtherance of commercial aviation and not for military purposes;

Whereas the risk of living on the remote islands meant that emergency medical care was not less than 5 days away, and the distance proved fatal for Carl Kahalewai, who died on October 8, 1938, en route to Honolulu after his appendix ruptured on Jarvis island;

Whereas other life-threatening injuries occurred, including in 1939, when Manuel Pires had appendicitis, and in 1941, when an explosion severely burned Henry Knell and Dominic Zagara;

Whereas in 1940, when the issue of discontinuing the colonization project was raised, the Navy acknowledged that the islands were ''probably worthless to commercial aviation'' but advocated for ''continued occupation'' because the islands could serve as ''bases from a military standpoint'';

Whereas although military interests justified continued occupation of the islands, the colonists were never informed of the true nature of the project, nor were the colonists provided with weapons or any other means of self-defense;

Whereas in June of 1941, when much of Europe was engaged in World War II and Imperial Japan was establishing itself in the Pacific, the Commandant of the 14th Naval District recognized the ''tension in the Western Pacific'' and recommended the evacuation of the colonists, but his request was denied;

Whereas on December 8, 1941, Howland Island was attacked by a fleet of Japanese twin-engine bombers, and the attack killed Hawaiian colonists Joseph Keliihananui and Richard Whaley;

Whereas in the ensuing weeks, Japanese submarine and military aircraft continued to target the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, jeopardizing the lives of the remaining colonists;

Whereas the United States Government was unaware of the attacks on the islands, and was otherwise focused on the entry of the United States into World War II;

Whereas the colonists demonstrated great valor while awaiting retrieval;

Whereas the 4 colonists from Baker and the 2 remaining colonists from Howland were rescued on January 31, 1942, and the 8 colonists from Enderbury and Jarvis were rescued on February 7 to 9, 1942, 2 months after the initial attacks on Howland Island;

Whereas on March 20, 1942, Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, sent letters of condolence to the Keliihananui and Whaley families stating that ''[i]n your bereavement it must be considerable satisfaction to know that your brother died in the service of his country'';

Whereas during the 7 years of colonization, more than 130 young men participated in the project, the majority of whom were Hawaiian, and all of whom made numerous sacrifices, endured hardships, and risked their lives to secure and maintain the islands of Howland, Baker, Jarvis, Canton, and Enderbury on behalf of the United States, and 3 young Hawaiian men made the ultimate sacrifice;

Whereas none of the islands, except for Canton, were ever used for commercial aviation, but the islands were used for military purposes;

Whereas in July 1943, a military base was established on Baker Island, and its forces, which numbered over 2,000 members, participated in the Tarawa-Makin operation;

Whereas in 1956, participants of the colonization project established an organization called ''Hui Panala'au'', which was established to preserve the fellowship of the group, to provide scholarship assistance, and ''to honor and esteem those who died as colonists of the Equatorial Islands'';

Whereas in 1979, Canton and Enderbury became part of the Republic of Kiribati, but the islands of Jarvis, Howland, and Baker remain possessions of the United States, having been designated as National Wildlife Refuges in 1974;

Whereas the islands of Jarvis, Howland, and Baker are now part of the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument;

Whereas May 13, 2015, marks the 79th anniversary of the issuance of the Executive order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaiming United States jurisdiction over the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, islands that remain possessions of the United States; and

Whereas the Federal Government has never fully recognized the contributions and sacrifices of the colonists, less than a handful of whom are still alive today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges the accomplishments and commends the service of the Hui Panala'au colonists;

(2) acknowledges the local, national, and international significance of the 7-year colonization project, which resulted in the United States extending sovereignty into the Equatorial Pacific;

(3) recognizes the dedication to the United States and self-reliance demonstrated by the young men, the majority of whom were Native Hawaiian, who left their homes and families in Hawaii to participate in the Equatorial Pacific colonization project;

(4) extends condolences on behalf of the United States to the families of Carl Kahalewai, Joseph Keliihananui, and Richard Whaley for the loss of their loved ones in the service of the United States;

(5) honors the young men whose actions, sacrifices, and valor helped secure and maintain the jurisdiction of the United States over equatorial islands in the Pacific Ocean during the years leading up to and the months immediately following the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the entry of the United States into World War II; and

(6) extends to all of the colonists, and to the families of these exceptional young men, the deep appreciation of the people of the United States.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. PERDUE. 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. 185, S. Res. 186, and S. Res. 187.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101–595, and further amended by Public Law 113–281, and upon the recommendation of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: the Honorable ROGER WICKER of Mississippi and the Honorable DAN SULLIVAN of Alaska.

The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 113–146, appoints the following individuals to serve as members of the Commission on Care: the Honorable Tom Coburn of Oklahoma, Stuart Hickey of Pennsylvania, and Thomas Harvey of New York.

The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 96–114, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: Chiling Tong of Maryland.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: the Honorable JONI ERNST of Iowa (designee of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C., sections 42 and 43, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN of Arkansas and the Honorable DAVID PERDUE of Georgia.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: the Honorable CORY GARDNER of Colorado (designee of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy: the Honorable DAN SULLIVAN of Alaska (designee of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services).

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 22, 2015

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Friday, May 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1314; finally, that all time during the adjournment of the Senate count postcloture on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PERDUE. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:16 p.m., adjourned until Friday, May 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

STEPHEN C. HEDGER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ELIZABETH LEE KING, RESIGNED.

INTER–AMERICAN FOUNDATION

LUIS A. VIADA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER–AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 20, 2018, VICE JOHN P. SALAZAR, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

AKHIL REED AMAR, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2020, VICE JAMSHEED K. CHOKSY, TERM EXPIRED.

ROBERT P. ZIMMERMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018, VICE MANFREDI PICCOLOMINI, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JESSICA ROSENWORCEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2015. (REAPPOINTMENT)

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

W. THOMAS REEDER, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION, VICE JOSHUA GOTBAUM, RESIGNED.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

DENISE TURNER ROTH, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES, VICE DANIEL M. TANGHERLINI, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

EDWARD L. STANTON III, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR., RETIRING.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ERIC STEVEN MILLER, OF VERMONT, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE TRISTRAM J. COFFIN, RESIGNED.

MICHAEL C. MCGOWAN, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE, FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOSEPH ANTHONY PAPILI, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 154:

To be general

GEN. PAUL J. SELVA

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. CLIFFORD B. CHICK

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 152 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, JR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

DANIEL A. LAPOSTOLE

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD FOR APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 188:

To be commander

ANNA W. HICKEY

To be lieutenant

KIMBERLY C. YOUNG-MCLEAR

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 21, 2015:

THE JUDICIARY

JILL N. PARRISH, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH.

JOSE ROLANDO OLVERA, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

PATRICIA D. CAHILL, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2020.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

MARK SCARANO, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON OF THE NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN D. ALEXANDER
REAR ADM. (LH) RONALD A. BOXALL
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT P. BURKE
REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW J. CARTER
REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTOPHER W. GRADY
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL E. JABALEY, JR.
REAR ADM. (LH) COLIN J. KILRAIN
REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW L. LEWIS
REAR ADM. (LH) DEWOLFE H. MILLER
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN P. NEAGLEY
REAR ADM. (LH) PATRICK A. PIERCEY
REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES A. RICHARD
REAR ADM. (LH) HUGH D. WETHERALD
REAR ADM. (LH) RICKY L. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. EUGENE H. BLACK III
CAPT. DELL D. BULL
CAPT. WILLIAM D. BYRNE, JR.
CAPT. EDWARD B. CASHMAN
CAPT. MOISES DELTORO III
CAPT. STEPHEN C. EVANS
CAPT. GREGORY J. FENTON
CAPT. JOHN V. FULLER
CAPT. MICHAEL P. HOLLAND
CAPT. HUGH W. HOWARD III
CAPT. JEFFREY W. HUGHES
CAPT. THOMAS E. ISHEE
CAPT. STEPHEN T. KOEHLER
CAPT. YANCY B. LINDSEY
CAPT. FRANCIS D. MORLEY
CAPT. CATHAL S. O'CONNOR
CAPT. JEFFREY E. TRUSSLER
CAPT. WILLIAM W. WHEELER III

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JEFFREY G. LOFGREN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL G. DANA

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MATTHEW P. BEEVERS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN N. CHRISTENSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SHOSHANA S. CHATFIELD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5148:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES W. CRAWFORD III

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF RHYS WILLIAM HUNT, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES D. BRANTINGHAM AND ENDING WITH GEORGE T. YOUSTRA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 4, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RANDALL E. ACKERMAN AND ENDING WITH CLINTON R. ZUMBRUNNEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 4, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA D. BURGESS AND ENDING WITH JAMES R. CANTU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MICHAEL I. ETAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF ERIK D. MASICK, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MUHAMMAD R. KHAWAJA AND ENDING WITH NIKALESH REDDY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF HENRY C. BODDEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF WILLIAM E. LANHAM, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF REBECCA L. WILKINSON, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW F. AMIDON AND ENDING WITH JOHN A. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. CORRADO AND ENDING WITH CRAIG C. ULLMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 29, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RORY L. ALDRIDGE AND ENDING WITH MARK D. ZIMMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 29, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF MIRIAM BEHPOUR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF THOMAS P. MURPHY, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TODD S. LEVANT, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JENNIFER L. BORSTELMANN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. THOMPSON, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MELISSA C. AUSTIN, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY S. ARDITO AND ENDING WITH RODERICK D. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GARRETT T. PANKOW, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM M. WALKER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER C. MEYER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER .

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY G. BENTSON AND ENDING WITH PAUL N. PORENSKY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KEVIN D. CLARIDA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRIANNA E. JACKSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JARED M. SPILKA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF FRANCINE SEGOVIA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TODD W. MALLORY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN AND COUNTY CLUB

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 90th anniversary of the Town and County Club in Hartford, Connecticut. This club was originally founded on May 21, 1925 as a private women's club and has continually flourished into an esteemed location for members to enjoy organized social, intellectual, and artistic gatherings.

The first President of the club was Miss Anne Eliot Trumbull, and on the day of the first meeting of her Board, the Club had been incorporated with the assistance of attorney Barclay Robinson, under the name of 'The Town and County Club, Incorporated'. The Articles of Association state the purposes for which the corporation was formed, and signed by the 16 subscribers present at the meeting. The Articles state: 'For creating an organized center for women's work, thought and action; advancing the interests of women; promoting science, literature, and art; providing an accessible place of meeting for its members; promoting social intercourse by such means as the members of the corporation shall deem expedient and proper for that purpose, and for acquiring and maintaining and club house and grounds.'

In a time when the most private club memberships were restricted to men, these women represented the voice and action for change by creating one of their own. In just five years after women's suffrage in 1920, women in the Hartford County area chose to congregate and soon created this popular club that would continue on and today, celebrate its 90th anniversary. It is my honor to congratulate the Town and County Club in Hartford, Connecticut.

IN HONOR OF THE 2015 GRADUATES OF LEADERSHIP ROWAN

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the graduates of the Leadership Rowan class of 2015. These graduates represent a cross-section of leaders in Rowan County, North Carolina, who are dedicated to making their county and local communities a better place.

Leadership Rowan is a nine month program designed to teach existing leaders and community volunteers about important local issues, introduce them to new means of involvement, and connect them with other leaders in the community. For 23 years under the sponsorship of the Rowan County Chamber of Commerce, Leadership Rowan has graduated over 500 emerging leaders.

As a graduate of Leadership Cabarrus and Leadership Montgomery, which are similar programs in other North Carolina counties, I understand the level of commitment necessary to complete this program. I commend each graduate for taking the time to learn more about the political, cultural, social, economic, and educational issues in Rowan County in order to better understand and improve our community. These 25 graduates completed courses in History and Power; Business and the Economy; Public Education; Human Needs; Government; Criminal Justice; Communications; and Quality of Life.

Participants in this year's Leadership Rowan class include: Keri Allman, D.J. Barksdale, Gary Blabon, Keith Bowersox, Wendy Brindle, Mary Burridge, Thomas Cobb, Heather Crawford, Victoria Curran, Teresa Dakins, Addison Davis, Benjamin Davis, Michelle Fisher, Jon Folstad, Rori Godsey, Ashlee Hawkins, Deborah Johnson, Heather King, Glenwood Oats Jr., Ann Pressly, Laurie Ritchie, Janet Spriggs, Shane Valley, Curtis Walker, and Jeanette West.

It is an honor today to congratulate the graduates of Leadership Rowan for completing this program and for their dedication to serving our community and the State of North Carolina.

HONORING RABBI ANCHELLE PERL AND THE WINNERS OF THE GOOD DEED AWARDS FOR LONG ISLAND TEENAGERS

HON. KATHLEEN M. RICE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of Rabbi Anchelle Perl of Chabad of Mineola and the winners of the prestigious Good Deed Awards for Long Island Teenagers.

For over two decades, the National Committee for the Furtherance of Jewish Education (NCFJE) has worked tirelessly to showcase and celebrate the tremendous achievements and service of our youth and to help our greater community appreciate their work.

The Good Deed Awards have helped provide so many young men and women with the recognition, confidence and encouragement they need to continue on a path of public service and become the leaders of tomorrow. This organization instills in them a sense of purpose and pride and demonstrates the potential that our nation's youth have for creating positive change in their communities and improving the lives of others.

That is why I want to begin by congratulating this year's winners. These 31 incredible young men and women come from over a dozen different high schools, represent a diverse set of backgrounds and cultures, and were nominated by a variety of distinguished community members, including educators, religious and community leaders, elected officials, and members of the local business community. Brought together by their commitment to public service and the desire to help others, this year's winners truly embody the very best that our community has to offer.

I also want to acknowledge Rabbi Anchelle Perl of Chabad of Mineola, who has graciously hosted the Good Deed Awards for the past 22 years. Having had the honor of attending this event in the past, I know the crucial role that Rabbi Perl plays in guiding and encouraging these incredible young men and women, and in promoting community support for their work. Rabbi Perl has devoted his life to serving this community and I am truly proud to be his representative in Congress.

HELEN GORDON DAVIS

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the outstanding work of a trailblazing public servant and one of the champions of the Florida equal rights and civil rights movements, the late Florida State Senator Helen Gordon Davis, who represented the Tampa Bay area in the Florida Legislature from 1974 until 1992.

Senator Davis devoted her public service career to confronting and changing the inequalities in economic, legal and social status for women and African Americans. She was a true pioneer for pay equity for women. In 1980, Mrs. Davis was presented with the Florida ACLU Bill of Rights Award as a testament to her dedication for civil liberties for all.

Senator Davis was elected to the Florida State House of Representatives in 1974 as the first woman from Hillsborough County to be elected to the Florida Legislature. She was subsequently re-elected six times. In 1988, Senator Davis successfully ran for the state Senate where she fought for economic equality for women, and sponsored the first legislation on sexual harassment. Among her many achievements, Mrs. Davis created the Marriage License Trust fund for Spouse Abuse Centers, Court Depositories for Child Support Payments, the Displaced Homemakers for Divorced Women Act, and doubled the penalties for hate crimes.

With passion and courage, Mrs. Davis paved the way for future generations of Hillsborough County women in politics.

Before her time as an influential legislator, Mrs. Davis was president of the League of Women Voters of Hillsborough County from 1966–1969. In 1971, Mrs. Davis founded Florida's first women's center which sought to help women succeed in the workplace and helped many gain tangible professional and life skills. Mrs. Davis was the first recipient of the

League of Women Voters of Hillsborough County's Lifetime Achievement Award.

Mrs. Davis was born on Christmas Day, 1926 in Brooklyn, New York. Originally a stage actress, Mrs. Davis moved to Tampa in 1948 with husband Gene Davis, where she was a high school drama teacher and regular fixture in the community theater.

Although Mrs. Davis passed away on May 18, 2015, her legacy will continue through her broad-based legislative accomplishments, the Women's Centre in the Hyde Park community of Tampa, and the women she championed both professionally and personally. Mrs. Davis is survived by her daughters Stephanie and Karen, her son Gordon, her sister Jeanne, and her two grandchildren. On behalf of the Tampa community, I am proud to recognize Helen Gordon Davis for her dedication to Hillsborough County, the State of Florida, and to women everywhere.

AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 880—another unpaid-for permanent extension of an expired tax provision offered by the Majority.

I am privileged to represent many of our country's leading research institutions and innovative researchers and entrepreneurs in New York's 12th District. Like many of my colleagues, I believe that a permanent R&D credit will support critical research and create high-skilled, high-paying jobs throughout the country. This bill makes important improvements to the credit, and I hope to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to provide incentives for businesses to invest in research and development.

However, I cannot support policies that extend certain tax provisions while other critical tax credits, like those for higher education and the Earned Income Tax Credit, face an uncertain future. All told, the Majority's slate of unpaid-for permanent tax extensions would increase the deficit by nearly $600 billion, all while its budget proposes severe cuts to education, transportation, and critical safety net programs in the name of deficit reduction. Americans are not fooled by this double standard, and Congress should reject this disingenuous approach to tax policy.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BELOVED JIM BRUCE GRANT, JR.

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and dedicated service of Northwest Florida's beloved Jim Bruce Grant, Jr. Jim was a loving husband, father, grandfather, patriot, and friend, and his loss will be mourned by all those who knew him.

A native of Gulf Breeze, Florida, Jim showed tremendous leadership and service qualities, earning Eagle Scout honors during high school, and he built on this success when he answered the call of duty, joining the Florida Army National Guard in 1982. Jim also continued his education, earning multiple college and post-graduate degrees including both a Bachelor's of Science and an LL.M degree from the University of Florida, as well as a JD from the University of Alabama.

After a civilian break in service, Jim rejoined the Alabama Army National Guard in 2004, serving as a Staff Judge Advocate with 62nd Troop Command, Montgomery, Alabama. During Jim's time in the Alabama Army National Guard, he served three tours of duty in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. During his first two tours, in 2006 and 2010, Jim was assigned as a Military Intelligence Advisor in Afghanistan, while his final tour was served supporting Special Forces in Iraq as part of 1st Battalion, 20th Special Forces Group, Huntsville, Alabama. In total, Jim served our Nation for more than 16 years with honor and distinction, earning numerous awards including: two Meritorious Service Medals, two Army Commendation Medals, Army Combat Action Badge, Afghan Campaign Medal with the number 2, and the Iraq Campaign Medal.

In addition to his meritorious service as part of our Nation's Armed Forces, Jim also had a successful career as an attorney in the firm of Capell and Howard in Montgomery, Alabama, and he was a loving and devoted family man.

To some Jim Grant will be remembered as a patriot and veteran, to others as a first-class attorney committed to our constitutional justice system, to his family and friends he will be forever be remembered as a husband, father and grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize the life of Jim Bruce Grant, Jr. My wife Vicki and I extend our heartfelt prayers and condolences to his wife, Jennifer; daughters, Amanda and Alicen; grandson, George; sisters, Janie and Diane; and the entire Grant family.

RECOGNIZING DELBERT STEVENS FOR HIS HEROIC ACTIONS IN DEFENSE OF HIS COUNTRY DURING WORLD WAR II

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Delbert Stevens, a native of Altoona, for his heroic efforts and selfless service to his country in World War II. Mr. Stevens, who grew up in Huntingdon County, will be deservingly honored at the upcoming Altoona Memorial Day Parade. He joined the Marines in 1943 when he was 23. He fought for our nation at Iwo Jima, where American forces undertook a historically difficult mission to advance our position in the war. Though nearly 7,000 Americans perished and 20,000 more were wounded in the siege, Mr. Stevens survived the long battle.

Among the soldiers called upon to secure the island, Mr. Stevens, serving as a corporal in the 28th Marine Regiment, overcame some of the grisliest experiences of combat. In unwavering service to his country and fellow Marines, he contributed to a decisive victory that ultimately helped enable American victory in the Pacific in World War II.

It is my honor to recognize him, one of our nation's many heroes, for his courageous service to our country. I would also like to thank all the other men and women like him who unselfishly promote and defend the American cause so that the world may be a better place.

CONGRATULATING MACEDONIA MINISTRY BAPTIST CHURCH ON ITS 80TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church on the occasion of their 80th anniversary.

Macedonia Ministry Baptist Church has been described as being unique in the sense that many of the descendants of the founders and early leaders of the church are still active members today.

On May 9, 1935, a council of 16 men and women came together to organize a new Missionary Baptist church in the City of Flint. The first pastor was Rev. Joseph Mack. In the 1940's, Rev. Ira Watkins led the congregation into a building fund campaign for the building of a new church. In 1953, they moved from their original storefront dwelling to their new building at 1116 Hickory Street. Rev. Watkins passed away in October of 1960, after serving 20 years as pastor.

In December of 1960, the congregation elected Dr. J.C. Curry as its third pastor. Dr. J.C. Curry would become the church's longest serving pastor and was one of the original organizers of the Church-Security-in-Ministry initiative. After 41 years, Dr. Curry retired in 2001.

The fourth pastor was Rev. Alfred L. Harris who led the congregation from 2002 to 2011. In June 2012, Bishop Neal Roberson was named as the new pastor. Pastor Roberson was honored to accept the assignment, stating he was grateful for the opportunity.

For eight decades, the Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church has worked tirelessly to help those in the community most in need. Residents of the area have come to rely on the Macedonia Ministry Baptist Church for such blessings as food baskets given to the impoverished during the holidays, ministerial services offered to inmates of the Genesee County Jail, and the annual Free Food Give-Away.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the tenacity of the Macedonia Ministry Baptist Church and thank them for the service they have provided to the City of Flint and surrounding communities.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MR. FRED CURLS

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and to remember the late Mr. Fred Curls, a pioneer for civil and political rights and a resident of the Fifth District of Missouri, which I am honored to represent. On Friday, May 15, 2015, Mr. Curls passed away, after an incredible and inspiring ninety-six years of life.

The silhouette of Mr. Curls now joins the always growing shadow of little-celebrated Kansas Citians whose work will make a difference for generations as yet unborn. Young African-American elected officials may not realize that the very office they hold—or aspire to hold—is, in no small part, related to the political pioneering of Mr. Curls.

Mr. Curls was one of the original founders of Freedom Incorporated, an African-American political organization which at one time could generate nearly 70,000 votes and remains influential to this day. The organization was at the forefront in serving as a catalyst for change in civil rights, public accommodations, and the election of candidates at all levels of government. Freedom Inc.'s office has been visited by City Councilpersons, Jackson County Executives, Mayors, Missouri State Senators and Representatives, Governors, Congresspersons, Senators, Presidents, and those who have Presidential aspirations.

For more than fifty years, Mr. Curls dedicated his life to the Greater Kansas City community, promoting and improving political empowerment and the civil rights of people of color. The ripples of his efforts are felt in our community and around the country. His children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren have followed in his footsteps in acknowledging their responsibility of giving back to the community. His son, State Senator Phil B. Curls, Sr. was the President of Freedom Inc. during a period when it was recognized as one of the most potent political organizations in the United States and brought about the election of the first African-American Congressman from the Fifth District of Missouri, U.S. Representative Alan Wheat.

Since the mid-1950s, Fred Curls was involved in real estate sales and appraisals, most notably in the African-American community of Kansas City. He fought against "restrictive covenants" whereby residential homes could not be sold in certain areas to minorities. He was part of a class action lawsuit which resulted in the United States Supreme Court outlawing such covenants.

In all of his activities, Mr. Curls demonstrated his dedication and commitment to the greater good of others. He was actively involved with his high school graduating class, the Class of 1937, which remained close even in recent years. He was honored by Jackson County, Missouri, as one of its "Legacy Awardees" for its 175th anniversary as a political subdivision. He was also honored by fellow Missourian, U.S. Representative WILLIAM LACY CLAY of St. Louis and myself as an awardee of the "Missouri Walk of Fame" designation, as one of the pioneers of Kansas City's African-American political struggle.

Throughout his life, he believed in the saying "make it happen." He put his principles into practice, and the results of his efforts "made it happen" throughout the Kansas City metropolitan area.

For those reasons and more, it is indeed an honor and a privilege to honor and remember the life of Mr. Fred Curls. Mr. Speaker, please join me in expressing our sympathies to the family of Mr. Fred Curls, and our gratitude for his endless commitment to serving the residents of Kansas City and the State of Missouri. Whatever we, as African-Americans, may attain in the political arena, Fred Curls and those who labored to act on our behalf as political pioneers have helped to change the course of history. He was a true role model not just to the African-American community in Missouri, but to the entire community at large.

CONGRATULATING JEFF HERMANSEN FOR HIS BRAVE ACT OF HEROISM ON THE JOB

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jeff Hermansen for his heroic actions on May 5, 2015. Mr. Hermansen selflessly put himself in harm's way in order to save the life of another.

Jeff Hermansen, a UPS delivery driver, was following his usual route across the East State Street Bridge in Rockford, Illinois on Tuesday, May 5th when he noticed a man struggling in the Rock River. Without hesitating, Hermansen removed his shoes, swam into the unpredictable Rock River, and brought the stranger to safety.

Mr. Hermansen's selfless heroics are made even more impressive by his excellent character. Following the incident, he declined any special treatment and went about his delivery route.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hermansen's harrowing actions and admirable display of character are the true embodiment of a hero.

PATRICK MADDEN

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mr. Patrick Madden as a member of the United States Air Force Academy Class of 2015.

Patrick will graduate from the U.S. Air Force Academy as a Second Lieutenant in the United States Air Force on May 28, 2015.

His career in the service has just begun, but it is a testament to Patrick's unselfish devotion to the people of this great nation. The challenges will be many and the time, although it may seem like an eternity, will fly by almost unnoticed.

The challenge for this young man will be to retain as much as possible, pass on what he learns to others, and live life for every moment.

South Mississippi is proud of Patrick and his accomplishments, and we look forward to him continuing to represent not only Mississippi, but the entire nation, as a United States Air Force officer.

As Patrick embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may always recall with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment graduating from a program as prestigious as the Air Force Academy.

I would like to send Patrick my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors, thank him for his service, and congratulate him on this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF GREG COLLINS, RECIPIENT OF THE GREATER WILKES-BARRE SALVATION ARMY COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Greg Collins, who is receiving the Community Service Award from the Greater Wilkes-Barre Salvation Army.

Mr. Collins is the Area President for Wells Fargo's Northeast Pennsylvania market, which serves nine counties in northeast Pennsylvania. Prior to joining Wells Fargo in 1992, Mr. Collins was marketing manager for Bridon American Corporation.

A native of northeastern Pennsylvania, Mr. Collins' leadership and influence extends far beyond the workplace. He serves as a board member for several area organizations, including Misericordia University, the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Business and Industry, Leadership Wilkes-Barre, and the Northeastern Pennsylvania Council of the Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Collins is a Scranton Plan committee member as well as Chairman of the 2015 American Heart Association Gala for Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Collins is a 2010 graduate of Leadership Wilkes-Barre's Executive Leadership Program, as well as a 4th degree member of the Knights of Columbus. Earlier this year, he received the 2015 North Star Award from the Northeastern Pennsylvania Council of the Boy Scouts of America. This community service award recognizes individuals for their contributions and dedication on behalf of humanity and the promotion of health and wellness for all.

It is a distinct honor to honor Greg Collins on receiving the Greater Wilkes-Barre Salvation Army Community Service Award, and I commend him for the many years of dedicated service he provided to our local community. His work on behalf of others serves as an inspiration for all of us.

RECOGNIZING HUNTINGTON HIGH SCHOOL AND HUNTINGTON MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS FOR REPRESENTING WEST VIRGINIA IN THE 2015 SCIENCE OLYMPIAD NATIONAL TOURNAMENT

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a team of talented students from Huntington High School and Huntington Middle School in Huntington, West Virginia, for their participation in the 2015 Science Olympiad National Tournament at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln May 15–16. Their participation is a first for any school from West Virginia and is testament to the great accomplishments of West Virginia students in the subject areas of science, technology, engineering and math.

It is these students that are our future engineers, mathematicians, physicians, and if the results from this competition are any indication, our future is in great hands. I also want to recognize the teachers and other volunteers that made this event possible to attend for the students. The knowledge and passion they convey to the students is certainly reflected in the impressive work that they do.

In closing, I would like to list the names of those who represented the great state of West Virginia at the 2015 Science Olympiad National Tournament:

Science Olympiad team members from Huntington Middle School include: Team Coach Leann Haines, Tess Anderson, Beth Bell, Khaled El-Shazly, Allyson Ey, Elena Ferguson, Shylah Johnson, Phillip Murphy, Kayla Patrick, Rankin Payne, Sam Pittman, Clara Poling, Perin Schray, Isaac Sutherland, Megan Wolf, Demetrios Svingos, Cassidy Woodrum.

Science Olympiad team members from Huntington High School include: Team Coach William Strait, Adam Cordingley, Sarah Cordingley, Denise Dawley, Omar Salem, Abdullah Hijazi, Alicia Bird, Zach Perry, Triston Poston, Will Frazier, Kyle Grimes, John Holbrook, Phillip Murphy, Thad Taylor, Steven Richbart, Yazan Khader and Levi Parett.

IN HONOR OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM HUFF III

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a respected public servant and outstanding citizen, the Honorable William Huff III, Tax Commissioner of Talbot County, Georgia. Sadly, Mr. Huff passed away on Thursday, May 14, 2015. Funeral services to celebrate his life will be held on Tuesday, May 19, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. at the Central High School Gym in Talbotton, Georgia.

A life-long resident of Talbot County, Georgia, William Huff was born on November 11, 1945, the youngest of six children. After graduating from Ruth Carter High School in Talbotton in 1963, he enrolled in Fort Valley State University in Fort Valley, Georgia, where he became a member of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. and was recognized in Who's Who Among Colleges and Universities in 1966. He earned a Bachelor's degree in Social Sciences and a Master's degree in Guidance and Counseling.

Upon graduation, Mr. Huff returned to Talbot County and taught at Ruth Carter High School from 1968–1970. During this time, he also was a part-time car salesman at Meadows Motors in Manchester, Georgia.

In 1971, Mr. Huff was elected to the Talbot County Commission at the young age of 26, launching a career in public service that would span more than 40 years. Moreover, Mr. Huff's election to the Talbot County Commission earned him a place in history as the first African American elected to office in Talbot County as well as the youngest African-American County Commissioner in the state of Georgia. In 1988, he became the first African-American Tax Commissioner in Talbot County. Not one to rest on his laurels, Mr. Huff also was a trailblazer in the business community, becoming the first African-American Ford dealer in the state of Georgia in 1975.

Further demonstrating his enduring commitment to his community, Mr. Huff served on numerous boards, including the Talbot County Planning Commission; Upson Technical College; the Independent Farming Association; and the Ford Motor Association. He was appointed to the United States Selective Service System Board in 1998 and was also appointed to the Governor's Council on Aging by former Georgia Governor George Busbee.

Maya Angelou once said, "A great soul serves everyone all the time. A great soul never dies." William Huff is one such great soul, who served humanity in a special way. He devoted nearly four decades of dedicated service to the people of Talbot County through his meaningful contribution of energy, skill, and genuine passion. He was an honorable human being who loved deeply and, in return, was deeply loved. His impression on this earth extends beyond himself to the very wellbeing of Talbot County, and for it he will be remembered by the community for time to come.

On a personal note, Mr. Huff was a dear friend of longstanding. I have truly been blessed by his friendship, counsel and inspiration throughout the years.

William Huff is survived by his wife, Emma Jean; children, William Vincent, Reginald, and Jamie; eight wonderful grandchildren; and a host of other family members and friends.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 730,000 people of the Second Congressional District salute Commissioner William Huff for his dedicated service and exceptional impact on Talbot County, Georgia. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Mr. Huff's family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALMA S. ADAMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, if I was present during the end of yesterday's vote series, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 259 and "nay" on rollcall No. 260.

HONORING LAURA ELIZABETH ALLIAH PERKINS FOR ACHIEVING PERFECT ATTENDANCE WHILE ENROLLED IN THE BROWARD COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM FROM KINDERGARTEN THROUGH HER SENIOR YEAR

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to recognize Ms. Laura Elizabeth Alliah Perkins, a recent graduate of Mcfatter Technical High School. Laura was honored at the Broward County Public Schools fourth annual Best-in-Class and Perfect Attendance Awards ceremony on Thursday, May 7, 2015, and again on Tuesday, May 19, 2015 at the Broward County School Board Meeting.

The Best-in-Class Award is an accolade presented to students who have been continuously enrolled in Broward County Public Schools from kindergarten through 12th grade, who have perfect attendance. This is a remarkable achievement and it is an immense honor of mine to recognize Laura for her unwavering devotion to education.

Having never missed a single day of school for a total of 2,340 days is no small feat. Furthermore, in a show of appreciation, various community and business partners have joined together to provide Laura and fellow honorees with an assortment of gifts and supplies that will assist them as they continue their journey towards higher education.

Mr. Speaker. I once again want to commend Ms. Laura Elizabeth Alliah Perkins for her dedication and commitment to education. She is a shining example of student success. I wish her all the very best as she begins studying at the University of South Florida this fall, and know that she will make her community and the state of Florida proud.

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL JACOBS

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep sadness to pay tribute to a remarkable person, Rachel Jacobs, who was among those who tragically lost their lives in the Amtrak accident in Philadelphia last week. Rachel was the eldest daughter of my close friends, Gilda and John Jacobs, was the wife of Todd Waldman, and a loving mother to her young son, Jacob.

The accident has been devastating for those who knew and loved Rachel Jacobs, and for

the families of the other people who were killed or injured. Those families deserve to know exactly how this horrific accident happened and to have confidence that it will never be repeated. They also deserve to know that those who bear responsibility for this tragedy are also held accountable. I will insist on answers, solutions, and accountability, and I trust that my colleagues will join me.

At her funeral service in Michigan on Monday, I and others had a chance to hear firsthand just how deeply Rachel had touched the lives of so many. There were common themes among those who spoke at the service and in several of the stories written about her in the media since the accident. She was a dedicated friend, always going out of her way to be there for those she was close to. At the service we heard about how during Hurricane Sandy, when Rachel was 40 weeks pregnant and coping without electrical power, she went to the hospital to support a friend who was giving birth. Rachel took great joy in her family, as a wife and partner to Todd and as a mother to Jacob. She was a leader and a team builder who inspired her colleagues at ApprenNet, the education technology startup where she served as CEO. And she was incredibly smart, passionate and committed to social justice. As one of her friends told the Detroit Jewish News, ". . . she lit so many sparks. She was a visionary and a mobilizer. I'm amazed at how much she managed to fit into her 39 years."

Rachel was known not only for her vision, but as the speakers at the service stressed, for her willingness to do the hard work necessary to bring her ideas to life. Detroit Nation might be the most vivid example of this. Rachel and friends in New York who had grown up in the Detroit area talked about creating a way for Detroit area natives who now live elsewhere to stay connected to their hometown and to participate in its revitalization. Rachel took this idea, sparked by a discussion among friends at a Passover Seder, and founded Detroit Nation—a nonprofit organization which now has more than 7,000 members in Metro Detroit and throughout the country. Detroit Nation creates connections between former Detroiters with expertise in a variety of areas and entrepreneurs and nonprofit organizations in Detroit who can benefit from that expertise, while also promoting the energy and innovation taking place in Detroit to people in cities throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, Rachel Jacobs' mother, Gilda, perfectly described Rachel's most vital trait when she told the Detroit Jewish News that her daughter ". . . connected with the world." This ability—to connect with the world and to create connections between other people to work together for a common good—has made a difference in the lives of many. May we all be inspired by Rachel, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in extending the deepest condolences to Rachel's husband, Todd Waldman and their son Jacob; to her parents, Gilda and John Jacobs; to her sister Jessica Steinhardt; and to all of Rachel's family, friends, and colleagues.

IN HONOR OF MURRAY J. PENDLETON, CHIEF OF POLICE OF WATERFORD, CT POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Chief Murray J. Pendleton of Waterford, Connecticut upon his retirement from the Waterford Police Department.

For 48 years, Mr. Pendleton has been a committed and active officer of the Waterford Police Department, serving for the past 23 as Chief of Police. Chief Pendleton has steadfastly focused on the security of citizens in Waterford, and he is known in particular for his devotion to improving traffic safety programs. Thanks to his tenacity and devotion, his tenure as Chief in Waterford has been recognized nationally and has left a lasting impact on the community.

Chief Pendleton's impressive law enforcement career started in the United States Air Force as an Air Force Police Officer in 1962. In 1967, he joined the Waterford Police Department, serving in multiple specialized roles until his promotion to Deputy Chief in 1984, and Chief in 1991.

Chief Pendleton has served as a valued resource to my office throughout my time in Congress, and his absence will be felt in eastern Connecticut. Chief Pendleton was not just a leader in Waterford and its outstanding department, but in the entire state, advocating for safe roads and highways, regionalizing first responders and resources, and making police and fire communications interoperable. Any time I had a question, he always made himself available in person or on the phone and his responses were always direct and honest with no sugarcoating.

Please join me in congratulating Chief Murray Pendleton on a lifetime of service to his community, and wishing him a rewarding, and well-deserved retirement.

DEDICATION OF THE LGBT MONUMENT IN ABRAHAM LINCOLN NATIONAL CEMETERY

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Chicago Chapter of American Veterans for Equal Rights, which will dedicate a monument for LGBT Veterans in Abraham Lincoln National Cemetery in Elmwood, IL on May 25, 2015. This is an historic day, as this is the first federally-approved monument honoring LGBT veterans to be dedicated in a National Cemetery in the United States.

It is fitting that this monument is located in the Abraham Lincoln National Cemetery. President Lincoln was not only our 16th President and from the great state of Illinois, but he was also the founder of the National Cemetery system. His Gettysburg Address of 1863 became a model of the principles of nationalism, republicanism, equal rights, liberty, and democracy.

I am grateful for the efforts of the American Veterans for Equal Rights (AVER) and their continued commitment and dedication to equal rights and equitable treatment for all present and former members of the United States Armed Forces.

Thanks to Stanley J. Jenczyk and his colleagues with the Chicago Chapter of AVER, the LGBT veteran community will have a lasting tribute honoring their achievements and sacrifices. This monument recognizes the innumerable accomplishments of our military and forever commemorates their endeavors as servants of our great nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this significant dedication with the Chicago Chapter of American Veterans for Equal Rights. I am honored to have such an exceptional organization in my district.

CONGRATULATING MILLEDGEVILLE'S TRIUMPH AEROSTRUCTURES-VOUGH AIRCRAFT DIVISION

HON. JODY B. HICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud Milledgeville's Triumph Aerostructures-Vought Aircraft Division, an exceptional manufacturer located in Baldwin County, Georgia that was recognized as the 2015 "Large Manufacturer of the Year" by the Georgia Department of Economic Development.

Today, I praise Triumph for their global vision, their commitment to job creation, and for their extensive economic contribution throughout Middle Georgia. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Triumph is more than a manufacturing company but also a place of business integrity and workforce excellence. And I am honored to have a business like Triumph in my home district.

Mr. Speaker, Triumph is not only dedicated to business excellence but also determined to building a network of community leaders throughout their organization. Triumph's management established a tuition reimbursement program for its employees looking to further their education while dedicating countless volunteer hours to United Way, Relay For Life, and the American Red Cross.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I congratulate Triumph on their outstanding economic and leadership achievements, and I look forward to their future endeavors in the 10th district of Georgia.

HONORING MARTHA HERM FOR HER WORK WITH THE CENTER FOR PREVENTION OF ABUSE

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Martha Herm for the more than two decades she spent as the Executive Director of the Center for Prevention of Abuse in Peoria, Illinois.

Annually, the Center provides assistance to more than 5,000 victims of domestic, sexual and elder abuse in addition to providing prevention education to children, teens and adults across Central Illinois.

On top of her decades of leadership with the Center, Martha has served her community through other leadership roles with the Coalition Against Domestic Violence and the Illinois Certified Domestic Violence Professionals Board. As so many can attest to, Martha has been a true asset to the Peoria area.

Mr. Speaker, Martha has spent her life dedicated to serving her community and the state of Illinois, and we are very gracious for all she has done. I wish her all the best going forward.

RECOGNIZING HOLY CROSS LUTHERAN CHURCH ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Holy Cross Lutheran Church of St. Cloud, Minnesota, for their 125th anniversary.

In 1890, Holy Cross Lutheran Church opened its doors. The congregation worshipped near the St. Cloud State University campus until they outgrew their facilities and in 1996 relocated to Clearwater Road.

For 125 years, generations of central Minnesotans have gathered together to worship under this church's roof. Today, more than 1,000 people celebrate their faith and love of Christ in this vibrant and growing faith community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this body join me in congratulating Holy Cross Lutheran Church on their anniversary. May they have many more fruitful years to come.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROJECT HEAD START

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H. Res. 92 and the Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, it is with great pride and deep appreciation for the opportunities this great nation affords to its citizens that I rise to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Project Head Start, one of the signal achievements of the Great Society and boldest initiatives launched by the nation in the War on Poverty.

Launched in the White House Rose Garden on May 18, 1965, by President Lyndon Baines Johnson, the aim of Project Head Start was bold and audacious in its scope and design.

As President Johnson stated in announcing the opening of a new front in the War on Poverty with the launch of Project Head Start:

''We set out to make certain that poverty's children would not be forevermore poverty's captives. . . .

''This means that nearly half the preschool children of poverty will get a head start on their future. . . .

''These children will receive preschool training to prepare them for regular school in September. . . .

''They will get medical and dental attention that they badly need, and parents will receive counseling on improving the home environment.''

Conceived as an eight-week summer program designed to provide pre-school training not just to prepare 5 and 6 year-olds to enter regular school the following September, but also to give nearly half the preschool children living in poverty ''a head start on their future.''

At its launch, the Head Start Program, administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity and wonderfully and skillfully led by its Director, Sargent Shriver, consisted of 2,500 projects, covering 11,000 Child Development Centers, serving about 530,000 poor children in every state of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson recognized that the bleak future waiting for children trapped in poverty was not a phenomenon concentrated in the inner-cities of the large urban cities of the North but could be found in every region in every state in the nation.

That is why the Head Start Program was launched not as a mere demonstration project limited to a handful of counties, but as a program national in scope serving every city, suburb, and rural area in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Head Start Program provided pre-school training to prepare poor children to enter regular school and help put them on an even footing with their classmates as they entered school.

But it also had an even higher aim and loftier purpose, and that was to assist children prepare for the challenges they will face in life and to combat poverty's great weapons—hunger and malnutrition; illness and poor health; ignorance and cultural deprivation.

Project Head Start was from the start a national undertaking, utilizing the services of 41,000 professionals, including teachers, doctors, dentists, nurses, nutritionists, employing more than 47,000 persons, who were assisted by more than 500,000 volunteers.

Based on its initial success as a summer program, the following year, in 1966, Head Start was funded as a primarily part day, 9 month program, largely through existing community action programs.

In later years, the Head Start Program would be expanded to serve children with disabilities, Native Americans, homeless children, and to provide bilingual and bicultural migrant and seasonal programs serving 6,000 children in 21 states.

Today, the Head Start Program serves nearly a million poor children, including: 160,829 enrolled in Early Head Start for 3-year olds; 910,833 enrolled in Head Start; 20,627 American Indian/Alaska Native children enrolled in Head Start; 4,722 American Indian/Alaska Native children enrolled in Early Head Start; 32,082 children of migrant or seasonal workers enrolled in Head Start; and 40,853 homeless children enrolled in Head Start.

Additionally, the Head Start Program serves 136,120 children with disabilities, 15,632 pregnant women, and provides services to 771,840 families.

In my home state of Texas, the Head Start Program serves 661,000 poor children under the age of 5, including 2,471 homeless children, 8,370 children with disabilities, and provides services to 53,333 families.

And in my home city of Houston, a remarkable organization called AVANCE has been serving the needs of low-income children and families since its founding in 1973.

AVANCE offers Head Start, Early Head Start, Parenting, Healthy Marriage, Fatherhood, and other programs designed to prepare and help low-income children, students, and families reach their potential.

Mr. Speaker, not only has the Head Start Program been a great benefit to its direct beneficiaries, it has provided substantial economic and social benefits to the nation as a whole.

Research studies have shown that for each dollar invested, the Head Start program yields a rate of return on investment (ROI) of 7–9 percent and the program is responsible for the direct creation of 236,591 jobs, with an average annual salary of about $31,000 for Head Start teachers with baccalaureate degrees.

Mr. Speaker, another societal benefit of the Head Start Program is the improved health of the children and families it serves.

Research has shown that the mortality rates for 5–9 year-old children who had attended Head Start are 33–50% lower than the rates for comparable children not enrolled in Head Start.

Moreover, Head Start children are less likely to fall victim to childhood obesity and are at least 8% more likely to have had their immunizations than children who did not attend preschool.

Mr. Speaker, the Head Start Program has been an unqualified success for the more than 31 million children and parents it has served since its inception in 1965.

And so it is that we can look back with pride on the 50 year record of this bold and innovative program.

But we cannot yet be satisfied because our work is not done and will not be done until every eligible child is afforded the opportunity to get a head start in life the program provides.

Today, only 42 percent of eligible low-income preschoolers are actually served by Head Start and less than 4 percent are in Early Head Start.

But we should not let the fact that we have more work to do to strengthen the Head Start Program detract from the joy and happiness we are justified in deriving from its half century of success and its vindication of our optimistic belief in the capacity of Americans to solve pressing national problems when people of goodwill work together in the spirit of cooperation rather than conflict.

The record of the Head Start Program shows that it can be done and that President Johnson was right—the Head Start Program was and is ''one of the most constructive, and one of the most sensible, and also one of the most exciting programs that this Nation has ever undertaken.''

And its reward for this bold act is the collective service and contributions to the betterment of society made by the 31 million children that have been served by the program over the past 50 years.

I thank the 100 colleagues who co-sponsored H. Res. 92, and especially the 65 members who joined me as original cosponsors of the resolution.

I also wish to express my thanks and appreciation to Chelsea Ukoha and Gregory Berry of my staff for their exceptional efforts and work on this wonderful tribute to a program that has contributed so much to the richness and vitality of our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on H.R. 1191 (Roll Call Vote 118), the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 on May 15, 2015. I would like to reflect that if I had the opportunity to vote on H.R. 1191, I would have voted Aye.

I strongly support the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 and I believe we are at a critical point where Congress must be afforded the opportunity to review any deal with Iran. Although I support the ongoing negotiations of the Iran Nuclear Framework, I strongly believe the United States must ensure Iran is denied any opportunities to further pursue its nuclear ambitions. It is critical that the final deal require a comprehensive inspection and verification vehicle, including the right to ''anytime, anywhere'' inspections. Iran must also remove all its enriched uranium and comply with six United Nations Security Council resolutions to reveal the extent of its prior nuclear work. Most importantly, I believe we must exercise extreme caution before lifting any existing sanctions. Iran must demonstrate compliance with the deal before any sanctions are lifted. Furthermore, the United States must have a structure in place to immediately re-impose these sanctions if Iran is found violating any terms of the agreement.

Iran's nuclear program remains a threat to the international community. A nuclear-armed Iran would pose enormous challenges to the national security of the United States and our allies including Israel. Signing a final deal will only be the first step—the United States and the international community must continue to work together to provide the necessary oversight in order to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

INTRODUCTION OF FIREARM RISK PROTECTION ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Firearm Risk Protection Act, innovative legislation to promote safe gun ownership.

Too often, our communities are left looking for answers after horrific tragedies inflicted with dangerous firearms. A requirement to carry liability insurance is a market-based solution that would hold gun owners responsible for the risk their firearms present, and create incentives for responsible gun safety practices.

The Firearm Risk Protection Act would harness the power of insurance markets to allow professional actuaries to determine the risk presented by each gun and gun owner. Just as with car insurance, higher-risk owners of firearms would face higher premiums, while responsible owners could qualify for reduced rates.

As gun violence continues to inflict scars on American families and our communities, Congress should look for new ways to promote gun safety and prevent future tragedies. I hope my colleagues will join me to support this forward-thinking legislation.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL R. MARTIN UMBARGER

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Hoosier and American, Major General R. Martin Umbarger, the Adjutant General of Indiana. Major General Umbarger is retiring after eleven years as the leader of the Indiana Army and Air National Guard, the Indiana Guard Reserve and support staff totaling more than 15,800 personnel.

Major General Umbarger began his career as an enlisted soldier for the Indiana Army National Guard in 1969. He was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant after graduating from the Indiana Military Academy as a distinguished military graduate. He has served as the Deputy Commanding General for the Reserve Component in the U.S. Army Forces Command, Assistant Division Commander for Training for the 38th Infantry Division, and as Commanding General of the 76th Infantry Brigade.

Major General Umbarger earned a Bachelor of Science Degree in business from the University of Evansville and attended the United States Command and General Staff College and United States Army War College. Major General Umbarger has directed the pre-mobilized training, deployment and redeployment of most of the Indiana Army and Air National Guard in support of the Global War on Terrorism. He has served as a member of the Secretary of the Army's Reserve Forces Policy Committee and currently serves on the Secretary of Defense's Reserve Forces Policy Board.

As Secretary of State, I had the privilege of working with Major General Umbarger to protect Hoosiers serving in the military, both out-of-state and overseas, by promoting and improving absentee voting processes. Major General Umbarger recognized the importance of ensuring that those fighting for our freedom had the opportunity to vote for those sending them into harm's way. He truly values the rights of the men and women under his command, and they know it.

As Indiana's Fourth District Representative, I have also worked with Major General Umbarger on legislation which would study the structure of our military and how reserve components can be best utilized.

Major General Umbarger is one of the most accomplished adjutant generals in the country and a valuable leader in Indiana. He has led the Indiana National Guard and served our state and nation with integrity and distinction over his 45 year career in the Armed Forces. I wish him and his family the best of luck as they prepare for the next chapter of their lives.

THANKING MS. SHARON ANN PORTER FOR HER SERVICE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to thank Ms. Sharon Ann Porter for her more than fifteen years of outstanding service to the House of Representatives, in a number of administrative and support roles.

Ms. Porter began her career in the House in February 2000 as the Data Entry Specialist under the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). Eager to learn and help carry out other duties, Ms. Porter was promoted to Financial Counselor in February 2001. As Financial Counselor she was responsible for the processing of payments as well as reimbursements requested by House offices, including Member, Committee, and Leadership offices. Ms. Porter worked diligently in all her roles, processing a large volume of payments on a daily basis, as well as forming long-lasting friendships with her customers and co-workers.

Additionally, Ms. Porter has offered her expertise during each House Service Fair, by volunteering extra time to assist with disseminating valuable information to House employees and customers. She was also instrumental in the transition to the new digital document management and electronic voucher submission known as E-Voucher, which streamlines services to House offices.

Ms. Porter's work ethic, diligence, and dedication have made her an invaluable asset to the CAO organization. She has consistently provided excellent customer service to Members and staff. Her outgoing personality, positive attitude, and sense of humor have endeared her to many colleagues and friends.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Ms. Sharon Ann Porter and I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking her for her distinguished service to the House of Representatives as well as the nation it serves. I wish Ms. Porter and her family all the best as she begins this new chapter in her life.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

SPEECH OF

HON. TULSI GABBARD

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 2015

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to be held on June 7, 2015, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

This annual celebration honors King Kamehameha I who established a unified Kingdom

of Hawai'i in 1810. King Kamehameha Day was celebrated first on June 11, 1872, and has been a Hawai'i State holiday since 1959. In 1970, the celebration of King Kamehameha's birthday in our nation's capital opened the rich history and culture of Hawai'i to more Americans.

In 1758, with the birth of Kamehameha, a prophecy foretelling that a great leader would be born and unite the islands of Hawai'i was fulfilled. Born into royal families from the islands of Hawai'i and Maui, Kamehameha's mentoring started at a young age. He learned religion, oral history, culture, economics, governance, navigation, warfare, and other fields of knowledge necessary to build a nation.

Kamehameha rose to power through political astuteness and superior forces. He was a visionary leader with a strategic mind, dominating presence, and persuasive personality. Kamehameha developed relationships with other royal families, built coalitions and sought the counsel of those steeped in modern warfare. By 1790, Kamehameha's modernized armed forces equipped with cannons and firearms and use of psychological warfare to undermine the spirits of opposing forces led to one successful military campaign after another.

While uniting the islands of Hawai'i, Kamehameha contemplated on the future of the Kingdom of Hawai'i and reasoned that for a nation to be vibrant, its citizens must feel safe and secure. Kamehameha reflected on a military encounter with fishermen gathering food from the ocean for their families. As Kamehameha gave chase to the fishermen, his leg got caught among the shoreline rocks. One of the fishermen hit him on the head with a paddle that broke into splinters. The fisherman spared Kamehameha's life.

Later, the fisherman was brought before Kamehameha. In his wisdom, Kamehameha ruled that the fisherman was innocent. The fisherman was protecting his family and land from an aggressor who could have done them harm. From that experience, Kamehameha embraced the inalienable rights of all men and women by proclaiming the Law of the Splintered Paddle (Kānāwai Māmala Hoe), the law of the land. The law stated, "Let every elderly person, woman, and child lie by the roadside in safety." The Law of the Splintered Paddle sets the moral tone to do no harm to fellow human beings, take personal responsibility and think before committing an act of violence. It is fitting that the words of the Law of the Splintered Paddle are enshrined in the Hawai'i State Constitution. Its values have become a model for human rights law regarding the treatment of civilians and other non-combatants.

Kamehameha knew that in order to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of his people, it was imperative to create economic opportunities. Kamehameha invested resources to maintain viable fishponds and taro patches; protect fresh water streams, fertile soils, and forest lands; build schools and train a new generation of leaders. Kamehameha also bore witness to rapid unfolding events occurring since the arrival of Captain James Cook in 1778. Kamehameha knew that it was the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the Native Hawai'ian people, and he made wise decisions to prepare his people for the future.

In closing, I would like to extend my appreciation to the staff of the Committee on House Administration, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Office of Sergeant at Arms who have helped make this annual birthday celebration for King Kamehameha I a success.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SCAN CONTAINERS ABSOLUTELY NOW (SCAN) ACT

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, after the tragic attacks on 9/11, Congress strengthened aviation security, which was the nature of the attacks against our country. While our aviation system is more secure—13 years later—we have not secured our nation's ports. Our ports are vulnerable to attacks.

I represent the Port of Los Angeles and the communities that surround the port; I have the personal responsibility of keeping the people of my district safe.

Top security experts recommend that shipping containers entering our nation's ports be scanned for radiological and nuclear materials and other potentially dangerous cargo. In addition, Congress passed laws requiring that 100 percent of all cargo be scanned by 2012. Today, three years after the deadline, we are scanning only 3 percent of incoming cargo.

I firmly believe that responding to ongoing terrorist threats and the risk of nuclear proliferation should remain top national security priorities.

The detonation of a nuclear device or "dirty bomb" at a port such as the Port of Los Angeles could cause a staggering loss of life. In addition, it could result in a West Coast or nationwide shutdown of all ports, which would cost the United States economy billions of dollars each day. The economic impact of port closure on supply chains was clearly demonstrated in 2002 when port workers were locked out for 8 days at the West Coast Ports. That cost $1 billion per day.

For these reasons, I am re-introducing the Scan Containers Absolutely Now (SCAN) Act. This bill would create a one-year pilot program at two United States ports to evaluate the process of 100 percent scanning of cargo containers and its potential use at all domestic ports.

I previously introduced this in the 113th Congress. This reintroduction includes several improvements to give ports who wish to apply, more flexibility on the management of the security systems.

We must take our responsibility to protect the nation seriously. We cannot allow inconvenience or shortsighted economic expediency to get in the way of keeping our nation's ports and citizens safe.

RESTORING EDUCATION AND LEARNING (REAL) ACT

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Restoring Education and Learning (REAL) Act, legislation that will curb our nation's high incarceration rate through the avenue of education.

Joined by Reps. DAVIS, LEE, SCOTT, DELAURO and RICHMOND, our legislation will reinstate Pell Grant eligibility to federal and state prisoners, which was allowed from 1972–1995. A provision in the 1994 omnibus crime bill amended the 1965 Higher Education Act and reversed this rehabilitating and well invested policy.

Back then, 350 postsecondary prison programs in 37 states existed across the nation for incarcerated individuals. That ability to gain post-secondary education has been drastically reduced to about a dozen today. Subsequently, our state and federal population has increased by nearly 50 percent from 1 million to 1.5 million today.

According to a recent Vera Institute study, it costs American taxpayers roughly $31,000 a year to house an inmate. In my home state of Maryland, it costs taxpayers more than $38,000 a year to house an inmate. Overall, our nation spends roughly $40 billion a year on correctional facilities.

This comes despite a recent report by the RAND Corporation, which found that for every $1 investment in prison education programs there is a $4–5 dollar reduction in incarceration costs during the first three years post-release of a prisoner.

Earlier this month, I visited the Maryland Correctional Institution in Jessup as an observer of Goucher College's Prison Education Partnership. I was inspired as I sat down with incarcerated men and women taking college courses and asking for the opportunity to better serve society once they are released.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor this important and much needed piece of legislation.

SAVANNAH STAFFORD

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Ms. Savannah Stafford as a member of the United States Naval Academy Class of 2015.

Savannah graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy with a degree in Oceanography, and her service assignment is Surface Warfare. She received a commission as an Ensign in the United States Navy on May 22, 2015.

Her career in the service has just begun, but it is a testament to Savannah's unselfish devotion to the people of this great nation. The challenges will be many and the time, although it may seem like an eternity, will fly by almost unnoticed.

The challenge for this young woman will be to retain as much as possible, pass on what she learns to others, and live life for every moment.

South Mississippi is proud of Savannah and her accomplishments, and we look forward to her continuing to represent not only Mississippi, but the entire nation, as a United States Navy officer.

As Savannah embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that she may always recall with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment graduating from a program as prestigious as the Naval Academy.

I would like to send Savannah my best wishes for continued success in her future endeavors, thank her for her service, and congratulate her on this momentous occasion.

APPLAUDING MIKE WHITE FOR HIS BRAVE ACT OF HEROISM ON THE JOB

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mike White for the brave act of heroism he displayed while on the job this past November of 2014.

Mike works as a United States Postal Service mail carrier in the Peoria, Illinois branch.

This past November, Mike was going about his regular route when he noticed a woman on her front porch having a severe asthma attack. Mike tried to get her an inhaler and called 911 then did all he could to comfort the woman and care for her child while they waited for the ambulance to arrive. Thanks to his help, after a week of being hospitalized, the woman returned home in good health.

On his next delivery to her home following the incident, the woman Mike aided ran over and gave him a hug, thanking him for all he had done to help her.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mike White and his willingness to go beyond the line of duty to help an individual in need. I thank Mike again for his service to our community.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF GASTON FRANCIS PERIAT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, dear friend and extraordinary American, Gaston Francis Periat. Gaston was born in San Francisco, California on September 19, 1922, and died peacefully in Santa Cruz, California, on December 11, 2013, at the age of 91.

Gaston was raised in San Mateo and graduated from San Mateo High School. He worked in his family's Chrysler-Plymouth-Dodge dealership, Periat & Sons, until World War II, when he entered the Army. Gaston was taught to speak French by his Swiss grandmother, and he spent much of the war in France where he acted as a liaison between the U.S. Army and French businesses. In February 1944, Gaston married Margaret (Peggy), and in 1946 the couple settled in San Mateo and began their family.

In 1970, Gaston and Peggy moved to Pescadero where Gaston enjoyed riding the trails on his horse Yuckabuck. After selling the family business in San Mateo, the family moved to Gilroy, where Gaston bought Gavilan Chrysler-Plymouth-Dodge. Upon his retirement, he returned to Pescadero where he served on the Pescadero Municipal Advisory Committee. During his final years, Gaston lived in the retirement community of Dominican Oaks in Santa Cruz.

Gaston Periat was a golfer, a story teller, a member of the Elks Club, a Rotarian and a friend to an extraordinary number of people. He was helpful to all in need and had the ability to make every person feel special. I was privileged to work with Gaston Periat during my time on the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors. He was unfailingly polite, concerned, professional and prepared, and we continued to work together during my tenure in Congress. He was a great and good man who made extensive contributions to our community and he will always be missed by those who had the good fortune to know him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in extending our condolences to Gaston Periat's wife of 69 years, Peggy, and to his daughter, Judy Periat; son Dan Periat and his wife, Andrea Periat; son Ken Periat and his wife, Kimberly Periat; daughter Janet Periat and her husband, Frank Higgins; granddaughter Adriana Goericke and her husband, Jan Goericke, and great-granddaughter Mia Goericke; granddaughter Camile Steinmetz and her husband, Carl Steinmetz, and great-granddaughter Lola Steinmetz; granddaughters Renee Periat and Nadine Periat; grandson Aaron Periat and his wife, Kim Periat, and great-grandson Maximus Periat.

May our tribute to Gaston, as well as our thoughts and prayers be a source of strength and comfort to his entire family. Our community and our country were made stronger and better by Gaston Periat.

HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL CHARLES 'CHICK' CLEVELAND

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant General Charles 'Chick' Cleveland, one of our country's great fighter pilots, an American hero, and a community leader in Montgomery, Alabama.

Lieutenant General Charles Cleveland was born in Honolulu, Hawaii in 1927 and was appointed for service at the U.S. Military Academy in West Point, New York. After graduating in 1949, he began his service in what was then the Army Air Corps, eventually transitioning into service with the U.S. Air Force and serving overseas during the Korean War. Later, Gen. Cleveland earned his master's degree in political science from Xavier University in Cincinnati, and completed the advanced management program at Harvard University in 1969.

In his more than 35 years of service, General Cleveland logged more than 4300 flying hours in military aircraft, including the F–86 Sabre. General Cleveland demonstrated a rarely-matched level of combat expertise, becoming one of our country's distinguished fighter aces. General Cleveland was credited with shooting down five enemy MiG–15 aircraft in Korea, officially earning the designation as an 'ace.'

General Cleveland went on to a distinguished career in the United States Air Force, holding several command positions including Commander of Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base in my hometown of Montgomery, Alabama.

Yesterday, the Congress awarded General Cleveland and all of the American Fighter Aces with the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest honor bestowed by Congress. I was honored to host General Cleveland in my office prior to the ceremony. My staff and I were privileged to spend time with this American hero and hear stories from his distinguished military service.

But General Cleveland's public service did not end with his retirement from military duty.

Since his retirement, General Cleveland has continued to devote countless hours to efforts to better his community, state, and country. After making Montgomery his family's home, he served as Director of the United Way, and led the Montgomery Area Food Bank. In 1989, he was chosen as Commissioner of the Alabama Department of Health and Human Services, serving through 1992.

Most recently, his 17 years of service as the President of the Alabama World Affairs Council helped transform the institute into the largest organization of its kind in the South.

The Alabama World Affairs Council is a fine organization which seeks to promote public awareness and understanding of international affairs as they relate to the political, economic, cultural, and military interests of the United States. The Alabama council is a member of the World Affairs Councils of America and is one of some 96 councils nationwide. Though General Cleveland is retiring from his position, he leaves an undeniable mark on the organization and its members who have benefited from his service.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Lieutenant General Cleveland—a distinguished fighter pilot, a public servant, a community leader, and an American hero. He has truly set an example for future generations of Americans to come, and it is my great honor to represent him here in Congress.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF DAVID BRUCE GOLDBERG

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to David Bruce Goldberg, who was born in Minnesota on October 2, 1967, and died tragically at age 47, on May 1, 2015, in Mexico. I had the privilege of representing him as a constituent residing in Menlo Park, California.

Dave graduated from the Blake School in Minneapolis and earned a BA degree, magna cum laude, from Harvard University. After graduating from college, Dave worked for Bain and Company and Capitol Records. In 1994, he founded Launch Media which was later acquired by Yahoo in 2001. In 2007 he joined Benchmark Capital, and in 2009, joined SurveyMonkey, where he was CEO at the time of his death.

Dave Goldberg was a successful entrepreneur, venture capitalist, and technology and music industry executive. He ran several online consumer businesses, and served as a director of many companies and organizations, but he was far more than the sum of his great professional success. Dave has been praised as warm, humble and kind, and described as a genius, a leader and a man of courage. He

was a sports fan, was passionate about education and children, and was lovingly described as a cross between a teddy bear and a tiger.

I've had the pleasure and privilege to work with Dave's wife, Sheryl Sandberg and the following are her poignant words expressed on the day of his funeral. They speak volumes about the goodness and greatness of this extraordinary man:

''I want to thank all of our friends and family for the outpouring of love over the past few days. It has been extraordinary—and each story you have shared will help keep Dave alive in our hearts and memories.

I met Dave nearly 20 years ago when I first moved to LA. He became my best friend. He showed me the internet for the first time, planned fun outings, took me to temple for the Jewish holidays, introduced me to much cooler music than I had ever heard.''

''We had 11 truly joyful years of the deepest love, happiest marriage, and truest partnership that I could imagine . . . He gave me the experience of being deeply understood, truly supported and completely and utterly loved—and I will carry that with me always. Most importantly, he gave me the two most amazing children in the world.''

''Dave was my rock. When I got upset, he stayed calm. When I was worried, he said it would be ok. When I wasn't sure what to do, he figured it out. He was completely dedicated to his children in every way—and their strength these past few days is the best sign I could have that Dave is still here with us in spirit.''

''Dave and I did not get nearly enough time together. But as heartbroken as I am today, I am equally grateful. Even in these last few days of completely unexpected hell—the darkest and saddest moments of my life—I know how lucky I have been. If the day I walked down that aisle with Dave someone had told me that this would happen—that he would be taken from us all in just 11 years—I would still have walked down that aisle. Because 11 years of being Dave Goldberg's wife, and 10 years of being a parent with him is perhaps more luck and more happiness than I could have ever imagined. I am grateful for every minute we had.''

''As we put the love of my life to rest today, we buried only his body. His spirit, his soul, his amazing ability to give is still with us. It lives on in the stories people are sharing of how he touched their lives, in the love that is visible in the eyes of our family and friends, in the spirit and resilience of our children. Things will never be the same—but the world is better for the years my beloved husband lived.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in extending our deepest condolences to Dave's wife Sheryl Sandberg, to their children, his mother, brother and entire family and many friends. As President Obama said in his message of condolence, ''His skills as an entrepreneur created opportunity for many, his love for his family was a joy to behold, and his example as a husband and father was something we could all learn from. We're heartbroken by him leaving us far too soon, but we celebrate a remarkable legacy.''

Our community, our country and our world are stronger and better because of the life and work of Dave Goldberg. May this tribute and the thoughts and prayers of countless others be a source of comfort and strength to his beloved Sheryl, their children and all the family.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL R. MARTIN UMBARGER

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Major General R. Martin Umbarger and wish him well upon his retirement from the Indiana National Guard. Since his initial appointment on March 11, 2004, Major General Umbarger has undertaken great responsibility as Adjutant General of Indiana, commanding the Indiana Army and Air National Guard and the Indiana Guard Reserve, as well as more than 15,800 state employees. In recognition of his outstanding accomplishments and distinguished career, a retirement reception in his honor will be held on Saturday, May 30, 2015, at JW Marriott in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Major General Umbarger began his remarkable military career with the Indiana Army National Guard in 1969. Upon graduating from the Indiana Military Academy in June 1971, where he earned the Distinguished Graduate Erickson Trophy, Major General Umbarger was commissioned as a second lieutenant, infantry branch. Prior to his present position, he served as deputy commanding general for the reserve component, United States Forces Command. Other significant assignments include the assistant division commander for training, 38th Infantry Division (Mechanized), and commanding general of the 76th Infantry Brigade (Separate).

Major General Umbarger is also a graduate of the University of Evansville, where he earned a Bachelor of Science degree in business. He also completed studies at the United States Command and General Staff College, as well as the United States Army War College.

A testament to his commitment to his duties, Major General Umbarger has been honored with many prestigious awards and accolades. He is the recipient of the Legion of Merit (2nd Award), the Meritorious Service Medal (Oak Leaf Cluster), the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal (7th Award), the National Defense Service Medal, the Armed Forces Reserve Medal (with one hourglass device), the Army Service Ribbon, the Army Reserve Components Service Ribbon, the Army Reserve Components Overseas Training Ribbon, the Army Staff Identification Badge, the Indiana Long Service Medal, the Indiana Emergency Service Medal, and the Indiana Distinguished Service Medal (Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster). In 2007, Major General Umbarger was also presented the Distinguished Alumnus Award from his alma mater, the University of Evansville.

Major General Umbarger has also exhibited his extraordinary leadership abilities in serving as a member of the Reserve Forces Policy Board and the National Guard Association of the United States, which he chaired from 2006 until 2008. He has also served as a principal member of the Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee and is a member of the Association of the United States Army, Indiana Chapter.

Major General Umbarger's civilian achievements are no less noteworthy. He is president of Roy Umbarger and Sons, a fourth generation, family-owned and operated business located in central Indiana that provides custom services to the local agricultural community. In conjunction with his civilian career and passion for his community, Major General Umbarger has participated on numerous boards within the community including the Johnson County Animal Shelter Advisory Board and the Indiana Feed and Grain Association, for which he is a past director and chairman. He also currently serves on the Board of Trustees for both Johnson Memorial Hospital and Franklin College.

Major General Umbarger's exceptional military and civilian career and passionate dedication to his community are exceeded only by his devotion to his family. The General and his loving wife of many years, Rowana, have one son, Jackson, two daughters, Erica and Trista, and eight beautiful grandchildren.

I have been privileged to work with Marty over these many years. He is a man of unsurpassed talent who is guided by a strong moral compass and a profound sense of duty. His work has enriched each of us and I am doubly fortunate because he is also my friend.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask that you and my other colleagues join me in honoring Major General R. Martin Umbarger for his outstanding contributions and unwavering dedication to the State of Indiana. He has served the state with distinction, and for this he is to be commended.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast votes from May 18–May 21st due to a family commitment.

Had I been present, I would have voted against H.R. 2250, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act. Republicans have chosen to fund the Department of Defense at higher funding levels at the expense of funding for other agencies already squeezed by strict sequestration rules. Although I support some of the provisions in this legislation, I oppose the manner with which Republicans have decided to prioritize spending for the country.

I would have voted in favor of H.R. 2353, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015. The strength and vitality of our nation's infrastructure is critical to our economic competitiveness. The Highway Trust Fund provides federal support for transportation projects on the state level in order to maintain a modern, efficient, and reliable transportation infrastructure. These projects also support local job creation and economic development. However, I am extremely dismayed that H.R. 2353 only extends authorization for the Highway Trust Fund for two months and does not address long term funding challenges. Congress must pass a bipartisan, long-term funding solution for the Highway Trust Fund.

I would have voted against H.R. 1806, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act. Since its enactment, the America COMPETES Act has bolstered our nation's science and energy competitiveness through increased investment in research and development and

STEM education. Unfortunately, instead of simply reauthorizing this bipartisan program, this bill undermines critical investments in science, technology, and research.

I would have voted against H.R. 880, the American Research and Competitiveness Act. While I am a strong supporter of making the Research and Development tax credit permanent, I do not support this legislation because this unpaid-for tax measure would add an estimated $181.6 billion to the deficit over 10 years.

I would have voted against H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015. While I support the development of the commercial space industry, this legislation does not strike the appropriate balance between the needs of the industry and overall safety of the programs for the general public and future customers.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF CAPTAIN JOHN J. LEVULIS

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Captain John J. Levulis. Captain Levulis proudly served our nation since 2012 in the U.S. Army, including one tour in Afghanistan. Nicknamed by his fellow soldiers as ''Captain America,'' Captain Levulis epitomized the leadership, courage, and nobility of a true American hero.

Captain Levulis was commissioned into the U.S. Army as a second lieutenant in 2012, following his graduation from the Niagara University ROTC program. He completed the Infantry Basic Officer course at Fort Benning, Georgia. Following basic training, Captain Levulis was reassigned to the 2nd Battalion, 87th Infantry Regiment at Fort Drum in New York, where he served as a heavy weapons platoon leader. He was deployed to Afghanistan in May of 2013 as a platoon leader and returned in 2014. After returning from Afghanistan, Captain Levilus was again stationed at Fort Drum.

Captain Levilus received numerous awards including the Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Unit Commendation, National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Overseas Service Medal, NATO Meritorious Service Medal, Combat Infantry Badge, and the Parachutist Badge.

On May 1st, Captain Levilus tragically lost his life in a motor vehicle accident while on duty in New Jersey. He leaves behind his loving wife, Julianne, mother, Barbara, father, Gary, and younger brother, James. My condolences go out to Captain Levilus' entire family and friends. New York State and our nation has lost a valiant soldier, honorable citizen, and first-rate man in Captain John J. Levulis.

TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT WILLIE C. JONES

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, Staff Sergeant Willie C. Jones of the U.S. Army Reserves, who was awarded the Purple Heart for his sacrifice for our country.

After being born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and growing up in Hawaii, Staff Sergeant Jones entered the Army in February 1994. He served in combat arms units on active duty for seven years before transferring to the Army Reserves. His first assignment in the Army Reserves was in the 100th Battalion, 442nd Infantry Regiment, the only infantry unit in the Army Reserves.

Staff Sergeant Jones served in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom from November 2008 to August 2009. In October 2012, he deployed to FOB Ghazni in Afghanistan as a Combat Sustainment Support Battalion Liaison NCO.

While serving at FOB Ghazni, Staff Sergeant Jones sustained significant injuries as a result of explosions due to enemy fire on June 18, 2013.

In addition to the Purple Heart, Staff Sergeant Jones has received the Combat Action Badge, 6 Army Commendation Medals, 7 Good Conduct Medals, 2 NATO Medals, 8 Overseas Bars, Iraq and Afghanistan Campaign Medals, the Gold Recruiter Badge with three sapphires, and the Army Recruiting Ring.

Staff Sergeant Jones currently resides in Decatur, Illinois, and works as a Movements Supervisor with the 236th Inland Cargo Transfer Company. I'm proud to honor him for receiving the Purple Heart, and am humbled by his bravery, service and sacrifice for our nation.

CONGRESSIONAL MOLDOVA CAUCUS STATEMENT ON THE RIGA SUMMIT

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, the Honorable DAVID E. PRICE, and the Congressional Moldova Caucus, the Republic of Moldova is a friend of the United States of America, and a partner country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Like Ukraine and Georgia, Moldova is part of a strategically significant segment of Eastern Europe that looks toward Europe for a promising and prosperous future.

The full integration of Moldova into the European Union is also in the strategic interest of the United States. As has been the case with other Eastern European nations that fully integrated into the European Union, integration will help Moldova develop new economic opportunities and contribute to the overall security and stability of the region.

The Republic of Moldova signed an Association Agreement with the European Union in 2014 and is currently implementing its ambitious Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA). Moldova also reached a visa liberalization agreement with the EU.

As the EU Summit in Riga convenes, we call on our allies in Europe to fully engage the Republic of Moldova and to chart out its bid for accession into the Union under the terms of the Lisbon Treaty. A failure to fully recognize the aspirations and legal rights of the Republic of Moldova in its application only stands to promote the false narrative that Moldova, along with Ukraine and Georgia, falls into an 'exclusive sphere of Russian interests in Europe', and runs counter to the democratic values of the United States and Europe.

Congress and the Obama Administration should continue to support the Republic of Moldova in its statecraft, economic and security capabilities. Progress demonstrated by the Republic of Moldova on a sustained path towards Western integration should be recognized. For example, despite Moldova's entering into an Association Agreement with the European Union, the Russian Federation continues to ban imports of Moldovan products, exert pressure on the Moldovan people, and disseminate propaganda to the Moldovan people. The Russian Federation continues to maintain a substantial military presence in Transnistria, in violation the Russian Federation's commitments at the Istanbul Summit. The Russian Federation continues to use this military presence—along with its fuel exports and intelligence assets within Moldovan territory—to continually destabilize the region.

Smaller and more fragile states across the globe face increasing pressure, destabilization and aggression from larger, totalitarian governments. These states are susceptible to falling into 'regional spheres of influence' without sustained, consolidated efforts of support by the world's democracies. Last Congress, the House and Senate both passed resolutions calling on the Obama Administration to support the Republic of Moldova's capabilities in reforming its judicial sector, fighting corruption, and reforming economic markets. In addition to continuing in these important reforms, we urge the Obama Administration to work in bilateral and multilateral forums to monitor human rights abuses in the region and help advance U.S. investment in Moldova's energy markets to lessen its dependence on Russian sources. We are struck by the Moldovan people's demonstrated commitments to free markets, democracy, and the rule of law. The United States must continue to serve as a leader in the community of Western nations by supporting the people of Moldova in their commitment toward integration.

HIGHLIGHTING SUMMER MEAL PARTNERS INAUGURAL EVENT ON MAY 30, 2015

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring much-needed attention to summer meal programs for food insecure families. A new collaboration of community organizations in Lucas County, Ohio called Summer Meal Partners is working to raise awareness and increase participation in summer meal programs in that county. This group can be a model for similar collaborative efforts supporting underserved communities around the country. Summer Meal Partners will hold their official kickoff event on May 30th of this year.

Today in Lucas County just eight percent of the 54,135 children that are eligible for free or reduced price school meals participate in readily-available summer meal support. This support could make a real difference in the

lives of tens of thousands more families but a lack of awareness, transportation and enrichment programming have limited participation.

Families without reliable access to sufficient affordable nutritious food face increased health, mental and behavioral issues.

Hunger undermines a child's ability to learn. Malnutrition and vitamin deficiencies also put children at risk for serious and permanent problems with attention, cognition and behavior. They undermine natural growth and development and lead to compromised immune systems.

With most primary school students on break, the summer can be a challenging time for working parents. Relief is available in the form of summer meals but only a small fraction of eligible families take advantage of this important initiative.

I congratulate Summer Meal Partners for their important work and for their upcoming kickoff on May 30, 2015.

HONORING DR. ALLEN CHAN

HON. SCOTT H. PETERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, every May we celebrate Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, a time to commemorate the significant contributions of the AAPI communities to our country.

This year, I am honored to recognize one of San Diego's community leaders, Dr. Allen Chan.

Dr. Chan was born in Hong Kong, and immigrated to the United States more than 40 years ago.

He was a charter president of the San Diego United Lions Club, is an accomplished chiropractor, and is the owner of the renowned local institution Jasmine Seafood Restaurant, which has served as a cultural heart in San Diego's Asian American community.

Dr. Chan was recently awarded the prestigious, and highly selective, Ellis Island Medal of Honor for his legacy of community service centered around preserving history, traditions, and values, and paying homage to the immigrant experience as an integral part of American culture.

I want to congratulate Dr. Chan, and thank him for his leadership in the AAPI community and for helping make San Diego a better place to live.

CONGRATULATING THE SARCOXIE ARCHERY TEAMS ON THEIR STATE AND NATIONAL TITLES

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Sarcoxie High School Archery Team on another Missouri state championship. This victory marks the Bears' third straight state title.

The Bears competed against 88 other schools from across Missouri with nearly 1,400 contestants. The team took the high school division title with a total of 3,367 points. Sarcoxie's archery program also added to their success this year with the middle school team placing 3rd in the middle school division. Sarcoxie competed against schools of all sizes, from the tiny and rural to the massive and urban. This small southwest Missouri school has proven again that size does not matter when it comes to talent, dedication and perseverance.

Individually, Sarcoxie's Zane White took second place in the state high school division with 293 points and Gavin Currey finished a close fourth with 290 points. Annika Johnson, Jordyn Kirby and Elizabeth Workman all finished in the top 15, further helping shoot Sarcoxie to first place.

Coaches Kaycia and David Woolsey deserve praise for successfully aiming the team toward their bullseye—a first place finish. Much effort goes into teaching skills to go the distance. That shows especially this year, as many on the Sarcoxie team were first-year competing archers. Only five were on the previous championship team.

In addition, Sarcoxie had their first national archery champion this year at the National NASP IBO 3D Challenge. Fifth grader, Max Wangler was the national champion from among 483 elementary boys. Max's teammate, Drake Acheson, placed third.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Sarcoxie High School Archery Team on a job well done. I look forward to seeing their continued success.

HONORING LIBRARIAN DIANE CHRISTIAN OF AURORA, ILLINOIS

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Diane Christian as she prepares for retirement after more than 40 years of service to the Aurora Public Library in Aurora, Illinois.

Diane Christian is a cherished figure in the City of Aurora, who has fostered a love of books and learning for many generations of young people. Starting as a part-time librarian in 1974, Diane later became the library's Children's Department Coordinator where she has played a critical role in the intellectual development of children throughout the community. In 2002, Diane launched the Welcome to America program that offers family literacy services to refugees from around the world and has served over 850 parents and children.

Diane is also an active volunteer in our community; she currently is a member of the Child Welfare Society and the Aurora Township Youth Commission. During her retirement, Diane intends to continue volunteering for the Aurora Public Library and helping with the transition to its new location.

I would like to thank Diane for her decades of commitment to the Aurora Public Library and wish her the best in her retirement.

HONORING LEO FINNEGAN

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a champion and leader from the State of Washington, Leo Finnegan.

Whether it's serving on community advisory boards, helping a parent navigate bureaucratic difficulties or organizing recreational activities for those with special needs, Leo Finnegan has been, and will continue to be, a deliberate and enthusiastic voice for the developmental disability community.

Leo and his wife Rose first moved to Washington State in 1975 with their five children, one of whom has special needs, Tim. When his son was unable to participate in Soap Box Derby Races with his other children, Leo took it upon himself to construct a two passenger car so the entire family could share in the fun together. This act sparked an idea to organize races for other children with special needs. He now organizes and oversees races every summer throughout Washington State in Issaquah, Sammamish, Snoqualmie, Richland, Spokane, and Oak Harbor. My godson Kyle and I were able to participate in one race several years ago, which is one of the many times I've had the opportunity to see firsthand Leo's work in our community. Leo also coaches the Special Olympics Basketball team in Washington. Through his work, Leo has touched thousands of lives, giving individuals with special needs recreational opportunities that enrich lives and strengthen families.

Mr. Speaker, Leo's actions embody the heart of a servant. I thank Leo for his passionate commitment to serving those with special needs.

AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1806) to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, in 2007, following reports that the United States could lose its competitive edge in the global economy, Congress came together on a bipartisan basis to boost federal research, spur American innovation, and maintain our strength in scientific and technological discovery. We reauthorized that bill, again on a bipartisan basis, in 2010.

Unfortunately, today we have a bill on the floor that abandons those bipartisan efforts, shortchanges critical research, and unacceptably interferes in decision-making at our scientific institutions. It makes particularly egregious cuts to climate change research and efforts to develop new energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies for a cleaner energy future. Climate change is real and we are

already seeing its impacts across the country. But it also provides economic opportunity, if we invest in R&D to develop new renewable sources and efficiency technologies. This bill would jeopardize American innovation in this critical area.

Today's bill also meddles in decision-making at our federal research institutions, decreasing funding at certain directorates at the National Science Foundation and imposing new requirements in the grant-making process. Our science agencies have a robust review process in place to fund the most critical research. Politics should have no part in that process.

Unlike earlier America COMPETES bills that were built on broad consensus, HR 1806 is opposed by the vast majority of our nation's scientific community. I urge my colleagues to listen to these scientists and bring forward a bill that invests in American innovation and supports the cutting-edge research necessary to maintain our leadership in the world.

SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF NEPAL

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after the massive earthquake shook Nepal, Eric Jean and Della Hoffman were stranded on a remote trail with a group of other backpackers. Friends of theirs from their time in college at Rice University, which is in my district, contacted my office for help. We worked with the State Department to set them free. Five days after the earthquake, Special Forces came to the village and rescued them.

Ms. Hoffman would later recall, "I don't think we even knew what was happening until some of the villagers ran out of the hut and then, immediately after that, the boulders just started coming down from both sides of the canyon, including into the village and on top of the houses."

Six U.S. Marines and two Nepalese soldiers sacrificed their lives attempting to save others just like Eric and Della when their helicopter crashed.

I stand with my colleagues in support of House Resolution 235, and urge the administration to work with the Nepal government and the international community to deliver aid quickly, easily, and with long-term rebuilding in mind.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING BUENA VISTA WINERY'S WINE TOOL MUSEUM

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Buena Vista Winery on the occasion of the opening of their new, first-of-its-kind Wine Tool Museum. The oldest premium winery in the United States, Buena Vista has been in operation since 1857 when a Hungarian immigrant, Count Agoston Haraszthy, established the vineyards and built the winery. Over the intervening years, the winery has had a colorful history, passing through many hands before ultimately being purchased by Jean-Charles Boisset in 2011. Boisset immediately hatched a plan to turn the property around that eventually culminated in the creation of the Wine Tool Museum, which officially opened to the public on March 24, 2015.

The Boisset family already had an impressive wine tool collection when Jean-Charles's sister encountered a man in Burgundy looking for a buyer for his enormous thirty thousand item collection of wine tools. With the combination of Boisset family implements and the new acquisitions, the Museum's collection encompasses items as diverse as antique plows and blades, secateurs, and wine harvest baskets.

Along with its impressive collection of tools, the Museum guides visitors through history with an educational film that traces winemaking in the region from the early days of Haraszthy through the plague of phylloxera. The first of its kind museum tells the story of California's wine community. People will not only be able see, but also learn about, the tools that brought wine from the vine to the bottle a century and a half ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we honor Buena Vista Winery at this time. Its commitment to not only preserving viticultural history, but demonstrating the evolution of the profession, will help increase awareness and appreciation for California and Sonoma's long history of winemaking.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF DEPUTY SHERIFF JOSE ALVARADO

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of José "Joey" Alvarado to the community of Wayne County, New York. Deputy Sheriff Alvarado has given 30 years of dedicated service to the Wayne County Sheriff's Office. In his role as Deputy Sheriff, he has played an essential role in safeguarding the rights and freedoms of the residents of his county.

Throughout his 30 years of service to the Wayne County Sheriff's Office, Deputy Sheriff Joey Alvarado has consistently performed with professionalism and dedication, working towards the goal of making his community a safer place.

Since 1985, Deputy Sheriff Joey Alvarado has served as a Jailor/Dispatcher, Correction Officer, and Deputy Sheriff. During his tenure as Deputy Sheriff, he was also assigned to the Sheriff's Office Special Investigation Unit. He has made an outstanding contribution through his career as Deputy Sheriff to the quality of life for all Wayne County residents.

I commend Deputy Sheriff Alvarado's sacrifice and contribution to the Wayne County community and wish him the very best in his retirement.

HONORING PENNSYLVANIA CYSTIC FIBROSIS, INC. (PACFI)

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to congratulate Pennsylvania Cystic Fibrosis, Inc. (PACFI) for 30 years of work in raising Cystic Fibrosis awareness and funding Cystic Fibrosis research efforts. PACFI is an independent, non-profit, all volunteer organization that provides crucial services and much needed support for Pennsylvania families affected by Cystic Fibrosis.

PACFI was founded on October 2, 1985. The PACFI organization is unique in that they do not have a paid staff and operate solely with volunteers. This allows PACFI to use 100% of donations they receive to provide benefits for Pennsylvania families such as paying for emergency and other medical expenses.

PACFI also works to fund Cystic Fibrosis research around the country. To date, they have raised more than $565,000 for institutions and universities that are on the leading edge of Cystic Fibrosis research. These donations are helping to discover better treatment options and will hopefully lead to a cure.

PACFI is doing excellent work in Pennsylvania on one of the most common and fatal genetic diseases. Cystic Fibrosis affects approximately 1 in 2000 people and their life expectancy is only 35 years. I commend PACFI for doing great work in the field of Cystic Fibrosis research and supporting families that need assistance with the costs of Cystic Fibrosis treatment.

CONGRATULATING SOFIA VICTORIA DE LA PENA ON FOUNDING THE FIT KIDS DAY NON–PROFIT

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sofia Victoria de la Pena on her work founding Fit Kids Day, and establishing the group in the South Florida community.

Sofia Victoria was a ninth grader at Carrollton School of the Sacred Heart in Coconut Grove, FL when she recognized an increased need for health programs for children. She wanted to add to the work being done to combat childhood obesity, and came up with a plan. Her idea was an entire day focused on fitness, which became known as Fit Kids Day.

To get the event started, Sofia Victoria reached out to leading students at other schools to be ambassadors for the program. The students walked throughout their neighborhoods, to spread awareness for the event and attract community support. Local businesses chipped in to help with the first event, providing services and food to the participants, which were offered free of charge. Since the first Fit Kids Day, the program has expanded, and multiple cities have organized their own events. In these cities, mayors or city managers organize a day of activities that are popular in their area.

Fit Kids Day caught on as an event, and is now a nonprofit organization. The Presidential Fitness Counsel has since talked to Sofia Victoria about using the Fit Kids Day model for their organization. The event was created by kids, for kids, and offers many leadership opportunities. In addition, the program has helped introduce fitness ideas and plans to less fortunate communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to congratulate Sofia Victoria de la Pena on her accomplishment, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing her outstanding achievement. It is an honor to know a family that continues to work hard to improve their community every day.

HONORING DAVIESS COUNTY, KY, ON CELEBRATING ITS BICENTENNIAL

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Daviess County, Kentucky, on celebrating its bicentennial.

Daviess County came into its existence on June 1, 1815, through an Act of the Kentucky General Assembly. But on May 30, 2015, Daviess County will begin to celebrate its 200th birthday.

Daviess County lies in the Western Kentucky Coalfield region and is also an oil producer. Bounded by the Ohio River, it serves as an important trade and transportation artery—making it a major manufacturing center, transportation hub and U.S. Customs Port of Entry on the Ohio River. It is also a leader in health care, medical research and pharmaceutical experimentation.

The keystone celebration, on May 30th, includes an early morning 5 k run/walk at the Mount Saint Joseph Motherhouse of the Ursuline Sisters. Activities for people of all ages will take place around the Courthouse Square, and the day will end with a reception and the opening of a special Bicentennial Art Exhibit at the Owensboro Museum of Fine Art.

Other activities will include honoring African Americans from Daviess County who served in the Union Army during the Civil War with the dedication of an historic highway marker on the Courthouse lawn. There will also be a series of Bicentennial-related programs at the Daviess County Public Library throughout the summer.

A new history of Daviess County, Kentucky, Celebrating Our Heritage, has been published and highlights many aspects of daily life in the county. Among these topics is Daviess County's rich history in the agriculture industry—citing corn, soybean and tobacco producers.

Daviess County is the home to some of Kentucky's great colleges and universities, including: Brescia University, Kentucky Wesleyan College, a campus of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System and a branch of Western Kentucky University.

It is important to also highlight the leadership in Daviess County and all their efforts to make this a successful and thriving community. Thank you for making Daviess County what it is today.

I encourage everyone in Kentucky's Second District to join in the festivities to celebrate the rich history and traditions of Daviess County. I congratulate all who live and serve the county and look forward to taking part in some of these celebrations myself. Here's to many more years of success.

ADVANCING RESEARCH FOR HYDROCEPHALUS PATIENTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to legislation I introduced last week, the Advancing Research for Hydrocephalus Act, and urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important bill. My new legislation—which is supported by the national Hydrocephalus Association—will facilitate better research into this devastating condition by requiring the collection of demographic information on the hydrocephalus community.

Hydrocephalus, which is defined as an abnormal accumulation of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) within cavities in the brain, can cause brain damage, vision issues, and extreme pain for those affected.

One of those affected, Adrienne D'Oria, a 22 year old from my Congressional District, has suffered from hydrocephalus since she was 10 months old. In addition to the excruciating pain, complications from shunt malfunctions, dozens of brain surgeries and hundreds of hospital visits have essentially eliminated any chance of a normal childhood. Hydrocephalus continues to limit her options for the future:

> All of my friends, everyone I went to school with is graduating and starting the next stage in their life. I can't do that,'' she said recently. ''I had to withdraw from so many classes because of hospital admissions and all the surgeries. Even though I've been out of high school for four years I only have the credits of a freshman. My friends are graduating and I'm stuck in limbo. I can't control it.

Unfortunately for Adrienne and thousands like her, the most common treatment for hydrocephalus remains a surgically-inserted shunt. Shunts drain the fluid from the brain through the neck and into other parts of the body. They frequently become blocked, malfunction, or cause infection. In almost half of all cases in children, the shunt fails within the first two years. When they do, patients must immediately locate a medical facility and a neurosurgeon who can correct the problem. This precarious situation is a constant source of fear for those who suffer from hydrocephalus and their families. In fact, hydrocephalus is the most common reason for brain surgery in children.

The scientific and medical communities not only have very few resources that can help them in understanding this condition, they are not even aware of the true impact of this disorder. Without better data and research, they cannot develop more effective treatments.

Mr. Speaker, there are some estimates that this condition affects roughly one million Americans. Yet given that hydrocephalus can occur either congenitally or be acquired, oftentimes through infection or traumatic brain injury, reporting of hydrocephalus has been inconsistent. Currently no mechanism exists to identify and track persons with hydrocephalus who develop the condition after birth. As a result, we do not have a good grasp on the demographics of hydrocephalus patients.

My bill provides a remedy. The Advancing Research for Hydrocephalus Act will establish a National Hydrocephalus Surveillance System (NHSS) to collect information on the incidence and prevalence of hydrocephalus among a range of demographics, including changes in epidemiology over time. This surveillance system would provide a wealth of data for researchers. Better surveillance will facilitate better research and lead to better outcomes, treatment and care for the infants, children, and adults experiencing the agonizing pain of hydrocephalus.

So I urge my colleagues to support my legislation to help provide assistance and raise the quality of life for individuals, like Adrienne, who are suffering from this condition.

IN RECOGNITION OF EAST HARLEM COUNCIL FOR HUMAN SERVICES, CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker I rise today to give recognition to the East Harlem Council for Human Services, which is celebrating 50 years of serving the local community. The work done by the Council has been vital to our community and has changed the lives of so many for decades. Groups like the Council and institutions like the Boriken Care Center are worth fighting for, and I will continue to make sure there are adequate resources available for them to continue to thrive and serve their community.

I am proud to honor the East Harlem Council for Human Services which was incorporated in 1965 though grass-roots efforts of local East Harlem residents committed to addressing unmet needs in their community. The Council is a multi-service not-for-profit which coordinates an array of affordable and no cost services to more than 10,000 individuals each year without regard for an individual's ability to pay for services. The Board of Directors and more than almost 200 staff members are united in a commitment to the Council's mission of providing the highest quality of comprehensive, community-based, fully bilingual services to the East Harlem community.

The Council is the largest grass-roots, multi-service not-for-profit in our East Harlem community. By continuing its strong history of diverse community-based leadership, and commitment to the self-determination of this institution and the East Harlem community at large, the Council has positioned itself for continued growth. The Council continuously renews its commitment to the residents of El Barrio to ensure that the Boriken Neighborhood Health Center and its sister programs will continue to provide affordable quality comprehensive services in East Harlem for many more decades.

There's no finer work than fighting to bring health and essential wellness to those struggling to make ends meet in underserved communities. Everyone deserves access to quality

care within their community and we are proud to have the East Harlem Council for Human Services serving us.

CONGRATULATING REV. DR. MICHAEL L. PFLEGER ON HIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PRIESTHOOD

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my congratulations to Rev. Dr. Michael Louis Pfleger, the Senior Pastor at Saint Sabina Church in Chicago on his 40th Anniversary of the priesthood. I am sincerely thankful for the forty years of his devotion to community service and endless effort in fighting social injustice.

Michael Louis Pfleger was ordained a Catholic Priest for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago on May 14, 1975 and since 1981 has been Pastor of the mostly African American Parish of Saint Sabina, a Catholic church in Chicago's Auburn Gresham Neighborhood. His uninterrupted tenure in just one neighborhood is normally unheard of in a diocese where Pastors usually serve for only six to twelve years. When he was appointed to his present position, at the age of 31, he became the youngest Pastor in Chicago Archdiocese. Under Pfleger's leadership, Saint Sabina has established an outstanding social service program including job programs, conflict resolution, Employment Resource Center, a Social Service Center, and also an elder home.

Father Pfleger has adopted three sons, and led efforts to curb drug and alcohol use, especially among teenagers. He has led protests of all kind, encourages people to register and vote, take positions on all kind of controversial issues, always on the side of the people. He has fought against the proliferation of hand guns and hold regular lecture series at Saint Sabina featuring individuals like Reverend Jesse Jackson, Reverend Al Sharpton, Reverend Jeremiah Wright, Dick Gregory, Minister Louis Farrakhan, Reverend Joseph Lowery, Harry Belafonte and others. He has called out disrespectful rappers, embraced salvation for prostitutes, defied the Cardinal and pushed for the Ordination of women as Priests. Michael Louis Pfleger, a man among men, a Priest among Priests, a force for good, a friend to humanity, my brother and a Servant of God.

ASTHMA AWARENESS MONTH

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, May is Asthma Awareness Month. As co-chair of the Congressional Asthma and Allergy Caucus and a senior member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce's Health Subcommittee, I want to take this opportunity to bring attention to asthma's prevalence in the United States, as well as what must be done to control its growth.

Asthma is one of the most serious chronic diseases in the U.S., affecting almost 26 million Americans and nearly 7 million children. It can cause shortness of breath, coughing, wheezing, chest pain, and even death.

In my home state of New York, asthma takes a particularly heavy toll—especially in my hometown of the Bronx. About 390,000 children and 1.4 million adults in New York have asthma. The total cost of asthma-related hospitalizations in New York in 2007 was a staggering $535 million. The Bronx, where I was born and raised and am proud to represent part of, has one of the highest rates of asthma-related emergency room visits in all of New York.

These statistics are even more alarming when looking specifically at minority and low-income populations. Children from poor households are twice as likely as their more affluent peers to be diagnosed with asthma. In addition, asthma rates among African American children increased by 50 percent between 2001 and 2009.

Asthma's prevalence costs children and adults dearly with regard to quality of life. However, it carries an economic cost as well. The direct medical costs of asthma treatment, coupled with absences from work and school, result in losses of more than $56 billion annually Children additionally suffer academically, as asthma causes about 14 million student absences each year.

While asthma can be treated and managed, it is too often not managed properly. Asthma sufferers require regular check-ups, asthma management plans, and access to both maintenance and fast acting inhalers. People with persistent asthma must be tested for allergies so they can learn what triggers might cause an asthma attack. Furthermore, environmental triggers in homes and schools, such as mold, dust, animal dander, pests, toxic chemicals, and excessive moisture must be eliminated.

Congress must also work to reduce asthma rates. A little over five years ago, Congress passed and President Obama signed into law the Affordable Care Act, which prohibited insurance companies from denying coverage to people with pre-existing conditions, like asthma. While this was a terrific stride, more efforts are needed here in Washington.

I have been a strong supporter of the Centers for Disease Control's National Asthma Control Program, which helps states implement systems to monitor and treat asthma. This Program's work has resulted in a $23.1 billion decline in asthma health care costs since 2001. In addition, deaths related to asthma have dropped by 24 percent since the Program's inception in 1999. Earlier this year, I wrote a letter asking appropriators to fund the National Asthma Control Program at $30.6 million in Fiscal Year 2016.

While financial support for this Program is vital, we cannot rely on funding alone to solve the problems that asthma causes. We must continue to increase awareness of preventative measures to help people manage their disease. In addition, we must work collaboratively across sectors to address the burden that asthma creates.

I look forward to continuing to work to ensure that adults and children across the United States can live healthier and more successful lives.

CHRISTOPHER BOULANGER

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mr. Christopher Boulanger as a member of the United States Air Force Academy Class of 2015.

Christopher will graduate from the U.S. Air Force Academy as a Second Lieutenant in the United States Air Force on May 28, 2015.

His career in the service has just begun, but it is a testament to Christopher's unselfish devotion to the people of this great nation. The challenges will be many and the time, although it may seem like an eternity, will fly by almost unnoticed.

The challenge for this young man will be to retain as much as possible, pass on what he learns to others, and live life for every moment.

South Mississippi is proud of Christopher and his accomplishments, and we look forward to him continuing to represent not only Mississippi, but the entire nation, as a United States Air Force officer.

As Christopher embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may always recall with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment graduating from a program as prestigious as the Air Force Academy.

I would like to send Christopher my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors, thank him for his service, and congratulate him on this momentous occasion.

REMEMBERING THE SACRIFICES OF THE FALLEN HEROES ON MEMORIAL DAY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember all those brave and heroic men and women of the Armed Forces who gave the last full measure of devotion in defense of our country.

Each May, veteran and service organizations come together to hold events around the country to demonstrate their gratitude to current and former men and women in uniform and their families for their service to our country.

The month of May is a time when a grateful nation acknowledges and affirms the debt owed to those brave men and women who risked their lives to preserve the freedoms we too often take for granted.

It is important that we recognize and celebrate the tremendous role military personnel have played across the globe.

Texas is home to more than 130,000 active military personnel and more than 1,600,000 veterans, 30,000 of which are from the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

It has been an honor to represent these constituents and I am extremely proud of their service.

As we acknowledge our former, current and future military men and women, it is essential that we provide them with the resources necessary to help wounded warriors, veterans, and their families' transition to civilian life.

That is why I was proud to cosponsor and help shepherd to passage H.R. 1344, Helping Heroes Fly Act, that was signed into law in 2013 and which facilitates expedited passenger screening at airports for service members who are severely injured or disabled, along with their families.

I also introduced H.R. 76, the ''Helping to Encourage Real Opportunity for Veterans Transitioning from Battlespace to Workplace Act of 2015,'' which provides strong incentives for employers to hire, retain, and employ veterans in positions that take maximum advantage of their skills and experience.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I recognize by the name the 53 brave men and women from my home city of Houston, who served in Iraq and Afghanistan and gave the last full measure of devotion to their country.

They are: Krystal Fitts, Jorge Luis Velasquez, Cody Norris, Jacob Molina, Pedro Maldonado, Edwardo Loredo, Matthew Catlett, Zarian Wood, Andrew Roughton, Edgar Heredia, Joshua Molina, Steven Candelo, Scott McIntosh, Orlando Perez, Jeremy Ray, Benjamin Garrison, Rodney Johnson, Matthew Medlicott, Alan Austin, William Edwards, Eric Salinas, Danny Soto, Roy Jones, Terrence Dunn, Hector Leija, David Fraser, Benjamin Rosales, Kenneth Pugh, Alberto Sanchez, Walter Moss, Michael Robertson, Howard Babcock, Timothy Roark, Ivica Jerak, Phillip George, Keith Mariotti, Clinton Gertson, Dexter Kimble, Jesus Leon-Perez, Thomas Zapp, Eric Allton, Andrew Houghton, Juan Torres, Pedro Contreras, Adolfo Carballo, Scott Larson, Leroy Sandoval, Armando Soriano, Keelan Moss, A. Esparza-Gutierrez, Tomas Sotelo, Brian Matthew Kennedy, and Brian Craig.

God bless them. And may God bless the United States.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAJOR MORRIS SHEPHERD

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable individual for his dedication to the State of Texas. I would like to congratulate and thank Major Morris Shepherd for his hard work and his passion for service. I would also like to applaud his retirement.

Major Shepherd has diligently served as Deputy Director for the Dallas Independent School District's Office of the Director of Army Instruction. His commitment spans many years, beginning with his commission as an Infantry Officer in 1974 from Prairie View A&M University. His service record reflects the hard work, resolve, and passion that he continues to embody and practice to this day.

Since his initial commission, Major Shepherd has progressed through the ranks. Following his graduation as an Airborne Ranger and a Distinguished Military Graduate he attended the United States Infantry Basic Officer's Course at Ft. Benning Georgia. He first served in the 1st Cavalry Division at Ft. Hood, Texas, and then served in the 2nd Infantry Division in the Republic of Korea. Major Shepherd also served as an Assistant Professor of Military Science at Alcorn State University, as a Project Officer, as a Director of Plans, Training, and Mobilization, as a Logistical Planning Officer for the 1st Cavalry, as an Executive Officer 15th Forward Support Battalion for the 1st Cavalry Division, and as a Director Resident Training Detachment. He finally retired from the U.S. Army after more than 18 years of service. Following his first retirement, Major Shepherd joined the Dallas Independent School District in 1995 serving as the Senior Army Instructor for Franklin D. Roosevelt High School. During his tenure he has received many notable recognitions and awards. From serving the country to serving his community, Major Shepherd's accomplishments have been well noted and appreciated.

His passion and drive are commendable. In our rapidly shifting world and fast-paced lifestyles it is always impressive to find someone like Major Shepherd that gives so generously of their time and effort to positively impact the lives of the people of Texas.

As we reflect on all of Major Shepherd's achievements, it is important to acknowledge that his belief in giving to those around him comes from the genuine patriotism and determination of a remarkable man. I want to express my heartiest congratulations and thanks to Major Morris Shepherd on his outstanding accomplishments, and for his immense contribution to our great country and to the State of Texas.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OLD DOMINION BAR ASSOCIATION

HON. ROBERT C. ''BOBBY'' SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th Anniversary of the Old Dominion Bar Association (ODBA), of which I am proud to be a member. Members will be gathering next week in Glen Allen, Virginia for their annual conference and to celebrate this historic milestone.

The ODBA traces its history to a December 1940 incident where an African American lawyer was asked to move to another section of the law library of the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals. Frederic Charles Carter, Esq. was working in the law library when he was ordered to move to another section because of an alleged new Supreme Court policy limiting African American attorneys to a specific section of the law library. Carter refused to move and the head librarian summoned a police officer to demand Carter see him in his office. Carter later inquired in a letter to the Chief Justice whether the court had indeed issued a new policy relegating African American lawyers to a special section of the law library.

Several months passed with no response from the Court, so Carter began reaching out to fellow African American Attorneys in the Commonwealth of Virginia, including R. H. Cooley, Jr. of Petersburg. Cooley also contacted colleagues in Norfolk, Newport News, and Portsmouth, as well as at the Howard University School of Law, to discuss the need to organize a bar association in Virginia specifically for African American attorneys.

Throughout 1941, Cooley and the following individuals met to organize the ODBA: J. Thomas Hewin, Sr., Roland D. Ealey, James T. Carter, Fredric Charles Carter, J. Byron Hopkins and Oliver W. Hill of Richmond; W. S. Duiguid of Lynchburg; Martin A. Martin of Danville; Thomas W. Young and J. Eugene Diggs of Norfolk; James Raby of Alexandria; and L. Marian Poe of Newport News.

The organizational meeting for the ODBA was set for April 12, 1942 in Richmond. Twenty-five attorneys attended the organizational meeting where they elected their inaugural officers: Oliver W. Hill, President; L. Marian Poe, Secretary; Martin A. Martin, Vice-President; and James M. Morris (of Staunton), Treasurer.

On May 21, 1942, the new association met again to adopt their constitution and set an annual membership fee of $4.50. Some balked at the cost which prompted Oliver Hill to include the following message on organization notices: ''If you are very, very busy—we need you. If you don't think you can afford it, you need us.''

As America became increasingly involved in World War II, many ODBA members, including its president Oliver W. Hill, entered military service to fight for our nation overseas. It was during this time that R. H. Cooley, Jr. became the organization's acting president. Throughout the war, he urged all members to ''keep abreast with service legislation in order to aid men and women in uniform and their families in matters pertaining to insurance, dependency allotments and any other phases necessary to solve their perplexing problems.'' Cooley also urged association members to help returning veterans, including volunteering their legal services when necessary.

By the war's end, there were forty-four active members of the association all across the Commonwealth, with local groups of ODBA members established in Richmond, on the Virginia Peninsula, in South Hampton Roads, and in Northern Virginia.

Originally organized to confront a discriminatory policy that offended the personal and professional dignity of members of the Virginia Bar, it has grown into an essential professional organization for African American attorneys practicing law in the Commonwealth of Virginia. It has not only provided positive professional relationships for its members and trained them to be effective advocates for their clients, but has also broken down barriers to membership and full participation for African American attorneys statewide and in the local bar associations and to their election as judges throughout Virginia. Moreover, its members have led the effort to desegregate America in all areas of public and private life, including education, employment, housing, and public accommodations.

Today, the ODBA continues its strong legacy of pursuing justice and ensuring its member lawyers hold themselves to the highest level of professional skill and conduct. The association holds numerous professional development seminars annually. And its members are very active in other national, state and local bar associations, as well as their local communities in general through community service and active civic engagement.

Mr. Speaker, as the Old Dominion Bar Association gathers in Glen Allen next week for its annual meeting, I wish to congratulate the association's current president, Helivi L. Holland, Esq., and all its members, past and present, on this 75th anniversary and thank them for all that they have done and continue to do on behalf of the legal profession and the

full participation of all in the life and bounties of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation as a whole.

HONORING CALIFORNIA'S GEOTHERMAL INDUSTRY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor California's Geothermal Industry as we celebrate Geothermal Awareness Month. It is important to recognize the success of existing geothermal facilities in California and the great value in promoting the development of new geothermal power, one of California's greatest natural resources.

Geothermal energy is an excellent source of clean, renewable energy that supports thousands of jobs across our district and state. Not only does the production of geothermal energy boost our economy and reduce our dependence on foreign oil, it provides counties with important royalty payments which they use to pay for important priorities like public safety, road maintenance and law enforcement. Furthermore, geothermal energy is critical to California's renewable and low carbon energy goals.

Geothermal energy is locally produced and boosts rural economies through jobs, royalties, tax payments and more. While in development, a geothermal power project will employ hundreds of individuals during construction and post-construction, more than most other renewable technologies. I am proud to represent The Geysers, which lies beneath the surface of Lake and Sonoma Counties, employs 300 full-time employees at Calpine, fifty full-time employees at the Northern California Power Agency's two Geysers power plants and more than 150 contractors. The Geysers is also the largest taxpayer in both Sonoma and Lake Counties.

Geothermal power benefits communities across the state, while providing important environmental benefits. In the south, The Salton Sea Restoration and Renewable Energy Initiative, a plan to save an important source of water and minerals in the state, can add up to 1,700 megawatts of low-impact, cost-competitive geothermal energy to the State's power grid. In the north, the Geysers maximizes the economic and environmental benefits of the resource, and helps reduce greenhouse gas emissions to the equivalent of removing almost half a million cars from the road, meaning cleaner air for local towns and cities.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we recognize May 21, 2015 as Geothermal Awareness Day and honor California's Geothermal Industry for ensuring that new and existing geothermal power is part of a diverse and sustainable energy mix now and in the future.

CELEBRATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF JOSEPH HOUCK

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished public service of Joseph Houck, who retires after 30 years with the Summit Fire Department including seven years as Fire Chief and Director.

Chief Houck obtained an Associate in Applied Science Degree in Fire Science Technology from Union County College. He is a graduate of the National Fire Academy's Executive Fire Officer Program and also completed the New Jersey's Certified Public Manager Program and received a Bachelor of the Arts Degree in Public Administration from Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Chief Houck started with the Summit Fire Department in 1985 as a volunteer firefighter and became a career firefighter in 1987. Due to his dedication and skill he became a recognized leader in the department and was promoted to Lieutenant in 1995, Battalion Chief in 2000, Deputy Chief in 2005 and Chief and Director in 2008. In addition, Chief Houck served as a New Jersey State Fire Instructor and was the City of Summit's Fire Official.

During his accomplished tenure, Chief Houck achieved a number of significant accomplishments in service to the City of Summit and in the name public safety. The Summit Fire Department was accredited by the Center on Fire Accreditation International—the only Fire Department in the state to earn such recognition—and the Department's reputation for professional and timely service improved under his stewardship. He managed numerous disaster responses, including Hurricane Sandy, and was a vital part of the City's emergency management team. His insight, guidance and experience proved extremely valuable during challenging times.

Chief Houck has also been a member of the New Jersey Career Fire Chiefs Association and has been its liaison to the New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness Emergency Services Sector, a member of the International Association of Fire Chiefs and served on its Emergency Management Committee working on interstate mutual aid plans.

I wish Chief Houck many years of happiness in his retirement spent with his wife, Irene, and his children. I thank him for his dedicated public service.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BRUCE FARRIS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and career of a local Fresno icon, Bruce Farris, who passed away on Wednesday, May 6, 2015 at the age of 88.

Bruce was born on March 25, 1927, in Coldwater, Michigan, to Ross and Ruth Farris. At the age of four, with the Great Depression limiting jobs, the family gathered their belonging and drove to California in their Hudson Essex automobile. They settled in Reedley and three years later moved to Fresno. There, Bruce attended Daily Elementary School, Hamilton Junior High, and graduated from Fresno High School in 1945. At Fresno High, Bruce played baseball, basketball, and most importantly, during his senior year, he wrote for the Fresno High Owl.

Following high school, Bruce attended Fresno State College for two years where he played basketball and wrote for the Daily Collegian as a reporter and an editor. After college, he worked for the Fresno Guide and the St. Louis Cardinals organization. At the age of 21, he was hired by the Fresno Bee. His career began by reporting on Fresno State athletics, and later expanded to a broader range of sporting events. What distinguished Mr. Farris from other reporters, and what made his career so impressive, was his enthusiasm for his job and his love for all sports. Additionally, Mr. Farris was unbiased and fair, making it a point to report objectively.

While working at the Fresno Bee, Bruce worked with a secretary named Barbara Harper, whom he married in 1955. Bruce and Barbara had three children, Greg, Nancy, and Sandra. They raised their children in a home on First Street, and opened their door to many, from people from church, to neighborhood kids, and friends, relatives, and foreign exchange students. Everyone was welcome in their home at any time.

In 1997, Mr. Farris was inducted into the Fresno Athletic Hall of Fame after decades of covering Fresno State athletics. Afterwards, Mr. Farris went on to report for the Fresno Bee as the newspaper's outdoors and golf writer. He worked at the Fresno Bee for 23 years before retiring in December 2002. Bruce had a truly amazing 52 year long career.

According to his daughter Nancy, Mr. Farris was defined by his faith, love of family, and love of sports, three things which led him to be such a great man. Mr. Farris' loss is heartbreaking for Fresno, and his passing will be felt by the many friends that he has gained throughout the years. Everyone that knew Mr. Farris describes him as a kind man who truly cared for others, and who was respected by everyone who had the honor of knowing him.

Mr. Farris' wife, Barbara, died in 2007. He is survived by his one son, Greg, two daughters, Nancy and Sandra, nine grandchildren, and one great-grandchild on the way. Mr. Speaker, it is with the utmost respect that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the wonderful life and distinguished career of Bruce Farris. Mr. Farris' passing is a loss to our community. While his presence will be greatly missed, his legacy will continue through his writing.

MATTHEW GOELLNER

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mr. Matthew Goellner as a member of the United States Air Force Academy Class of 2015.

Matthew will graduate from the U.S. Air Force Academy as a Second Lieutenant in the United States Air Force on May 28, 2015.

His career in the service has just begun, but it is a testament to Matthew's unselfish devotion to the people of this great nation. The challenges will be many and the time, although it may seem like an eternity, will fly by almost unnoticed.

The challenge for this young man will be to retain as much as possible, pass on what he learns to others, and live life for every moment.

South Mississippi is proud of Matthew and his accomplishments, and we look forward to him continuing to represent not only Mississippi, but the entire nation, as a United States Air Force officer.

As Matthew embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may always recall with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment graduating from a program as prestigious as the Air Force Academy.

I would like to send Matthew my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors, thank him for his service, and congratulate him on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO PUBLISHER DOROTHY LEAVELL AND THE CHICAGO CRUSADER NEWSPAPER ON ITS 75TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Crusader Newspaper is celebrating its 75th year Anniversary with a festive gala on June 5th, 2015 at the Loews Chicago Hotel and I take this opportunity to commend and congratulate them for 75 years of pleading the cause for Black America. To maintain itself for 75 years as a free and independent Black oriented publication is indeed a great business accomplishment.

The Chicago Crusader's mission has not changed since it was established by Mrs. Leavell's late husband, Balm M. Leavell and his late partner Mr. Joseph H. Jefferson. The Chicago Crusader was founded in 1940, was published in the Ida B. Wells Housing Development and financed with donations.

Mrs. Dorothy Leavell has worked at the Crusader for more than fifty years and has been editor and publisher, for forty-seven years since the death of her late husband. The Chicago Crusader Newspaper and Mrs. Dorothy Leavell affectionately know to ''tell it like it is''. In 1941, the Chicago Crusader acquired the Gary Crusader and they are recognized as one of Chicago and Gary's most successful Black owned business enterprises.

The Chicago/Gary Crusader maintains its roots in the heart of the Black community with its headquarters being located in the 6400 Block of South King Drive in Chicago. Mrs. Dorothy Leavell is a stalwart member and leader of the National Newspaper Publishers Association, has served as Chairman of the National Black Chamber of Commerce, is a patron of the Arts and a Crusader for Civil Rights, equal opportunity and equal justice for all.

We salute you Chicago/Gary Crusader, we salute you Mrs. Dorothy Leavell, may you and the Crusader forever live.

HONORING YOUNTVILLE CEMETERY ASSOCIATION

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lee Hart and the Yountville Cemetery Association, caretakers for the George C. Yount Pioneer Cemetery in Napa County. The cemetery is named after George C. Yount, an early settler, who was also the first person to plant grapevines in the Napa Valley.

Yount himself was buried in the cemetery in 1865 before it was purchased by his son-in-law to be preserved for future generations. The Yountville Cemetery Association was created in 1892, and took on the responsibility for its upkeep and preservation. By 1959, California recognized the cemetery as a state historical landmark. The cemetery is the final resting place for over one hundred of our nation's veterans and their families, and also includes historic Native American burial grounds.

The association's all-volunteer staff continues to maintain the grounds year-round, along with responding to family requests and handling the few burials that still occur there each year. This year marks 150 years since Yount's passing and 50 years since Lee Hart joined the Association Board as its President.

Mr. Hart is a local historian and authority on Yount's history and has been volunteering at the George C. Yount Cemetery and Ancient Burial Grounds for 50 years. In 1965, the organization lacked organization and volunteers. Hart decided to help create a new board with by-laws and fifty years later continues volunteering. Hart was just 25 years old when he lost his parents three months apart in 1965. His mother's family, long time Yountville residents were buried in the Yountville Cemetery. As such, Hart made the decision to bury his parents in Yountville.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we honor Lee Hart and the Yountville Cemetery Association at this time. Their commitment to maintaining the George C. Yount Pioneer Cemetery has preserved an important part of Napa and California's history.

THE UNITED STATES' COMMITMENT TO FIGHT AGAINST VIOLENT EXTREMISTS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, April 2nd was expected to be just another day at Garissa University College in Kenya. But in the early morning hours, students awoke in terror as armed gunman stormed the campus. They claimed to be militants from Al-Qaeda's offshoot—Al-Shabaab.

The students' fate was determined by their religion. The terrorists allowed Muslims to leave and kept an unknown number of Christians hostage. After nearly 15 hours of fear, 147 people were killed.

Groups like Al-Shabaab, ISIS, Boko Haram, and many more allow for no compromise and are intent on spreading oppression and fear amongst those who do not share their ideology.

I commend the first responders and ordinary Kenyans who showed tremendous heroism that day, and my deepest condolences go out to the families and victims of this senseless attack.

H. Res. 213 reaffirms United States' commitment to the multilateral, global fight against violent extremists.

We must be vigilant in this fight, and we must allow for no compromise when there are threats to freedom.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING GRANGER MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Granger Middle School in Aurora, Illinois, for being named an Illinois Horizon School to Watch by the Association of Illinois Middle-Grade Schools.

The Association of Illinois Middle-Grade Schools recognizes educational programs that promote quality and fairness in order to provide educators, parents, and students with the best learning environment possible. Alongside the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grade Reform, the Association of Illinois Middle-Grade Schools designates certain institutions that fit these criteria as an Illinois Horizon School to Watch.

Granger Middle School was included for the second time on this list because the faculty, staff, and students have consistently demonstrated outstanding academic achievement, sensitivity to the needs of their students, and a commitment to creating equal opportunity in the classroom. Additionally, Granger Middle School's dedicated faculty and involved parents make them one of the best middle schools in the state of Illinois. These qualities create not only a terrific educational experience inside the classroom, but also produce a community that supports and encourages students long after their time at Granger is complete.

Congratulations to Granger Middle School for being named an Illinois Horizon School to Watch.

INTRODUCTION OF SIMON WIESENTHAL HOLOCAUST EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to introduce the Simon Wiesenthal Holocaust Education Assistance Act.

This important bill will support efforts around the country to increase awareness and understanding of the Holocaust through educational programs. States across the country encourage their schools to teach about the atrocities

of the Holocaust, and this bill will enhance these efforts through targeted grants to nonprofit educational organizations to support teacher training, student field trips, and the development of high-quality educational materials.

A Pew Research Center report published earlier this year found that the harassment of Jews worldwide reached a seven-year high in 2013, and violent anti-Semitic attacks across Europe last year highlight that intolerance persists even in the 21st century. Programs supported by this legislation will help students learn the consequences of intolerance to work towards unity and peace.

I hope my colleagues will join me to support the Simon Wiesenthal Holocaust Education Assistance Act.

IN RECOGNITION OF BOBBIE STEEVER, RECIPIENT OF THE GREATER WILKES-BARRE SALVATION ARMY OTHERS AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bobbie Steever, who is receiving the Greater Wilkes-Barre Salvation Army Others Award.

Since retiring from Bell of America in 1991, Mrs. Steever refused to let retirement slow her down. She has worked for several companies and organizations including Trade Eastern, Inc., Lewith & Freeman Real Estate, and Penn State Wilkes-Bane. Following her time at Penn State, she spent 15 years with TRR & Associates as a professional consultant in fundraising, events planning, and public relations. Today, she serves as the Executive Director of Community Services for TFP Limited, a real estate development and management company.

Driven by a genuine passion to serve others, Mrs. Steever's outreach to the community began many years ago serving as Chair of Bell's Community Relations Service Team. She has served as chair, board member, solicitor, and friend of several local non-profits, including the Osterhout Library, Back Mountain Memorial Library, Catherine McAuley House, Family Service Association of Wyoming Valley, Luzeme County Community College, Penn State Wilkes-Bane, Wyoming Valley United Way, Association for the Blind, American Heart Association, and the Salvation Army. In 2010, the Times Leader newspaper recognized Mrs. Steever as one of the Great Women of Northeast Pennsylvania for her accomplishments in the workplace and in her community.

Mrs. Steever also served with the Salvation Army's Wilkes-Barre Corps for nine years, where she repeatedly proved her ability to effectively orchestrate their Annual Community Award Dinners, raising approximately $1,300,000 for the Kirby Health Center Family House, a transitional housing program for homeless families.

It is a distinct honor to congratulate Bobbie Steever on receiving the Greater Wilkes-Barre Salvation Army Others Award, and I commend her for the many years of dedicated service she provided to our local community. Her work on behalf of others serves as an inspiration for all of us.

DEVELOPMENTS IN RWANDA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in 1994, the east African nation of Rwanda experienced one of the most horrific genocides in modern times. An estimated 800,000 Rwandans—mostly ethnic Tutsis and moderates among the ethnic Hutus were brutally murdered in a state-backed extermination campaign that lasted for months.

Hutu-Tutsi tensions date back to colonial times, when the Belgians created a superior class composed of Tutsis, shutting out Hutus from government jobs and higher education despite Hutus comprising about 85% of the population. In 1959 and 1960, tensions among the Hutus exploded in a campaign that left 20,000 Tutsis dead and created 300,000 Tutsi refugees.

As with this earlier genocide, the international community watched largely from the sidelines during the 1994 genocide in Rwanda as the death toll rose from April until July of that year until the Rwandan Patriotic Front or RPF defeated the Hutu-led government military. More than two million mostly-Hutu refugees flooded into the Democratic Republic of the Congo, leading to continuing problems in that country. The RPF-led Rwandan government has criticized the United Nations for sheltering Hutu participants in the genocide and for allowing them to arm in refugee camps.

Over the years, the RPF has used the guilt of the international community as a shield to prevent criticism of its action. U.N. Ambassador Samantha Power referred to Ambassador Susan Rice and her colleagues in the Clinton administration in the 1990s as Bystanders to Genocide. She quotes Rice in the 2002 book as saying, ''If we use the word 'genocide' and are seen as doing nothing, what will be the effect on the November congressional election?'' Part of Rice's team during those years was Gayle Smith, current nominee to head the U.S. Agency for International Development.

As far back as May 1998, I chaired a hearing that included testimony about the willful U.S. neglect in preventing the Rwandan genocide. As recounted in an issue of the New Yorker magazine at the time, a high-ranking Rwandan informant had warned the U.N. leadership, including Kofi Annan, and the United States about preparations for killings 3 months before they began. The recipients apparently did not act on that information.

Furthermore, the United States has been accused not merely of inaction, but also of obstructing preemptive multilateral efforts to quell the crisis. Some have alleged that, in the words of Refugees International president Lionel Rosenblatt, ''The ball was not only dropped by the United States, it was blocked by the United States.''

Paul Kagame, now President of Rwanda, was hailed as one of ''Africa's new leaders'' by Rice and her team during the 1990s, and there has been no apparent change in their high opinion of him since then despite what Deputy Assistant Secretary Robert Jackson describes as several public administration statements related to human rights concerns and ongoing dialogue with the Rwandan government.

Kagame has been considered a hero on the international stage, and has long been immune to public criticism. However, human rights reports about abuses in Rwanda have grown over the years. The most recent State Department human rights report about Rwanda accuses the government of ''targeting of political opponents and human rights advocates for harassment, arrest and abuse.'' Many observers note the constraints on freedom of expression that criminalizes public criticism of the RPF and its policies, as well as outlawing public discussion of ethnic issues. In that vein, the RPF has used charges of ''genocide ideology'' and ''divisionism'' as well as national security concerns, to justify prosecution of opposition political figures and journalists and prevent human rights organizations from reporting on events in their country.

In recent years, there are credible reports that the RPF government has commissioned assassins to kill dissidents living in exile who criticize the government or attempt to form political associations or parties.

Several years ago, our committee Chairman ED ROYCE was told by Paul Russessabegina of Hotel Rwanda fame that the Rwandan Government had targeted him and was behind several attempts on his life in Belgium.

In early 2014, former Rwandan intelligence chief Patrick Karegeya who had been living in exile in South Africa, was found murdered in his hotel room in Johannesburg.

Karegeya was one of two dissidents, one of the witnesses at a hearing I held yesterday—former Rwandan Major Robert Higiro—says he was asked to have killed. The assassination plot he revealed was investigated and substantiated in a series of articles in Canada's Globe and Mail newspaper, which interviewed Rwandan exiles in South Africa and Belgium.

Since 2012, I have chaired a series of hearings on the violence perpetrated by various militias in eastern DRC. Perhaps the best known of them, the so-called M23, was supported by Rwanda. This Congress has enacted restrictions on some military assistance to Rwanda in response to its involvement in militia activity in the DRC and involvement in resource smuggling from that country, as uncovered in several U.N. reports.

These charges of serious human rights and other abuses would be troubling in any case, but Rwanda is a country that has enjoyed significant U.S. and international support. By largely avoiding criticism of Rwandan human rights issues, the Bush and Obama administrations raised appropriations to Rwanda from $39 million in FY2003 to $188 million in FY2014. This largely has involved funding of health, food security and other socioeconomic projects, as well as support for Rwandan participation in international peacekeeping.

Rwanda is the sixth largest troop and police contributing country in the U.N., with more than 4,000 troops, more than 400 police, and 13 military observers in seven U.N. missions, including: the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID); the U.N. Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS); the U.N. Stabilization Mission in Haiti

(MINUSTAH); the U.N. Mission in Liberia (UNMIL); the U.N. Interim Security Force in Abyei (UNISFA); the U.N. Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI), and the U.N. Integrated Peace-building Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNIOGBIS).

Rwanda, due to donor aid, political stability and favorable investor policies, has grown by an average of 8% annually over the past decade. It is considered one of the recipient countries most able to achieve results from aid programs. Yet donors began reducing or redirecting funds in 2012 because of Rwanda's role in supporting M23. The growing reports of human rights abuses also are leading to greater caution among donor nations about directly supporting the Rwandan Government.

LONG TERM FUNDING FOR HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of a long-term surface transportation bill.

Right now Americans are looking to Congress for REAL bipartisan solutions to fund and upgrade our deteriorating infrastructure system. As hard as it may be, as uncomfortable and contentious as the debates may become, it's time to for us to move past the senseless chatter and to stop kicking the can down the road.

We must get serious about fixing America's infrastructure and establishing long-term funding for the Highway Trust Fund. This is not the time for partisan politics. We need to work together for the benefit of the men and women who sent us here.

Yesterday, the House passed a bill that was nothing more than another "Band-Aid" for a much larger problem. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that 1 out of every 9 bridges in the U.S. is structurally deficient, and gave our overall infrastructure a "D−."

An alarming 54 percent of all major U.S. roads are in poor or mediocre condition, and these roads account for 1 in 3 fatal traffic accidents. In my home state of Alabama alone, driving on roads in need of repair cost motorists $1.2 billion a year.

Now is the time for a lasting solution to this important issue. Yet, here we are, at the end of May, and we are no closer to crafting a long-term solution to invest in our roads, bridges, and rails than we were this time last year.

The benefits to investing in our highways, bridges, railroads, and other transit systems are clear. By building the infrastructure of tomorrow, we would create thousands of good-paying jobs that help more hard-working Americans earn a living.

A solid transportation system is necessary to quickly move goods, which will help further grow our economy. This is vital if America is to compete in the 21st century global marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to work together to develop a long-term plan that will improve our aging infrastructure, encourage job creation, and strengthen our nation's economic development.

IN HONOR OF SSGT MICHAEL WAYNE SCHAFER

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a real American Hero, SSGT Michael Schafer of the United States Army, 2nd BATTALION, 173 Airborne. Mike served in Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan. He received the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, and the Silver Star. Michael was killed in Oruzgan in combat on July 25, 2005 as part of a quick response team while helping fellow soldiers under fire. He is survived by his wife Danielle, son Devin, his mother Karen and step-father Daniel Barr, his father Mark Schafer, retired Navy of Williamsburg, his sister Sarah, and two brothers, Mark Shafer and Timothy Barr. Today and every day let us all remember all of those selfless heroes like Michael and their families who give that last full measure in the name of freedom. Michael wanted to become a Ranger, but due to a loss of hearing in combat, was told he should retire. Instead, he chose to return to his brothers in combat and died on his last tour. Albert Caswell penned the following poem, "Our America's Son", in honor of Michael Shafer this Memorial Day.

"Our, America's Son
this chosen one
Of warm heart and steal,
who to us all has so revealed
How it is on earth,
as it is in heaven as they will be done.
Who so gave that full measure.
The greatest of all possible treasures,
as did America's Son
As now we all so weep
As all in our heart's Michael you we keep,
oh so very deep.
As we remember what to all of us what you'd so teach
About life and death,
all in honor's quest . . . for all your brothers in arms you'd seek . . .
As you were a man of actions and deeds
All else supersedes
Could all our hearts as high yours exceed?
But for the greater good,
in all you could.
Now all in our grief.
Now all in our loss we seek.
Of such cost it reaps.
This pain to ease.
As to us now all so speaks.
For your life was Army Strong.
For magnificent men like you Mike,
all live ever after in history like a song.
Whose courage forever rings loud and long.
As but The Best of the Best.
Because moments are all we have.
Just minutes to turn good from bad.
And now we lay your fine body down to sleep.
All in our hearts now so very deep.
And across Williamsburg tonight
There comes a gentle rain
Comes our Lord's tears to so help to ease your families pain
To wash down upon you to remain
Until, once again up in Heaven you will all meet again,
and you won't have to cry no more
And hush little baby don't you cry,
because one day up in heaven you will look into your father's eyes
And remember he is with you this day by your side.
And you too Danielle his lovely wife, must somehow find the strength to start a new life
And all of his family find peace all in his light.
Now rest my son,
your war is over on earth, is done.
And rise up for your new battle begun.
As an Angel in the Army of our Lord
To watch over us ever more.
For Michael you are now so one.
At Ease, America's Son!"

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3201–S3252

Measures Introduced: Forty-six bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1409–1454, and S. Res. 183–187. **Pages S3237–38**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "Report on the Legislative Activities of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation During the 113th Congress". (S. Rept. No. 114–50)

Special Report entitled "Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016". (S. Rept. No. 114–55)

S. 143, to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes. (S. Rept. No. 114–51)

S. 808, to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment. (S. Rept. No. 114–52)

H.R. 615, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–53)

H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–54)

S. 335, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–56)

H.R. 2029, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–57)

S. Res. 87, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater cooperation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism.

S. 802, to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 1417, to reauthorize the United States Grain Standards Act. **Page S3236**

Measures Passed:

Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse: Committee on Environment and Public Works was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1690, to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse", and the bill was then passed. **Page S3249**

William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse: Senate passed S. 261, to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse. **Page S3249**

George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse: Senate passed S. 612, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse". **Page S3249**

New Mexico Navajo Water Settlement Technical Corrections Act: Senate passed S. 501, to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico. **Pages S3249–50**

National Foster Care Month: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 168, recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S3250**

Honoring Brave Young Men from Hawaii: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 109, acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific led to World War II, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S3250**

Perdue (for Schatz) Amendment No. 1437, to amend the preamble. **Pages S3250–51**

Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 185, recognizing the significance of May 2015 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States. **Page S3251**

National Public Works Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 186, designating the week of May 17 through May 23, 2015, as ''National Public Works Week''. **Page S3251**

National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 187, expressing support for the designation of the month of May 2015, as ''National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month''. **Page S3251**

Measures Considered:

USA Freedom Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2048, to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes. **Page S3201**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Saturday, May 23, 2015. **Page S3201**

Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1357, to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015. **Page S3201**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2048, to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes. **Page S3201**

Ensuring Tax Exempt Organizations the Right to Appeal Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of 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, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S3202–12, S3225–31**

Pending:

Hatch Amendment No. 1221, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3202**

Hatch (for Flake) Amendment No. 1243 (to Amendment No. 1221), to strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program. **Page S3202**

Hatch (for Inhofe/Coons) Modified Amendment No. 1312 (to Amendment No. 1221), to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to require the development of a plan for each sub-Saharan African country for negotiating and entering into free trade agreements. **Page S3202**

Hatch (for McCain) Amendment No. 1226 (to Amendment No. 1221), to repeal a duplicative inspection and grading program. **Page S3202**

Stabenow (for Portman) Amendment No. 1299 (to Amendment No. 1221), to make it a principal negotiating objective of the United States to address currency manipulation in trade agreements. **Page S3202**

Brown Amendment No. 1251 (to Amendment No. 1221), to require the approval of Congress before additional countries may join the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. **Page S3202**

Wyden (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 1227 (to Amendment No. 1221), to make trade agreements work for small businesses. **Page S3202**

Wyden (for Warren) Amendment No. 1327 (to Amendment No. 1221), to prohibit the application of the trade authorities procedures to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement that includes investor-state dispute settlement. **Page S3202**

Hatch Modified Amendment No. 1411 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 1299), of a perfecting nature. **Page S3202**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 62 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. 183), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion

to close further debate on Hatch Amendment No. 1221 (listed above). **Pages S3206–07**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Friday, May 22, 2015, and that all time during the adjournment of the Senate count post-cloture on the bill. **Page S3251**

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101–595, and further amended by Public Law 113–281, and upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Senator Wicker, and Senator Sullivan. **Page S3251**

Members of the Commission on Care: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 113–146, appointed the following individuals to serve as members of the Commission on Care: The Honorable Tom Coburn of Oklahoma, Stuart Hickey of Pennsylvania, and Thomas Harvey of New York. **Page S3251**

Congressional Award Board: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 96–114, as amended, appointed the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: Chiling Tong of Maryland. **Page S3251**

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appointed the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: Senator Ernst (Designee of the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services). **Page S3251**

Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C., sections 42 and 43, appointed the following Senators to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Senator Boozman, and Senator Perdue. **Page S3251**

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), appointed the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: Senator Gardner (Designee of the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services). **Page S3251**

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), appointed the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy: Senator Sullivan (Designee of the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services). **Page S3251**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By a unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. EX. 184), Jill N. Parrish, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah. **Page S3224**

By a unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. EX. 185), Jose Rolando Olvera, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas. **Page S3224**

Patricia D. Cahill, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020. **Page S3225**

Mark Scarano, of New Hampshire, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Northern Border Regional Commission. **Page S3225**

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

35 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S3223–25, S3248–49, S3252**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Stephen C. Hedger, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Luis A. Viada, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for a term expiring September 20, 2018.

Akhil Reed Amar, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2020.

Robert P. Zimmerman, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

Jessica Rosenworcel, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2015.

W. Thomas Reeder, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

Denise Turner Roth, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of General Services.

Edward L. Stanton III, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

Eric Steven Miller, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years.

Michael C. McGowan, of Delaware, to be United States Marshal for the District of Delaware, for the term of four years.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.
1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.
Routine lists in the Air Force and Coast Guard. **Pages S3251–52**

Messages from the House: **Page S3235**

Measures Referred: **Page S3235**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S3201–02, S3235–36**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S3236**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S3236–37**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3238–40**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3240–47**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3234–35**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S3247**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S3247–48**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S3248**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—185) **Page S3207, S3224**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 8:16 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, May 22, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3251.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "United States Grain Standards Act Reauthorization Act of 2015".

NOMINATION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Jeffrey Michael Prieto, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING AND 302(b) ALLOCATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill entitled, "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2016"; and

An original bill entitled, "Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016".

Also, committee completed its review of 302(b) subcommittee allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority allocated to the committee in S. Con. Res 11, 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.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN IRAQ AND SYRIA

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States policy in Iraq and Syria, after receiving testimony from General John M. Keane, USA (Ret.), former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, Frederick W. Kagan, American Enterprise Institute Criminal Threats Project, and Brian Katulis, Center for American Progress, all of Washington, D.C; and Colonel Derek J. Harvey, USA (Ret.), University of South Florida Global Initiative for Civil Society and Conflict, Riverview.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "The Financial Regulatory Improvement Act of 2015".

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, after the nominee, who was introduced by Representative Hahn, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

ENERGY LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining concluded a hearing to examine S. 160, and H.R. 373, to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, S. 365, to improve rangeland conditions and restore grazing levels within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Utah, S. 472, to promote conservation, improve public land, and provide for sensible development in Douglas County, Nevada, S. 583, to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, S. 814, to provide for the conveyance of

certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, S. 815, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and S. 1240, to designate the Cerro del Yuta and Rio San Antonio Wilderness Areas in the State of New Mexico, after receiving testimony from Senator Heller; Leslie Weldon, Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Timothy M. Murphy, Acting Assistant Director, National Conservation Lands and Community Partnerships, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Rick Johnson, Idaho Conservation League, Boise; and Brett Stevenson, Wood River Bicycle Coalition, Hailey, Idaho, on behalf of the International Mountain Bicycling Association.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 802, to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 87, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater cooperation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism;

The nominations of Charles C. Adams, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland, Cassandra Q. Butts, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, Paul A. Folmsbee, of Oklahoma, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, Stafford Fitzgerald Haney, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Costa Rica, Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, and Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service, all of the Department of State, Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 81 public bills, H.R. 2487–2567; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 49–51; and H. Res. 280–285 were introduced. **Pages H3557–62**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3564–65**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Graves (LA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3509**

SPACE Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 2262, to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, by a yea-and-nay vote of 284 yeas to 133 nays, Roll No. 262. **Pages H3511–34**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–17 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill. **Page H3521**

Agreed to:

Smith (TX) amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–127) that makes technical corrections and requires a GAO report on state and municipal spaceports in the existing indemnification regime; **Pages H3524–25**

Grijalva amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–127) that broadens the coverage of experimental permits to include suborbital launch vehicles to allow for non-revenue testing; **Page H3525**

Rohrabacher amendment (No. 3 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–127) that creates an independent

study regarding indemnification for spaceflight participants including options, unintended consequences, and potential costs; **Pages H3525–26**

Castro amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–127) that ensures the Orbital Traffic Management study includes input from nonprofit organizations that conduct research in space traffic and orbital activities; **Page H3526**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 5 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–127) that facilitates outreach to minority-and women-owned businesses on business opportunities in the commercial space industry; and **Pages H3526–27**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 6 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–127) that facilitates the participation of HBCU, Hispanic Serving Institutions; National Indian institutions, in fellowships, work-study and employment opportunities in the emerging commercial space industry. **Pages H3527–28**

Rejected:

Edwards amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 7 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–127) that sought to substitute the text of S. 1297, a bipartisan Senate companion of this legislation (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 261). **Pages H3528–33**

H. Res. 273, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2262) and (H.R. 880), was agreed to on Wednesday, May 20th.

Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 274, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, by a yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 174 nays, Roll No. 263. Consideration began yesterday, May 20th. **Pages H3534–35**

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure—Communication: Read a letter from Chairman Shuster wherein he transmitted copies of resolutions to consider 2 building project survey resolutions and 1 resolution, included in the General Services Administration's FY2015 Capital Investment and Leasing Programs. The resolutions were adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on May 20, 2015. **Pages H3535–44**

Extending the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, and making certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 2496, to extend the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, and to make certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014. **Pages H3546–47**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, May 22. **Page H3547**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow, May 22. **Page H3556**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3533, H3534, H3534–35. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 6, the "21st Century Cures Act". H.R. 6 was ordered reported, as amended.

WHAT ARE THE STATE GOVERNMENTS DOING TO COMBAT THE OPIOID ABUSE EPIDEMIC?

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "What are the State Governments Doing to Combat the Opioid Abuse Epidemic?". Testimony was heard from Jerome Adams, M.D., Health Commissioner, Indiana State Department of Health; Monica Bharel, M.D., Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Public Health; Mark Stringer, Director, Division of Behavioral Health, Missouri Department of Mental Health; and Larry Wolk, M.D., Executive Director and Chief Medical Officer, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

A DANGEROUS NEXUS: TERRORISM, CRIME, AND CORRUPTION

Committee on Financial Services: Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing held a hearing entitled "A Dangerous Nexus: Terrorism, Crime, and Corruption". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1853, to direct the President to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan in the International Criminal Police Organization,

and for other purposes; H.R. 2100, the ''Girls Count Act of 2015''; H.R. 2323, the ''United States International Communications Reform Act of 2015''; H. Res. 213, condemning the April 2015 terrorist attack at the Garissa University College in Garissa, Kenya, and reaffirming the United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and for other purposes; and H. Res. 235, expressing deepest condolences to and solidarity with the people of Nepal following the devastating earthquake on April 25, 2015. The following legislation was ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1853, H.R. 2100, and H. Res. 213. The following legislation was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 2323, and H. Res. 235.

ISSUES FACING CIVILIAN AND POSTAL SERVICE VEHICLE FLEET PROCUREMENT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled ''Issues Facing Civilian and Postal Service Vehicle Fleet Procurement''. Testimony was heard from Joseph Corbett, Chief Financial Officer and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service; William Toth, Jr., Director, Office of Motor Vehicle Management, General Services Administration; and Lori Rectanus, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 475, the ''GI Bill Processing Improvement Act of 2015''; H.R. 571, the ''Veterans Affairs Retaliation Prevention Act of 2015''; H.R. 675, the ''Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2015''; H.R. 1575, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the pilot program on counseling in retreat settings for women veterans newly separated from service in the Armed Forces; H.R. 1607, the ''Ruth Moore Act of 2015''; and H.R. 2256, the ''Veterans Information Modernization Act''. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 475, H.R. 571, H.R. 675, H.R. 1607, and H.R. 2256. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1575.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 22, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Friday, May 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 1314, Ensuring Tax Exempt Organizations the Right to Appeal Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2:30 p.m., Friday, May 22

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 2:30 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Alma S., N.C., E772
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E772
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E771, E773, E777
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E771, E787
Castor, Kathy, Fla., E769
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E771
Costa, Jim, Calif., E785
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E773
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E783, E786
Davis, Rodney, Ill., E779
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E781
Edwards, Donna F., Md., E776
Emmer, Tom, Minn., E774
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E783
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E777, E777
Foster, Bill, Ill., E780, E786
Gabbard, Tulsi, Hawaii, E775
Green, Al, Tex., E775
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E782
Hahn, Janice, Calif., E776
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E772
Hice, Jody B., Ga., E773
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E769
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E774, E783
Jenkins, Evan H., W.Va., E772
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E779
Kato, John, N.Y., E779, E781
Kildee, Daniel T., Mich., E770
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E785
Larson, John B., Conn., E769
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E772
Long, Billy, Mo., E780
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E770, E775, E786
Marino, Tom, Pa., E781
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E770
Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E771, E776, E783, E785
Peters, Scott H., Calif., E780
Pitts, Joseph R., Pa., E779
Poe, Ted, Tex., E781, E786
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E773
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E782
Reichert, David G., Wash., E780
Rice, Kathleen M., N.Y., E769
Roby, Martha, Ala., E777
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E775
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E775
Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'', Va., E784
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E784
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E788
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E770
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E782, E787
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E781, E785, E786
Tsongas, Niki, Mass., E778
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E780
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E778
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E788

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.