United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 2015 No. 88

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 SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 3, 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.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

HONORING BRENT WINN LAYTON

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to acknowledge and honor the life of a personal friend and Gold Star Father Brent Winn Layton. The beloved father, son, brother, and uncle died unexpectedly at the age of 47 on Saturday, May 23, 2015, in Longmont, Colorado.

Brent was born on October 23, 1967, in Berkeley, California, to Shirley Hughes and A. Winn Layton. Although Brent lived in many cities throughout his life, he was a longtime resident of the Escalon area and considered it home.

Brent was a very gifted man with many levels. He served as a deputy sheriff in Kern County, California, and Clark County, Arkansas. He also served as a peace officer for the Escalon Police Department. In addition to his commitment to law enforcement, Brent was committed to God. He was a very spiritual man and found great comfort in his faith.

Unfortunately, in 2009, Brent became a Gold Star Father when his firstborn son, James, was killed in action in Kunar province, Afghanistan, serving during Operation Enduring Freedom. Since then, Brent's mission in life was to embrace other Gold Star families and help them through the grieving process.

Brent had many friends that loved him, and he had a heart full of love for them. His laugh, his sense of humor, and his big bear hugs will be missed forever. In addition, his friends and family admired his honest pride in his Cherokee Nation citizenship and will miss listening to him play guitar. There is peace in knowing that he is now with his son as well as the family and friends that have gone before him.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing Brent for his friendship, faith, and unwavering support for other military families. He had a genuine love for people, community, and country and will be missed by many. God bless him always.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week, we started the 33rd extension of the highway spending program. The 33rd time that we failed to deal meaningfully with the crisis in funding our transportation system. It is a symbol of Congress' failure to deal with a country that is falling apart and falling behind.

No country became great building its infrastructure 7 months at a time.

It prompts silly ideas. One recently, an op-ed page of The Wall Street Journal, talks about ''Taxing for Highways, Paying for Bike Lanes'' as the problem. Well, as is pointed out in letters to the editor today, it is not spending on bike paths which Dr. Pete Ruane, head of the American Road & Transportation Builders Association, pointed out is about 1 percent of the total Federal transportation highway budget, if you include sidewalks as well.

No, the problem is that we are paying for 2015 infrastructure with 1993 dollars. We have not raised the gas tax in 22 years. Now, I would suggest that what we ought to do is to look at the broad coalition that is represented by the authors on that page from the roadbuilders and the cyclists—they are representative of the broadest coalition on any issue in American politics today—from the AFL–CIO to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the truckers—represented eloquently by Governor Bill Graves, who is not just president of the American Trucking Associations, he was the Republican Governor of Kansas who raised the gas tax not once, but twice.

There is an opportunity for us to break the logjam. I would suggest that maybe the House Ways and Means Committee could, for the first time in the 55 months that the Republicans have been in charge, actually meet to discuss transportation funding. That is our job.

Let's dedicate an entire week to solving this problem. Let's invite in representatives of that broad coalition: people who build, maintain, and use our transportation system. Let's hear from the six Republican States that already this year have raised the gas tax,

Printed on recycled paper.

red Republican States: Utah; Georgia; South Dakota; Idaho; Iowa; and, most recently, Nebraska, where the legislature overrode the Governor's veto to raise their gas tax.

It is time for Congress to do its job and to be in partnership with those States who expect us to maintain the Federal responsibility. Let's hear from the broad array of people and then allow the Ways and Means Committee to follow regular order.

There is more support for raising the gas tax. The public is already paying the price. The bill I have, which would provide 210 billion additional dollars over the next decade, would cost the average motorist just about $90 a year. At a time of declining gas prices, that is not that great, but motorists are now paying $350 a year on average in damage to their cars. The country paid $125 billion in the cost of congestion.

Let's stop beating around the bush. Let's pass the first 6-year transportation reauthorization, the first since 1998. The first step is for the Ways and Means Committee to do its job, bring these people in, work together on a bipartisan basis, raise the gas tax, index the gas tax, then abolish the gas tax, replace it with something that is sustainable.

In the meantime, let's rebuild and renew America and put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs while we strengthen communities from coast to coast.

HOLDING THE VA ACCOUNTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our veterans.

Memorial Day was just this past weekend, and we honored those who paid the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation.

This weekend also, veterans from around our great country journeyed here to our Nation's Capital to visit the monuments that were publicly erected in their honor. I am so proud that a group of over 60 veterans living in south Florida—including David Millan, Don Lowe, and Augustine Fernandez—were able to make the trip on the first-ever Honor Flight from Miami International Airport, located in my congressional district.

They, like all veterans, are true American patriots, courageous and brave, putting others before themselves, willing to stand up and fight for our Nation's ideals and for the spread of freedom, peace, and prosperity abroad. That is who they are. It is in their DNA.

My family and I, we know the sacrifice and the courage and the resolve that is required to dedicate one's life to the service of our country. My husband, Dexter, proudly served in Vietnam as a U.S. Army Ranger, earning a Purple Heart. My stepson, Douglas, and his wife, Lindsay, both served tours of duty as Active Duty Marine Corps aviators in Iraq, with Lindsay also having served in Afghanistan. They are still serving our Nation as Marine reservists.

I could not be prouder of them and their fellow veterans and have the highest respect for the families and caregivers who support our vets after they return home from their missions. I recognize that we can never repay our veterans in full for their contributions, but we must certainly try. I would like to think that all Americans feel the same way.

A key part of our Nation's commitment to our veterans has always been providing them with quality health care, especially with respect to injuries suffered in the line of duty; but, more than a year after the most recent VA health system scandal rocked this administration and forced the replacement of a Cabinet Secretary, the VA's commitment on health care continues to fall tragically short.

A year later, the number of patients facing long wait times is still the same, and somehow, the number of patients waiting more than 90 days has actually doubled. A year later, the VA health system continues to fail our veterans. We know that these veterans have the right stuff, the selflessness, the courage, and the pride that they demonstrate in defense of the American way of life; but what must they think of our government now?

Unconscionably long wait times, bureaucratic mismanagement, top-down rationed care are all well below the bare minimum standards any American should expect; yet this is exactly what the VA, under this administration, continues to offer our veterans.

At least this Congress has pushed for reform, for access, for choice. In the last year, we have passed laws that set out to improve access for veterans seeking medical care and mental health services. Congress also provided the VA with $16 billion to shorten wait times and improve healthcare quality.

I have joined many of my colleagues to demand that the VA publicly release the findings of 140 internal healthcare investigations conducted since 2006 to enforce accountability at the VA. I have also joined a bipartisan contingent of my House colleagues to offer to help the VA staff focus on providing health care by allowing congressional staff to serve as the primary point of contact for veterans asking about their claims and their long appointment times.

Over and over again, Congress' efforts have been met by a stubborn bureaucracy that looks to skirt legislative intent on expanding veterans access and choice and reforming the way that the VA health system does its business.

I am committed to holding the VA under this administration responsible for the continued failings of our VA health system, and I will continue to fight alongside my colleagues in Congress for the reforms that will provide our veterans with the quality health care they deserve.

We know that our veterans should not have to wait another year. The time is long past; the time is now. The next time that south Florida residents come to D.C. on Honor Flights to visit their war memorials, they will truly know that our Nation honors their service by providing quality health care at all of our VA facilities.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for allowing me to precede them.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida. Of course, I am always glad to hear her speak on the floor. I wanted her to know that.

Mr. Speaker, we are now less than a month from the deadline for Congress to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

In 2012, this House came together under the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Cantor, who worked with my office, and we put a bill on the floor that reauthorized the Bank and increased its lending authority with a bipartisan vote of 330–93. This should not be and is not a partisan issue.

Helping small- and medium-sized American businesses access new overseas markets and compete on a level playing field is something that Democrats and Republicans have long agreed that Congress ought to do.

That is why it is deeply concerning to read comments from Majority Leader MCCARTHY that Congress should ''wind down'' the Bank and allow its charter to expire. That, in my view, is a minority opinion on the floor of this House, and that would be a profound mistake.

□ 1015

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that helps our businesses compete successfully in global markets. We are going to talk about trade, apparently, next week, but what we need to make sure is that we can export goods that are made in America, that we will make in America, and that we will sell abroad. The Export-Import Bank facilitates that effort. It is a critical tool that helps businesses compete successfully in global markets.

Last year alone, it supported $27.5 billion in export activity. About 90 percent of its transactions support thousands of small businesses that otherwise would have difficulty accessing markets.

The Ex-Im Bank has supported 1.3 million private sector jobs since our economic recovery began, including 164,000 jobs just last year, and it does all this without costing the taxpayers

a single cent. In fact, it brought $675 million in profits to the Treasury last year and more than $2 billion over the past two decades. We cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, to let the bank expire.

Even more than just preventing a lapse, we ought to be providing exporters and potential exporters with certainty by enacting a multiyear reauthorization.

With the Export-Import Bank's future uncertain, businesses that could be reaching new customers abroad have been holding back making investments in growth that would create more jobs here at home. We are going to hear a lot about jobs here at home next week as we debate the fast-track authority. This deals with jobs here in America. With the Export-Import Bank's future uncertain, we are seeing uncertainty in the marketplace.

A multiyear extension and an increase in the bank's lending authority would give a green light to these businesses that it is time to invest and expand.

We all talk about investing. We all talk about expanding jobs. I want to quote: ''There are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear.'' Let me repeat that for my colleagues. ''There are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear.'' Those are not my words. That is a quote. They are the words of Speaker JOHN BOEHNER on April 30 of this year, just a few weeks ago.

He is not the only Republican who wants to save the bank. Representative STEPHEN FINCHER, Republican of Tennessee, has said that ''a majority of RSC members support the bank's reauthorization.'' RSC members are amongst the most conservative members of their party in this House. In fact, there are 59 cosponsors on Mr. FINCHER's bill. They are Republicans.

All of my party, the last time we reauthorized it and this time, will vote to create jobs in America by voting for the Export-Import Bank. Now, we have 188 members. You don't have to be much of a mathematician to know if you have 188 and 60, that is 248. All you need is 218 to pass the bill.

The Speaker has said he wants to let the House work its will. He said that in 2011 when he became Speaker. And he said the House works best when the House can work its will. If we bring the Export-Import Bank bill to the floor, it will pass. Together with 180 Democrats, or 188—180 who have sponsored the 7-year reauthorization bill introduced by Ms. WATERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HECK, and myself—it is clear that a majority of the House supports a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, we should act. We should act now before we find ourselves at the eleventh hour, before the June 30 deadline. Now, we have just seen shutting down the security apparatus to protect America for a couple of days. Let's not put at risk the economic security of our country.

Governors of both parties from across the country have written in support of taking action. Business leaders, the Chamber of Commerce, and organizations like the National Association of Manufacturers have all asked Congress to reauthorize the bank. There are now just 13 legislative days until the deadline by which we must do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our Speaker, I ask our majority leader, let the House work its will and vote on a multiyear reauthorization that will restore certainty for thousands of small businesses. Help them compete in new markets. Support the growth of good jobs here in our country, and contribute to deficit reduction. There will be a lot of debate next week about jobs. The Speaker believes that we will lose jobs if we don't pass the Export-Import Bank reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leader, bring the Export-Import Bank reauthorization bill to the floor. It will pass. It will be good for America. It will be good for Americans. It will be good for our economy. Pass this bill.

REFOCUSING ON THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks 1 year since the Veterans Affairs Secretary, Eric Shinseki, resigned amid a scandal that shook this country to its core. When President Obama reluctantly accepted Secretary Shinseki's resignation, he had a lot to say about his commitment to fix the VA and where the buck stops. He said: ''We're going to do right by our veterans across the board, as along as it takes.'' And then: ''This is my administration. I always take responsibility for whatever happens.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, a lot has happened over the past year, and here are some of the highlights:

Last June, reports emerged that patient scheduling manipulation had been particularly egregious inside the central Alabama VA. During a meeting to discuss these findings, the director of the central Alabama VA led me to believe that appropriate action had been taken to remove the employees that were responsible for this. That wasn't true.

So I began to dig a little bit deeper into the problems, working with very courageous whistleblowers and the press to uncover major instances of misconduct, negligence, and mismanagement inside the central Alabama VA. What we were able to expose was more than 1,000 patient x rays, some showing problems, went missing for months and years. A pulmonologist was called, not once but twice, for falsifying more than 1,200 patient records but somehow given a satisfactory review. An employee took a recovering veteran to a crack house, bought him drugs and prostitutes, all to extort his veteran's benefits. When caught, that employee, as extraordinary as this is, was never fired. Not until a year and a half later, when it was reported in the press and exposed publicly, did the VA take action.

What else happened last year? Congress passed a historic VA reform law providing unprecedented authority for holding employees accountable. The director of the central Alabama VA who lied to me became the first manager fired under the new reform law. Other managers were also removed, and the southeast regional director quietly retired when an investigation into central Alabama VA was expanded at my request to include him.

So again, a lot has happened over the past year. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that hasn't happened over the past year.

Improvement to access for patient care, the one thing that we really need for our veterans, hasn't happened. It really hasn't happened nationally, and certainly it hasn't happened in central Alabama. In fact, VA medical centers in Montgomery and Tuskegee were recently identified number one and number two, respectively, the worst hospitals in the Nation for extended delays in patient appointment completions. The first and the second worst hospitals in the country are in the central Alabama VA.

A workload report at the end of April showed that more than 6,500 consults over 90 days were still pending, including more than half awaiting approval for non-VA care. So not enough improvement has happened where it matters most for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't mention some of the progress the central Alabama VA has made. What was a major staff shortage is beginning to be filled, and that includes the mental health side. I appreciate very much the new acting director of the region, Tom Smith, keeping me updated on the latest. I am grateful for him stepping into this important role in a difficult situation, trying to rebuild, trying to rebuild some of the trust that has been lost.

As I have told him, the progress isn't enough. One reason I believe it isn't enough is that Washington has demonstrated something of a short attention span when it comes to these problems. We got their attention last year and a lot of nice promises have been made in terms of the national VA's commitment to improve in central Alabama, but once our problems leave the front page, there hasn't been sufficient follow-up. Mr. Speaker, maybe that is because we are depending on a broken bureaucracy to fix itself. Maybe it is because we have been asking VA leaders to intervene rather than requiring them to intervene. Maybe it is time that we change that.

You know, when a public school continues to fail to meet basic standards, what happens? The State Department of Education comes in to take over and

start to turn the place around. It is a process that isn't pleasant, but everyone from principals to teachers to students to parents, they understand the consequences of the failure of that school system to improve. I believe that we need a similar mechanism at the VA when medical centers continue to fail our veterans. That is why I am preparing legislation that will allow the Washington VA to do that.

My constituents, my veterans in Alabama, are getting the worst healthcare services that this country could provide. They deserve better.

TEXAS AND THE IMMIGRATION DEBATE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. What does that bumper sticker say? ''Don't mess with Texas.'' Well, I am about to not follow that advice.

You see, Texas has put itself front and center in the national debate over immigration and is leading the way among the 26 States suing the Federal Government to stop the lawful and sensible executive actions introduced by the President. The court case that has gotten so much national attention is Texas v. The United States.

The 25 other States with Republican Governors and attorneys general who are suing the country play second fiddle to Texas. A week ago, in the Fifth Circuit in New Orleans, a three-judge panel issued a split decision. They did not issue a stay to the injunction of the President's executive actions imposed by a lower court, you guessed it, in Texas. Two out of three judges ruled that Texas would likely be found to have standing to bring the lawsuit because Texas would have to issue more driver's licenses to long-term Texas residents.

Now, please note that we are not talking about free driver's licenses. We are talking about driver's licenses at the same cost everyone else pays. As a matter of fact, they could raise the price of the driver's licenses. Somehow, having more licensed drivers who can drive legally in Texas and across the country and who know the rules of the road is an unreasonable burden on the State of Texas, according to the politicians who run the State.

So Texas is holding up the implementation of the program around the country for as many as 4 million people who live in American families. Who would these licensed drivers be? They would be immigrants who have U.S. citizen children. They would have lived and worked in American neighborhoods for years, shopped at the same grocery stores, and taken their kids to the same parks and schools as citizens do. They would have submitted their fingerprints for a criminal background check at their own expense.

So while most Americans no longer believe we should be trying to deport all 11 million undocumented immigrants, and especially not those with deep roots in the U.S. with families, the politicians who run the State of Texas believe we should.

Lived in the U.S. for 5 years or more? 10? 15? Driving to work anyway? Own a business that employs citizens? Too bad. The Republican leaders in Texas do not want you to be able to work on the books, pay your full share of local and Federal taxes, and pay for a driver's license so you could drive legally. No. That would be a burden.

□ 1030

Reality and Texas should really get to know one another.

Now, let's remember that this is the same set of Texas politicians—including the Governor and some Republican Members of Congress—who are reluctant to tell some of their voters that no, in fact, President Obama does not have a secret plan to use Walmart department stores as internment camps for gunowners, which is the latest conspiracy theory promoted by Chuck Norris.

We can all get a chuckle about Operation Jade Helm—the alleged U.S. military invasion of Texas—but it is not as funny when we begin to realize that for many Republicans in the Republican Party in Texas, crazy is a constituency that must be dealt with delicately.

So I want to end by speaking directly to the millions of families who are waiting for Texas politicians and judges to stop the delay tactics.

And I will use the language many of them speak and which God understands as well, or at least I assume he speaks Spanish because he named his only son Jesus.

I will summarize my remarks first in English.

The message is that we will not give up hope and cannot stop pushing for the implementation of the President's executive actions just because politicians have prevented something important from happening—again.

That is why I am inviting people in Chicago to join me on Saturday in Little Village so we can renew our commitment to prepare ourselves for DACA and DAPA.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Don't give up.

There are Republican politicians in Texas and elsewhere trying to block our way towards implementation of DACA and DAPA and they want us to lose heart, lose patience, and lose our resolve.

But we must stay strong and prepare ourselves and our brothers and sisters and our neighbors to be ready when—eventually—the court rules in favor of America's immigrants.

I will continue fighting and I need your help. If you live in Chicago come join us on Saturday morning in Little Village at Iglesia Santa Inez de Bohemia.

And wherever you live, continue fighting and preparing your neighbors and yourselves to keep our families together and make sure we are not deporting those who are assets to our country.

¡No se rinden!

Hay politícos republicanos en Tejas y en otros lugares tratando de bloquear nuestro camino hacia la implementación de DACA y DAPA y quieren hacernos perder la esperanza, perder la paciencia y perder nuestra determinación.

Pero hay que permanecer fuertes y preparándonos a nosotros mismos, a nuestros hermanos y hermanas y a nuestros vecinos para estar listos cuando la corte finalmente resuelva a favor del Presidente y de los inmigrantes en Estados Unidos.

Voy a seguir luchando y necesito su ayuda. Si usted vive en Chicago venga y únase a nosotros el sábado en la mañana en la Iglesia de Santa Inés de Bohemia en La Villita.

Y dondequiera que ustedes vivan, sigan luchando y preparando a sus vecinos y a ustedes mismos para mantener a nuestras familias unidas y asegurarnos de que no estemos deportando aquellos que son un gran valor a nuestro país.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks.

BERTIE'S RESPECT FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES ACT

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

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, our national military cemeteries are hallowed ground. And I ask my colleagues to agree and support my bill, H.R. 2490, Bertie's Respect for National Cemeteries Act.

On October 15, 1969, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, a man named George Emery Siple shot and killed Bertha Smith, known to everyone as ''Bertie.'' Siple was convicted of the murder and sentenced to life in prison without parole. Thirty years later, he died in prison. Because he was a military veteran, he was buried in Indiantown Gap National Cemetery in 1999.

He was buried there despite a Federal law that was passed in 1997. That law said that veterans convicted of Federal or State capital crimes are not permitted to be buried in Veterans Affairs national cemeteries or Arlington National Cemetery.

For Bertie Smith's family, this is a heart-wrenching situation that has gone on for three decades. Jackie Katz, Bertie's daughter, has called it ''hell'' and a ''horror'' to live with the fact that George Siple was memorialized and buried with full military honors.

When I first began to look into this issue, it was clear to me that it was as frustrating as it was heartbreaking.

Back in 1997, led by our Pennsylvania Senators, Congress passed a law that

said that veterans found guilty of capital crimes could not be buried in our national veterans cemeteries. At the time, you may remember, the country was still reeling from the Oklahoma City bombing. And veterans everywhere were justifiably appalled that Timothy McVeigh, a military veteran, could be buried with full military honors.

Now, McVeigh did not receive that burial. But a major problem we discovered was that the law was not actively enforced for others until 2006.

Since then, the VA has relied on an ''honor system,'' which requires family members to willingly report their relative's criminal record.

In 2013, Congress once again sought to protect our VA national cemeteries by passing a law to explicitly allow the VA to remove veterans from cemeteries if they had been convicted of a Federal or State capital crime. However, this law does not extend to veterans buried between 1997 and 2013, a time period that includes George Emery Siple.

That is why I have introduced Bertie's Respect for National Cemeteries Act. What this law will do is require Veterans Affairs to take every reasonable action to ensure that a veteran is eligible to be buried, including searching public criminal records. It will clarify Congress' original intent by providing Veterans Affairs the explicit authority to remove veterans convicted of capital crimes who were wrongly buried after 1997. And it will specifically provide for the removal of George Emery Siple from Indiantown Gap National Cemetery.

This bill really only reaffirms what Congress intended in the first place. And it enjoys the support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

There were precedents for the removal of convicted murderers from veterans cemeteries—from Arlington National Cemetery and VA cemeteries in Michigan and Oregon, to name just a few.

Additionally, nothing in the bill would withdraw previous military honors, such as Purple Hearts or medals for valor, otherwise earned by the deceased veterans.

The discussion of military veterans who have been convicted of murder often raises the issue of mental health treatment and posttraumatic stress disorder. There is no question that PTSD is a real condition affecting many servicemen and -women, and I have always stood for funding the evaluation and treatment of those who may be afflicted.

That said, those who have been convicted of capital murder by our judicial system have been declared guilty of the worst offense possible, and any mitigating factors would have been considered at trial and sentencing.

I don't think it is too much to say that murderers should not be buried next to true American heroes. And the memories of victims like Bertie Smith should not be disregarded.

I ask my colleagues for their support in saying that real, true honor really means something in our national military cemeteries.

HONORING OFFICER GREGG BENNER OF THE RIO RANCHO POLICE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Gregg Benner of the Rio Rancho Police Department, who was killed in the line of duty on May 25.

I offer my heartfelt condolences to the family and loved ones of Officer Benner as they mourn the loss of a husband, father, grandfather, and friend who was taken from them far too soon.

Officer Benner dedicated his life to protecting his community and his country. From his career in the United States Air Force to his last 4 years serving as a member of the Rio Rancho Police Department, Officer Benner put his health and safety on the line to make us safer.

The same was true last week. When most of us were settling down after a long Memorial Day weekend with family and friends, Officer Benner was doing his duty to protect the people of Rio Rancho. When he didn't return that evening, Officer Benner left behind a legacy of valor of service.

The loss of any police officer is a painful reminder of the dangers that they face each and every day. While we are shaken by Officer Benner's loss, we can take comfort in the memories that he left behind for all who knew him and the example that he set for all those in the community.

Rio Rancho is a tight-knit community, and while a tragedy such as this is unexpected and shocking, the response has brought out the best of its residents, who have displayed an outpouring of support and sympathy. My thoughts and prayers are with Officer Benner's family, friends, fellow officers, and the entire Rio Rancho community, and I hope that they find peace in this most difficult time.

Officer Benner, thank you for your service, and may you rest in peace.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, costs simply explode on anything that the Federal Government subsidizes because there are simply not the same incentives or pressures to hold down costs as there are in the private sector.

Over the last several weeks, many thousands of young people have graduated from our colleges and universities burdened with sizable student loan debts.

It shocks the students of today when I tell them that tuition cost only $90 a quarter my freshman year at the University of Tennessee in 1965–66—$270 for a whole school year. I once heard House Minority Whip STENY HOYER say it cost only $87 a semester when he started at the University of Maryland.

Students today think the Federal student loan program is one of the best things that ever happened to them. Actually, it may be one of the worst. Until that program started in the mid-1960s, college tuition and fees went up very slowly, roughly at the rate of inflation.

After the Federal Government decided to ''help'' students and start subsidizing these costs, tuition and fees started going up three or four times the rate of inflation almost every year.

Last year, columnist Kathleen Parker wrote in The Washington Post that since 1985, the cost of higher education has increased 538 percent, while the Consumer Price Index—inflation—over the same period has gone up 121 percent.

Colleges and universities were able to tamp down opposition to fee increases by telling students not to worry, they could just borrow the money.

When I was an undergraduate at UT and later in law school at George Washington, students could work part time, as I always did, and pay all their college expenses. No one got out of school with a debt because of tuition and fees. Now almost everyone does.

Now, 40 million Americans owe money on student loans. Outstanding student loan debts now total over $1.3 trillion. Some analysts think it may be a bubble about to burst.

Floyd Norris, writing in the International New York Times, said: ''Student loans are creating large problems that may persist for decades. They will impoverish some borrowers and serve as a drain on economic activity.''

Hedge fund manager James Altucher wrote that ''we're graduating a generation of indentured students.''

Ohio University economist Richard Vedder several years ago wrote a book entitled, ''Going Broke by Degree.''

Richard Vedder, in an article last August, wrote that ''a political storm is brewing in Washington over the consequences of rising college costs.'' He added that ''the biggest single cause of this financial problem, and a contributor to many other weaknesses in our economy, is the dysfunctional, Byzantine system of Federal financial assistance for college students.''

Mr. Vedder pointed out that before the late 1970s, Federal financial aid programs for colleges were modest in size, and tuition went up an average of only 1 percent above the inflation rate.

''Since 1978,'' he wrote, ''in an era of rapidly growing Federal financial assistance programs, annual tuition increases have been 3 to 4 percent a year beyond the inflation rate.''

In 1987, William Bennett, the Secretary of Education, said: ''Increases in

financial aid have enabled colleges and universities to raise their tuition, confident that Federal loan subsidies will help cushion the increase.''

From 1939–1964, Federal student aid—mainly the GI bill—averaged just 2.5 percent of university spending.

From 2002–2014, Federal student loan aid spending averaged a whopping 33 percent of university spending.

Several things, Mr. Speaker, could and should be done to start helping solve this problem.

First, Federal and State legislators, parents, and even students themselves should speak out against tuition increases higher than the rate of inflation.

Secondly, colleges and universities that hold these increases down, or hopefully someday even lower their costs, should be given priority and rewarded in Federal and State grants and appropriations.

Third, the Congress and State legislatures should hold hearings that feature people who have been victimized by taking on heavy student loan debts at the start of their careers.

Fourth, every college or university that receives Federal money—99.9 percent—should be required to give financial counseling or at least some type of simple, easy-to-understand document to every person receiving a student loan warning about potential problems.

□ 1045

Lastly, but most important of all, Federal and State governments should give incentives to schools that require professors to teach classes rather than writing for obscure journals or doing esoteric research that produces no tangible results.

Too many professors have lost their desire to teach. They seem to think 6 hours a week is heavy load. The result is that too many students cannot get the classes they need to graduate, and it is now taking 5 or 6 years to get a 4-year degree.

This is a very serious, fast-growing problem, Mr. Speaker, that needs major reforms sooner rather than later.

PRIORITIZING ONLINE THREAT ENFORCEMENT ACT

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, imagine waking up every morning with the dread that you will face hundreds of violent threats as soon as you get to work.

Imagine that, while you are in your office, people threaten to sexually assault you, and they know where you live, when you are home, and who your family members are. Maybe they even show you the weapon they will use in the future to harm you. We would never tolerate this in our offices, but this is a daily reality for women online.

Right now, millions of women and girls are online, navigating their personal and professional lives; yet women will be targeted with the most severe types of online threats and harassment at a rate 27 times higher than that of men. Although these threats occur online, there is nothing virtual about their devastating impacts on women's lives.

Meet Jessica Valenti, a journalist who founded a site that features topics like women in the media, women's health, and LGBT rights. The price Jessica pays for creating this forum and expressing a feminist point of view on the Internet is an unrelenting barrage of rape and death threats.

After threats forced her to leave her home, to change her bank accounts, and to change her phone number, she contacted the FBI. The FBI advised her to never walk outside by herself and to leave her home until the threats blow over. The threats continue today, 4 years later.

In Pennsylvania, a women described her terror after her abuser announced on Facebook that he planned to tie her up, put her in a trunk, pull out her teeth one by one, and then her nails, chop her into pieces, but keep her alive long enough to feel the pain.

Then there is the story of my constituent, Brianna Wu, a video game developer who had to flee her home with her family in the middle of the night after specific threats to rape and to kill her and her husband. Her online attackers released her home address and described in graphic detail the acts of violence they were planning.

Another woman moved nine times in an 18-month period out of fear of online threats. She moved across the country and changed her job four times just to stay safe.

None of the people who made these threats has been prosecuted, and most of the examples I have of online threats that women, including myself, have received are too vile and obscene to share on the House floor. In Jessica Valenti's words: ''When people say you should be raped and killed for years on end, it takes a toll on your soul.''

For Jessica and Brianna and other victims of severe threats online, there are huge financial and professional impacts. They have lost work opportunities and have spent money on legal advice, protective services, and temporary housing.

They have had to pay to have their personal information scrubbed from Web sites. This is a significant price to pay just to remain an active participant of an online economy.

What has been our response? In a 3-year period, of an estimated 2.5 million cyber stalking cases, only 10 were federally prosecuted. A judge in Massachusetts recently told one victim who works in technology and has suffered terrifying threats from an ex-boyfriend to simply go offline.

When I asked the FBI about the investigation and prosecution of online violence against women, they told me it is not a priority. By failing to address the realities of changing technology and a changing economy, we are failing these women.

It is not okay to call this an Internet problem. It is not okay to say to women that this is just the way things are. It is not okay to tell women to change their behavior, to withhold their opinions, and to stay off the Internet altogether, just to avoid severe threats.

For decades, women who have been victims of sexual assault and abuse have been told they have provoked their abusers by what they wore or what they have said. We have worked hard to change that culture; yet, by not taking these cases seriously, we send a clear message that, when women express opinions online, they are asking for it.

That is why I am calling on the Department of Justice to enforce the laws that are already on the books and take these investigations and prosecutions seriously. The Prioritizing Online Threat Enforcement Act would give the Department of Justice and the FBI the resources and the mandate to investigate and enforce the Federal laws on cyber threats.

It is not Congress' job to police the Internet, but we have a responsibility to make sure that women are able to fully participate in our economy. I urge my colleagues to support this crucial bill.

Let's keep the Internet open and safe for all voices.

FUNDING THE STRATOSPHERIC OBSERVATORY FOR INFRARED ASTRONOMY PROGRAM

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

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the House Appropriations Committee for fully funding the Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy, SOFIA, program.

The SOFIA program is something that is stationed in my district. It is a 747 airplane with a 100-inch telescope in the back. Some people ask why we would need this or why this is something that NASA is so excited about. It is because we have certain programs that are in the atmosphere, and on the ground today, many of them have restrictions, but SOFIA doesn't. SOFIA does things that other telescopes just can't do.

First, it flies at 40,000 feet, so it gets above the water vapor. That is something that we just can't do from the ground. We can't do that type of science, those observations—we just can't do it—yet SOFIA does something that many other telescopes can't do.

It does something that the Hubble can't do. It does something that our beloved James Webb Space Telescope, which is going to be launched in the next couple of years, cannot do. It

lands, and we can upgrade it. If there is something new in 2015, we can put it on SOFIA. SOFIA can take off. We can do our projects, and we can do our experiments. It can land. If we have something new in 2016, we can do the same thing and so on and so forth.

For the next 20 years, we will be flying SOFIA if this Congress continues to fund it. Last year, SOFIA was on the chopping block, and without the good leadership of our majority leader, it might have gone away.

What I wanted to bring to everyone's attention is, if we are going to fund NASA, if we are going to fund projects for our new generation, if we are going to explore, if we are going to do all of the things that make America great and that make America the exploration country that we have been for the last 100-plus years, then we have to invest a little bit.

When the administration threatened to shut down SOFIA in fiscal year 2015, Congress showed strong support to make sure that SOFIA would continue; but, as we move forward, we understand what these types of projects bring.

As I look into the crowd, I see an awful lot of young folks who have either visited Washington, D.C., or they are on a tour, or they are doing something. That is what SOFIA brings. Every year, we put fifth and sixth and seventh grade teachers in SOFIA for a 9- or 10-hour mission.

They get to work with NASA. They get to work with scientists from America and from Germany because this is a joint project, and they get to see what projects and what experiments NASA is doing. They also get to work with NASA hand in hand.

They get to bring that back to the classroom, and they get to teach their fifth through seventh grade students about astronomy, about learning, about new planets, about new stars, about dying stars, about new solar systems. They take that at a practical level not just what is in the book, but what they learn, what they see, and what they do with NASA itself.

Also, I greatly appreciate the language that the committee included in the report accompanying the fiscal year 2016 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill, which reaffirms our support for SOFIA and rejects NASA's plan to conduct a senior review of the mission at such a premature stage.

If we are going to look at what SOFIA and other projects from NASA do, we have to allow them to bring us some real data. That data takes time. If we are going to do that on a 1- or 2-year status and then, maybe, cancel a project, then all of the money that we have injected into this project will be for naught.

Given that SOFIA achieved full operating status just this last year, in 2014, it has been designed for a lifespan of up to, like I said, 20 years. A senior review should not be at a 2-year stand, but it should go to a 5- or an 8-year stand so that we can collect the data and make sure that this program is worth the money the taxpayers spend on it.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle because they have supported this project just like they have supported many projects for NASA and for our experiment community.

Without the support from both sides of the aisle, it is really going to be difficult for America to continue to be the leader in space exploration and exploration abroad.

IMPROVING TREATMENT OF U.S. TERRITORIES UNDER FEDERAL HEALTH PROGRAMS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a comprehensive bill to improve the treatment of Puerto Rico and the other territories under Medicaid, traditional Medicare, and Medicare Advantage.

This is the first time that a Member of Congress has filed legislation to address the range of challenges that patients, physicians, hospitals, and insurance providers in the territories face as a result of the unequal treatment the territories receive under Federal health programs.

The bill serves as a blueprint for policymakers in identifying the various problems that exist under current Federal law and in proposing fair, realistic, and technically precise solutions to each problem.

Based on my conversations with congressional leaders and officials in the Obama administration, I believe there is bipartisan recognition that Federal health laws do not do justice to American citizens living in the territories.

I recognize that Republicans and Democrats have different opinions regarding the virtues of the Affordable Care Act, but it is my hope that policymakers can agree that it is in the national interest to take concrete steps to eliminate or reduce the numerous disparities that the territories confront under Medicaid and Medicare. These inequalities were enshrined in law long before 2010 and remain in place today.

Stated simply, if the will exists among officials in the legislative and executive branches to improve the treatment of the territories under Federal health programs, as I believe it does, then my bill provides a way forward. After today, no Federal policymaker can say: I want to help, but I don't know how.

Rather than summarizing the bill's 16 sections, I will highlight the provisions relating to Medicaid, the program for low-income individuals, which is jointly funded by the Federal Government and each State or territory government.

In the States, there is no limit on Federal funding for Medicaid as long as the State provides its share of matching funds. The Federal contribution, known as an FMAP, can range from 50 percent for the wealthiest States to over 80 percent for the poorest States.

By contrast, the funding that the Federal Government provides for Medicaid in each territory is capped. When I took office in 2009, Puerto Rico's cap was only $260 million a year, and the Federal Government was covering less than 20 percent of the cost of the territory's Medicaid Program.

During my tenure, the Federal Government has increased Medicaid funding for the territories, but that funding remains capped. Especially in the case of Puerto Rico, it is still profoundly inequitable. Most problematic, this funding expires in 2019, and in Puerto Rico, it will be depleted well before then.

This funding cliff is unique to the territories. The bill I am filing today would avert this cliff and provide a more stable and equitable level of Medicaid funding for the territories. Starting in fiscal year 2017, the bill would provide the territories with State-like treatment within well-defined parameters.

□ 1100

Specifically, each territory's Medicaid program could cover individuals whose family income is at or below the Federal poverty level. As long as a territory covers individuals within these income limits, the Federal Government would fund the territory's Medicaid program as if it were a State Medicaid program. The annual funding caps would be eliminated, and each territory would receive an FMAP based on its per capita income. However, the limiting principle is that if a territory wants to cover individuals earning above the Federal poverty level, it will generally be required to use territory dollars, not Federal dollars.

The rationale behind this new proposal is simple. Residents of the territories are American citizens. At the very least, the Federal Government should provide each territory with the funding necessary to provide health coverage to their residents who live at or below the Federal poverty level. Anything less is unacceptable from a moral and public policy standpoint.

I invite my colleagues to support this comprehensive bill and to work with me to enact its provisions into law.

RECOGNIZING JESSE HILL AND DELAWARE VALLEY VIETNAM VETERANS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, for decades Vietnam veteran and Levittown, Bucks County, resident Jesse Hill has dedicated himself to preserving the memory of those lost in Vietnam and bringing awareness to those still missing.

In Vietnam, Jesse served with distinction with the Army 1st Cavalry Division for two tours of duty between 1967 and 1969, when he earned a Purple Heart for his service and his personal sacrifice. Upon returning home, he became a founding member of the Delaware Valley Vietnam Veterans, or DV3, as they call themselves.

Today, Jesse continues to recognize the service and sacrifice of all who fought and fell in that war and others since, especially Iraq and Afghanistan, through the Donald W. Jones Flag Memorial. Named after a fellow cofounder, Jesse's leadership has sustained this impressive display for 30 years. The Flag Memorial has been located in various sites across Bucks County over the years, including the Washington Crossing Historic Park, Core Creek Park, Silver Lake Park, and now at Falls Township Community Park, where it draws an annual crowd of thousands of veterans and grateful community members.

Having participated in planting flags at this powerful memorial with members of my staff for several years, I am always humbled by the sacrifice that each flag represents and grateful for Jesse's commitment to remembering those we have lost in conflict.

I thank Jesse and all the members of the Delaware Valley Vietnam Veterans for their continued work and support of the veterans in our region and their service to our Nation and our community.

WATERS OF THE U.S. RULE

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

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the recently finalized waters of the U.S. rule.

Documents show that the EPA crafted the waters of the U.S. rule behind closed doors, leaving no seat at the table for farmers, business leaders, county and State officials, homebuilders, livestock producers, ranchers, and many others who are concerned by this Federal overreach, and it affects their lives.

Everybody wants clean water—let's all be on the record for that—but we need to respect this process. Stakeholders should have been consulted. The people whose lives are affected by this rule should have been consulted. The EPA's final rule is flawed, and despite attempts by Congress, it is not an improvement over the proposed rule.

The rule still requires farmers and ranchers to get permits for activities on their own land. On their own land. The rule still expands the waters under the EPA's jurisdiction. The rule still hurts manufacturers and States and counties looking to expand economic development projects and looking to expand opportunity.

This rule remains flawed and should be thrown out. I urge Members of Congress to support efforts to stop this job-killing, farm-killing rule that invites lawsuits instead of real solutions. I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to support efforts to create a new rule that will truly improve water quality for all Americans and put stakeholders in the process and respect private property.

TRAGIC FLOODING IN CENTRAL TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, over the Memorial Day weekend, the communities of central Texas suffered a terrible tragedy after heavy rains and powerful storms hit the Lone Star State, resulting in the deaths of 24 people, including a number from Corpus Christi and the district that I represent.

Though I don't represent Hays County, where some of the major flooding happened and one of the hardest hit parts of the State, nearby Caldwell and Bastrop Counties are in the 27th District of Texas, and I have pledged my help to the entire area in every way possible.

Immediately after the floods, I visited the Bastrop County Emergency Operations Center and have been in contact with leaders throughout the district to help in the recovery and aid efforts and to make sure that the resources are available and that we are looking for ways to improve our response and readiness in the future.

But, you know, it wasn't just tragedy that I saw during this. It was not just devastation. I also saw the hope and spirit of a community that came together in aid and rescue efforts. I was moved, touched, and inspired by what I saw.

Hundreds of volunteers, including my wife Debbie, joined emergency personnel and law enforcement folks to help however possible. Debbie came home with stories of hundreds of people who drove over 3 hours from Corpus Christi to search for some of the victims who were from Corpus Christi, including my daughter's elementary and middle school tutor, who perished in the flood.

Despite this tragedy, it is amazing how people came together in the spirit of America and how it showed through. This gives me hope for the entire country, and it makes me proud to be an American.

At the request of a constituent, I will also be working with local officials to investigate how we can make our emergency notification systems better and how it can make sure people have access to accurate and timely disaster information so we can prevent tragedies like this in the future.

Obviously, we can't stop Mother Nature, but we can be prepared. We can make sure the public has the information they need to keep themselves safe, and we can help those devastated by these sorts of tragedies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and everyone join me in continuing to pray for the victims of these floods and these tragedies, their friends, their families, and the volunteers who gave so selflessly of their time.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend William Rice, Calvary Baptist Church, Clearwater, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Father, we praise You as the author of life and affirm with our Founders that You are the giver of liberty.

We ask that You would direct these who gather as Members of Congress to help govern our land. Grant them wisdom beyond themselves. Grant them the humility to remember Whom they serve and to Whom they must give an ultimate account. Grant them a deep burden for righteousness and a burning passion for justice.

Forgive us, Lord, as a people, for walking in pride and imagining that we can long stand without Your blessing. Awaken us to a reverence for Who You are as the living God and for Your eternal truths.

You, O Lord, are a great and mighty God, yet You are also compassionate and gracious. Be gracious to us still, and grant us a spiritual awakening that will renew our Nation from within.

In Jesus' Name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

WELCOMING REVEREND WILLIAM RICE

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce to my colleagues our guest chaplain for the U.S. House of Representatives today, Pastor Willy Rice of Clearwater, Florida's Calvary Baptist Church.

Pastor Willy is a Florida native, attending Calvary as a young man and returning to the church years later in 2004 to become the church pastor. Pastor Willy is joined in ministry by his wife, Cheryl, and together they have three children.

Mr. Speaker, Calvary Baptist Church is a church that is indeed alive. Pastor Willy and the entire church family minister each day through worship services, through Calvary Christian School, by serving those in need through Calvary Cares, and through ministries that support families, the elderly, supporting foster care and adoption services, providing grief counseling and ministry, and ministries to the deaf community.

In each of these ministries, Pastor Willy and the Calvary family remain focused on sharing the saving grace and the love of the Christ in Whom we put our faith, living out this faith each day with a spirit of evangelism, a humble compassion, and a heart of Christian ministry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues today to welcome Pastor Willy and his wife Cheryl. May God bless the Rice family, and may God bless the church family at Clearwater's Calvary Baptist Church.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

ALLEN AMERICANS HOCKEY TEAM IN THE PLAYOFFS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because I would like to congratulate some very talented individuals in my district—the Allen Americans hockey team.

I am proud to represent the city of Allen in Washington, D.C., and everyone in Collin County is lucky because we are able to call the Allen Americans our home team. They have had a stellar season, and they are now on their way to winning their third straight championship. Today the Allen Americans will play the South Carolina Stingrays in game 3 of the Kelly Cup Playoffs.

I would like to say to the Allen Americans: Congratulations for making it this far. Good luck tonight. Your hometown believes in you, and we can't wait to see you bring home your third championship. You have worked hard, so go show them why you don't mess with Texas. Go get the Stingrays.

HONORING THE ALLIED TROOPS WHO LANDED ON THE BEACHES OF NORTHERN FRANCE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 71 years ago this week, 160,000 Allied troops landed on the beaches of northern France. Nine thousand were killed or wounded on D-day. Their bravery and sacrifice made possible the liberation of a continent and the defeat of an evil ideology.

The American heroes who fought at Normandy are examples of what we want our country to be: courageous, generous, and undeterred by a commitment to freedom. But we owe every veteran from D-day to today more.

We should remove the expiration dates in the GI bill so that veterans have access to education and training at any point in their career. We should pass an infrastructure plan with a preference for hiring veterans in the building and construction trades. We should help veterans keep medical appointments by providing child care at the VA clinics. And we should make sure that our veterans hospitals are state-of-the-art facilities.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend I will join all Americans and remember our soldiers who fought on D-day. May our country always be worthy of their sacrifice.

CONGRATULATING BAKER ELMORE

(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, it is with sincere gratitude I have the opportunity to recognize Baker Elmore, legislative director of South Carolina's Second Congressional District. I will always appreciate Baker for his service on behalf of the people of South Carolina.

A native of Cheraw, South Carolina, and formerly of the award-winning USC golf team, Baker has faithfully served on the staff for 6 years in various roles, including legislative director, legislative assistant, and special assistant. His expertise on nuclear energy, trade, and foreign affairs, combined with his ability to connect with constituents and eagerness to assist them, has made a difference, especially promoting the missions of the Savannah River site.

It is with mixed feelings, but great happiness, that I bid Baker farewell. Baker is moving on next week to serve as director of Federal programs at the Nuclear Energy Institute, NEI. This is a tremendous vote of confidence in his capability, his competence, dedication, and integrity.

Congratulations to his parents, Mike and Debbie Elmore, along with his grandparents, Sam and Gina McCuen and Harriet Elmore, for raising such a talented staff member.

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

Godspeed, Baker Elmore.

RECOGNIZING THE ABILITYONE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support and admiration for the AbilityOne Program, this country's single largest provider of employment for people who are blind or have significant disabilities.

AbilityOne currently works with approximately 4,600 blind individuals and over 44,000 disabled people, 3,000 of whom are military veterans or wounded warriors, helping them gain greater independence and a higher quality of life. This is accomplished by providing them with both the skills and training necessary to find valued jobs with good wages and benefits.

Mr. Speaker, Congress first recognized the need for this type of program in 1938 and expanded upon it in 1971. Today AbilityOne delivers more than $2 billion in quality products and services to the Federal Government at fair market prices. It also provides critical support to the U.S. armed services for both military and humanitarian operations. With a national network of nearly 600 community-based nonprofit agencies, AbilityOne contracts projects in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

With the participation of more of its citizens in the workplace, every community benefits from greater cultural diversity and awareness.

SECURING THE RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 26 States, including my home State of Texas, for stopping an imperial White House dead in its tracks.

For far too long, this President has forced his will on the American people with his pen and his phone. Well, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has said enough is enough. Last week, the Court of Appeals upheld an injunction to stop the President's unilateral actions that would have granted 5 million illegal aliens work permits and eroded the foundation of our system of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not anti-immigration. The Constitution of the United States is clear: immigration and naturalization are issues for Congress and the American people to decide, not a self-declared king sitting in the White House.

Lawlessness breeds lawlessness. Last week, Texas and the Fifth Circuit secured the rule of law, and I thank them for it.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AND T-HUD

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share that the Nation is desperate for a long-term, 21st century transportation and infrastructure system that provides sustainable solutions to our Nation's infrastructure crisis. We can't kick the can down the road anymore. Patching our roads and our budgets will not reverse the serious decline in our infrastructure.

In April of this year, I joined elected officials and community leaders in my district at the Central Ohio Transit Authority's new Spring Street Terminal to ''Stand Up 4 Transportation'' and call for a long-term funding bill.

Short-term patches like the one that was rushed through Congress last month fail to meet the challenge of our Nation's crumbling roads and bridges—even as other nations advance their infrastructure by leaps and bounds.

Mr. Speaker, without meaningful long-term transportation bills that provide forward thinking and predictable investments for our infrastructure, we are slamming the brakes on the economy and jobs.

It is time to act. The clock is ticking.

ROME HIGH SCHOOL ON BEST HIGH SCHOOLS LIST

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rome High School, which was ranked as one of the ''Best High Schools in America'' by U.S. News & World Report for the fourth year in a row. It also earned a silver ranking, meaning Rome High is one of the top 10 percent of schools nationwide.

These high achievements are evidence of the commitment, the dedication, and the hard work put forth by Rome High students, their faculty, and the staff. In fact, when the Rome News Tribune asked him about the rankings, Principal Evans noted: ''We are striving for a gold rank of course.''

Mr. Speaker, this commitment to hard work and doing the best you can embodies the values that make northwest Georgia a great place to live, to work, and to raise a family.

Congratulations to all those involved in the Rome High School community. Enjoy your summer break. You have earned it.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram, with the help of ISIS, has made a dangerous comeback. Just yesterday, Boko Haram attacked again, using a suicide bomber to kill 20 more people.

In his inauguration speech last Friday, President Buhari vowed to defeat Boko Haram. I hope and pray that President Buhari remains committed to this vow because we here in Congress will certainly remain committed to holding him accountable.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to wear red in solidarity with the thousands affected by the evils of Boko Haram. We will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls.

Listen to these headlines: ''Kidnapped Nigerian Girls Likely Being Used by Boko Haram as Suicide Bombers''; ''U.S. Signals Willingness to Widen the Role in Fighting Boko Haram in Nigeria''; ''Boko Haram and ISIS Are the Worst Sexual Abusers''; ''How Boko Haram Is Turning Children into Weapons''; ''With Help from ISIS, a More Deadly Boko Haram Makes a Comeback''; ''Nigerian Girls Kidnapped by Boko Haram May Be Held in Underground Bunkers''; ''Boko Haram Militants Raped Hundreds of Female Captives in Nigeria.''

Continue to tweet. Tweet #bringbackourgirls.

□ 1215

REMEMBERING ARLENE BUSH

(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, I rise to remember and celebrate a wonderful public servant from Bloomington, Minnesota, Arlene Bush.

Arlene Bush served on the Bloomington School Board for 33 years and volunteered for many more. But the longevity of Arlene's service is just part of the story. Arlene was known for the kindness she showed to everyone whom she interacted with.

Superintendent of Bloomington Public Schools Les Fujitake remembered how Arlene always approached decisions that the school board faced by asking, ''What is best for the children?'' Arlene was a fixture at school events and at the annual Congressional Art Competition in Bloomington. In fact, she often took the time to tag along with me when I visited schools.

Arlene's positive, kind, and supportive spirit was contagious to those around her. Her legacy will be remembered far beyond the Bloomington School Board meeting room and the Minnesota School Boards Association award that bears her name.

My condolences go out to Arlene's family, to the Bloomington Public Schools, and to the entire Bloomington community who mourn the loss of Arlene but who celebrate a wonderful public servant.

HIRE A HERO ACT

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support an important initiative.

We celebrate and show honor to our veterans, fallen servicemembers, and those in the Armed Forces during Memorial Day and Veterans Day, and then in some respects we go on about our business.

Those veterans and the men and women in the National Guard and Ready Reserve need our continued support. We do that through health care, educational initiatives, and other ways. We must do it as well to support them economically with jobs.

Too many American servicemembers remain unemployed. Although the overall veteran unemployment rate has dropped in recent years, the rate of unemployment among our post-9/11 veterans is 7.2 percent.

As our economy continues to improve, we must be sure that those who fight to defend this country are not left behind. The men and women who serve in the National Guard and Reserve are highly trained, well-qualified individuals who add tremendous value to our employer's workforce.

Let's make it easier for those employers—and even incentivize them—to bring the men and women who continue to serve in the National Guard and Reserve on their payroll. Through the Hire A Hero Act, H.R. 2457, employers would receive a tax incentive to hire our National Guardsmen and Reservists. This would support small businesses by providing them with highly skilled workers and assist our great men and women.

Please join me in supporting the Hire A Hero Act.

ENDING ALZHEIMER'S

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the 5.3 million Americans living with Alzheimer's disease as we observe Alzheimer's Awareness Month.

Families affected by this illness know firsthand Alzheimer's takes more than just memories; it takes the lives of loved ones.

Despite being the sixth-leading cause of death in the United States, Alzheimer's is the only disease in the top

ten causes of death that cannot be slowed, stopped, or prevented.

The time to take action is now. It is our duty as Members to work on behalf of the families who lose their loved ones to this devastating disease and on behalf of those individuals who slowly lose those pieces of themselves that made up who they once were. No one should have to go through such an emotionally tolling process.

As a member of the Congressional Alzheimer's Caucus, I am devoted to raising awareness and devising solutions to once and for all end Alzheimer's.

Together we can, and must, fight this important fight.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLUE LIGHTNING INITIATIVE

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the second anniversary of the Blue Lightning Initiative, a DHS and DOT program to equip airline personnel with the tools to identify and save victims of human trafficking.

I represent Las Vegas, which attracts more than 42 million visitors every year. As a premier global destination, we are sadly all too familiar with the impact of this heinous crime.

Clearly, we must engage in an all-hands-on-deck approach to identify and apprehend traffickers, which includes our airline personnel who are on the front line.

That is why I am introducing legislation to ensure all our airlines take on this challenge and close off the skies to those engaged in this modern-day slavery.

Human trafficking is not the only issue that is facing our aviation industry, so I will be hosting industry leaders from across the country at an aviation symposium in my district next week to discuss how we can work together to strengthen our Nation's aviation, create new job opportunities, and foster economic growth.

CACHE VALLEY TRANSIT

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Cache Valley Transit District in Logan, Utah, has received an Excellence in Motion award by the national Community Transportation Association and has been named as the ''Urban Community Transportation System of the Year.'' Among other criteria, this award is given to a transportation system that demonstrates creative and innovative services that are responsive to community needs and serves an urban area of more than 50,000 people.

The Cache Valley Transit District has a 19-year legacy of fare-free riding, a precedent for the Nation. They have cultivated close relationships in the community through traditional and nontraditional partnerships, such as support for a community art program, a new medical voucher program, and Call-A-Ride buses which provide curbside service for the elderly and disabled.

For these and other reasons, they certainly merit the Excellence in Motion award.

THE VETERAN WELLNESS ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, right before the Memorial Day holiday, Congressman TIM RYAN of Ohio and I introduced H.R. 2555, the Veteran Wellness Act, a bipartisan bill that will improve Veteran Service Organizations' ability to promote good health among our Nation's veterans. This is critical at a time when an average of 22 veterans take their lives by suicide each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, veterans across the country turn to these organizations to participate in a wide variety of programs to build and cultivate a community of support among fellow veterans. These facilities are a place of comfort and familiarity for thousands of men and women and their families.

The Veteran Wellness Act will expand upon what these organizations are currently doing and create a greater number of opportunities for veterans to access wellness programs and therapies.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to be there for our Nation's heroes as they begin transitioning back to civilian life.

I ask my colleagues to join me and Congressman RYAN in supporting this bipartisan bill. We owe these brave men and women no less.

USA FREEDOM ACT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President signed into law the USA Freedom Act. It is a bill I oppose because I believe it continues to allow unwarranted intrusions into the innocent lives of Americans in contradiction to the vision of our Founders and our Constitution.

But what is most important to remember about this debate is that even with the reforms in the USA Freedom Act, a provision of law in the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, on the books since 1986, still allows government investigators to read the emails, texts, and information stored in the cloud or on any server of all Americans, at any time, without a warrant, without probable cause, and without any due process.

Our Federal law gives digital communication little to no protections under the Fourth Amendment, regardless of the reforms signed into law yesterday.

A lot has changed in email communication since 1986, and that is why we must pass the Email Privacy Act, a broad bipartisan bill with over 270 cosponsors which would give email, digital communication, the same Fourth Amendment protections as paper mail or letters on our desks.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this legislation. Let's pass H.R. 699, and let's assure the American people that government has moved into the 21st century and not forgotten the Constitution along the way.

REMEMBERING HADIYA PENDELTON

(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 in remembrance of Hadiya Pendelton, a young woman from my home State of Illinois who was shot tragically in Chicago when she was only 15.

Hadiya would have been 18 years old yesterday. In her memory, her friends asked their classmates to commemorate her life by wearing orange. Yesterday, I joined with my colleagues in the House to honor her memory in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, every single day in the United States, nearly 300 people are victims of handgun violence. Yesterday, gun owners, sportsmen, lawmakers, faith leaders, teachers, students, and more wore orange to bring attention to the issue of handgun violence.

It is my hope that this nonpartisan unifying action will show that victims of gun violence like Hadiya are not forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, we must set aside our partisan differences so that we may honor the victims of this tragic and unnecessary violence and come together to make our homes, our businesses, schools, and communities safer.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2289, COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 288 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 288

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-

users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-18. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as 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 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Friday, June 5, 2015, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, H. Res. 288, providing for the consideration of a very important piece of legislation, H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2289 under a structured rule and makes five amendments in order—two Democrat and two Republican, as well as one bipartisan amendment—allowing for a balanced debate on these important issues.

H.R. 2289 is essential to the smooth functioning of the American economy and is long overdue for an enactment into law. This important legislation will reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, also known as the CFTC, which had its statutory authority lapse in September of 2013.

The House passed, with strong bipartisan support, a very similar version of this legislation on June 24 of last year. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to take up the House-passed bill despite its strong bipartisan support in the House, leading us to reconsider this legislation again today.

After the financial crisis of 2008, almost everyone agreed that changes needed to be made to our financial services sector in order to protect our economy and prevent another crisis in the future. Like many of my colleagues, I have concerns with some of the reforms that were instituted in response to this financial calamity because they have put overly burdensome restrictions on our business communities.

However, it is important to note that this legislation keeps intact the overarching reforms made in title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act. Every witness who appeared in front of the Agriculture Committee was supportive of the clearing, margining, and execution requirements that are the heart of title VII; yet, like every major comprehensive law—and this was very comprehensive—there are always unintended consequences that need to be addressed, and H.R. 2289 does just that.

For example, the authors of Dodd-Frank would likely argue the law's main purpose is to reduce systemic risk to the economy. However, I don't think anyone would argue that farmers, who are simply trying to lock in a good price for their corn or for their wheat, are a systemic risk to our economy.

It is just as restaurant chains that are looking to make sure they have enough beef or pork or potatoes to sell to their patrons also do not pose a systemic risk. Utility companies that are seeking to ensure that they have enough power to meet the needs and demands of their customers did not cause the financial crisis.

Unfortunately, though, the current law imposes rules that treat all of these entities as major risks to our economy, and it imposes overly burdensome capital and paperwork requirements on them.

Mr. Speaker, critics may claim this bill undermines consumer protections. However, this could not be further from the truth. Title I of H.R. 2289 puts in place greater consumer protections, like requiring brokerage firms to notify investors before moving funds from one account to another in order to prevent abuses like those that occurred at MF Global prior to its bankruptcy.

It would also require firms that become undercapitalized to immediately report to regulators and work with them to restore adequate capital and financial security. These title I provisions are commonsense reforms that will protect consumers.

Title II would make reforms to the CFTC itself, such as strengthening the cost-benefit analysis the CFTC must perform when considering the impacts of its rules and appointing a chief economist to assist with compiling and analyzing financial data.

Critics may claim that requiring cost-benefit analyses will open up the CFTC to lawsuits, which could be costly. However, such critics also ignore the endless cycle of the proposal and reproposals of rules that are rushed, poorly conceived, and unworkable.

This work requires the CFTC to waste staff time and Commission funds to redraft rules or to provide workarounds for impacted parties. This requirement merely gives the CFTC a standard for writing good rules the first time that will benefit our economy and the users.

Title II would also require the CFTC to take steps to invest in IT to protect sensitive market data against cyber attacks, a very real issue given the recent breaches we have seen at the IRS and at various national retailers. Most importantly, this section reauthorizes the CFTC until 2019, which has been operating without our authorization, to spend money for a year and a half.

Title III now gets to the heart of what I mentioned earlier, providing relief to the end users or the farmers, the restaurants, the manufacturers, the utilities, and other entities that rely on a steady supply of commodities that have been caught up in the unintended consequences of Dodd-Frank's reforms.

These users have a genuine need to use markets to hedge against bad weather, natural disasters, inflation, price shocks, and other unforeseen circumstances that could jeopardize their ability to serve their customers. These entities inherently want to avoid risk and, thus, shouldn't be subjected to the same requirements as financial and investment entities.

Mr. Speaker, title III of H.R. 2289 makes significant reforms to aid these end users, such as preventing utility companies from being inappropriately classified as ''financial entities'' and being treated like banks under the law.

It exempts end users who are not otherwise regulated by the CFTC from having to keep records of every email, phone call, fax, or letter with regard to every trade, a huge recordkeeping burden. It would prevent nonbank swap dealers from having to hold more capital than banks do, which would put them at an unfair disadvantage in the market.

Additionally, this section would allow end users operating in rarely traded markets not to have to disclose trade data, which can be a serious disadvantage if they must publicly show all of their trading partners what they are buying and selling.

Title III would also require the CFTC to determine if the rules for foreign swaps are equivalent to U.S. rules and create a workable system of substituted compliance for market participants whose activity crosses multiple jurisdictions. This would ensure that businesses which trade internationally do not have to comply with two sets of divergent rules.

Mr. Speaker, the most important thing to remember about H.R. 2289 is that the farmer who grows the food that you eat for dinner did not cause the financial crisis, neither did the people you buy your electricity from or the people who provided the wood for your desk or the metal used in your car. I do not know of any reason we should continue to treat them as if they did, which is what the current law does, and it is what H.R. 2289 is seeking to correct.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for the consideration of important legislation that will help grow our economy. I support its adoption, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation.

Since my friends on the other side of the aisle have assumed the majority, they have made it their mission to undermine the Dodd-Frank Act and hamstring the ability of our regulators to put in place strong rules to prevent another financial crisis, and this legislation is no exception.

H.R. 2289 reauthorizes the Commodity Futures Trading Commission through 2019 while making substantial changes to the CFTC's internal operations and rolling back key Dodd-Frank provisions intended to strengthen our financial regulatory framework.

I have specific concerns with the new cost-benefit requirements imposed in title II of the legislation. The CFTC already conducts cost-benefit analyses on its rulemakings, and this provision could significantly slow down the rulemaking process while also creating openings that will put the CFTC at the risk of increased litigation.

Title II of H.R. 2289 also proposes several unnecessary changes to the Commission's internal operations that can make it more difficult to manage the agency.

According to CFTC Chairman Massad, the provisions contained in title II could weaken the Commission's ability to respond in a timely and effective manner. For example, if these measures were currently in place, it would have made it more difficult for the agency to positively respond over the past 10 months to concerns raised by market participants. Also included in this bill are substantial changes to rulemakings taking place at the Commission under the Dodd-Frank Act.

I am particularly concerned by the cross-border language contained in the bill, which will undercut the efforts already underway by the Commission to negotiate on an international system of safe and robust derivative rules that are necessary to apply to the global derivatives market.

H.R. 2289 requires the CFTC to create a rule that will automatically allow U.S. banks and foreign banks conducting business in the U.S. to do so under the rules imposed by foreign jurisdictions, all of which are currently more lenient than our own. We have seen this kind of race to the bottom before, and we all know how it ends.

Worse yet, Mr. Speaker, is that this legislation hamstrings an agency that is already woefully underfunded. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the CFTC will need 30 additional personnel annually to handle the increased workload imposed by both the new cost-benefit analysis requirements and the mandated cross-border rule contained in this legislation.

Will my friends on the other side of the aisle provide the necessary funding increases to the CFTC to carry out these requirements? I doubt it.

Dodd-Frank significantly expanded the CFTC's role in overseeing our financial markets, and they have already completed over 80 percent of their required rulemakings, the best rate of any financial regulator. They have done so despite the fact that Congress has not done its part to provide the agency with the resources it needs to police these incredibly complex markets, populated by highly sophisticated and extremely powerful entities.

Remember AIG, the insurer brought down by derivatives trades that the CFTC is now policing? If that memory is fuzzy, I am sure you will remember the funds we provided to bail AIG out, which came to a total of $67.8 billion. That would be enough to fund the CFTC at the level requested in the President's budget for over 200 years.

The Commission needs a reauthorization, but it certainly doesn't need one saddled with changes that will hamstring its internal operations, prolong its rulemakings through an inflexible cost-benefit analysis requirement that opens it up to litigation risk, and force it to allow a race to the bottom on international rules governing a global market.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just like to make one comment in response to those of my colleague from Massachusetts in considering the underfunding of CFTC.

In the last 5 years, through the reductions of Federal spending and the efforts that have been going on, I think anyone would be hard-pressed to find another agency that has received an almost 50 percent increase in its budget over that period of time.

I will just point out that, certainly, they have received a lot of new responsibilities under Dodd-Frank, but also a large increase in their available resources.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to provide for the consideration of H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

I want to start by thanking Chairman SESSIONS and the entire Rules Committee for their time and work in preparing this rule. Yesterday's hearing was spirited but fair, and they have produced a rule that reflects the tremendous work the Agriculture Committee has put in on this issue.

Over the past few years, the Agriculture Committee has heard from dozens of witnesses at over 10 hearings. These witnesses, many of whom are market participants struggling to comply with the needlessly burdensome rules and ambiguous portions of the underlying statute, have been consistent in their call to action. To address their concerns, H.R. 2289 makes targeted reforms that fall into three broad categories: customer protections, Commission reforms, and end-user relief.

Title I of the bill protects customers and the margin funds they deposit at their FCMs by codifying critical changes made in the wake of the collapses and bankruptcies of MF Global and Peregrine Financial.

Title II makes meaningful reforms to the operations of the Commission to improve the agency's deliberative process. In doing so, it also requires the Commission to conduct more robust cost-benefit analyses to help get future rulemakings right the first time and to avoid the endless cycle of reproposing and delaying unworkable rules.

□ 1245

While the CFTC is already required to consider costs and benefits of the rules it proposes, this rule attempts to legitimize that practice, a practice that has been called into question. The current practice has been called into question by the Commission's own inspector general, who reported the agency seemed to view the process as more of a legal one than an economic one.

Finally, title III of the bill fixes real problems faced by end users who rely on derivatives markets to manage

their risks. When it is more costly for those who need these markets to use them, it discourages the exact kind of prudent risk management activities Congress intended to protect with the end user exemption in Dodd-Frank.

Accordingly, the bill provides relief to agricultural and commercial market participants struggling to comply with overreaching and costly recordkeeping requirements and allows utility companies to continue using contracts that allow for a change in the volume of the commodity delivered without the worry of needlessly complying with the swaps regulations.

H.R. 2289 will preserve end users' ability to hedge against anticipated business risk by providing a more workable definition of bona fide hedging. The bill also addresses serious concerns regarding the lack of harmony and clarity in global derivatives regulation by requiring the CFTC to publish a rule addressing how the U.S. swaps requirements apply to transactions occurring outside the United States and with non-U.S. persons.

To be clear, H.R. 2289 makes these meaningful improvements for market participants without undermining the basic goals of title VII of Dodd-Frank, the Holy Grail, to bring clearing, reporting, and electronic execution requirements to swaps transactions.

In closing, I would like to thank the members of the Committee on Agriculture who have worked hard, including Mr. NEWHOUSE, to advance this important legislation. I am especially appreciative of Mr. LUCAS, who worked on reauthorization last year, which was our starting point for this year, as well as some of our newest members. I also owe particular thanks to Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT and Mr. DAVID SCOTT, the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, respectively, that oversees the CFTC. Both of these gentlemen have joined me as original sponsors and have held a series of hearings on reauthorization.

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. They did outstanding work helming a new subcommittee focused on these issues, and I look forward to their diligent oversight work throughout the rest of the Congress.

Similar to the CFTC reauthorization bill passed by the House with overwhelming bipartisan support last year, the Commodity End-User Relief Act is comprised of narrowly targeted changes to the Commodity Exchange Act. The committee has again put together a bill that earned the bipartisan support of our members because we brought the right relief to the right people.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule and support for the underlying act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to my colleague from Washington State with regard to the funding of the CFTC that the agency has never received the funding that it has requested, and that is just a fact. Here we are imposing new requirements, new mandates. CBO, as I mentioned in my opening, estimates that the CFTC will need an additional 30 personnel annually to handle the increased workload imposed by the new cost-benefit analysis requirements of the mandated cross-border rule contained in the provisions in this bill, and so we are asking an agency that has never been properly funded to even do more and not provide it with the proper funding. I don't think that is a smart way to move forward when it comes to an issue so important.

I also want to point out to my colleagues that they should have received a letter from the Consumer Federation of America strongly opposing this bill. Let me just read you the first paragraph. It says:

> We are writing on behalf of the Consumer Federation of America to ask you to oppose H.R. 2289, which the House is expected to vote on this month. This legislation would hamstring the Commodity Futures Trading Commission from effectively overseeing and regulating commodities and derivatives markets, leaving consumers exposed to fraud, manipulation, and abusive practices, and putting the safety and stability of the U.S. financial system at risk. The language in this bill largely mirrors the language offered in last year's CFTC reauthorization bill, which the Obama administration strongly opposed because it undermined the efficient functioning of the CFTC and offered no solution to address the persistent inadequacy of the agency's funding. We urge you to resist this relentless attack on the CFTC by voting against this misguided and harmful legislation.

I would tell my colleagues who are observing this debate that each one of them received a copy of this letter from the Consumer Federation of America strongly opposing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include the statement for the RECORD.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
June 2, 2015.

Re Oppose H.R. 2289

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing on behalf of the Consumer Federation of America (CFA) to ask you to oppose ''The Commodity End User Relief Act'' (H.R. 2289), which the House is expected to vote on this month. This legislation would hamstring the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) from effectively overseeing and regulating commodities and derivatives markets, leaving consumers exposed to fraud, manipulation, and abusive practices, and putting the safety and stability of the U.S. financial system at risk. The language in this bill largely mirrors the language offered in last year's CFTC reauthorization bill, which the Obama Administration strongly opposed because it undermined the efficient functioning of the CFTC and offered no solution to address the persistent inadequacy of the agency's funding. We urge you to resist this relentless attack on the CFTC by voting against this misguided and harmful legislation.

First, this bill would impose an assortment of new, onerous cost-benefit analysis requirements on the CFTC which are likely to delay and obstruct agency action. Under the Commodity Exchange Act, the CFTC already has a statutory mandate to evaluate the costs and benefits of its actions in light of numerous considerations, including the protection of market participants and the public, efficiency, competitiveness, financial integrity, price discovery, and sound risk management practices. This bill would add seven new considerations for the CFTC to undertake. Included in the new economic analysis regime is a requirement for the Commission to assess available alternatives to direct regulation and to determine whether, in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, those alternatives to direct regulation maximize the net benefits. The practical effect is a further tilting of the regulatory process in favor of adopting an approach that best benefits industry rather than the public.

Essentially, if this bill is adopted, the CFTC will be required to undertake an in-depth, burdensome economic analysis for each regulation it proposes and compare its proposal to every conceivable alternative. Such a framework likely will create insurmountable barriers that cripple the agency from putting forth rule proposals and finalizing them in a timely manner so as to effectively protect market participants and the overall economy. In addition, the CFTC would be required to evaluate the cost to the Commission of implementing the proposed action, including providing a methodology for quantifying the costs. While this provision is clumsily worded, it appears that the practical effect of requiring the CFTC to consider costs to itself and its staff will be to paradoxically add time and costs to the cost side of the equation, thereby hindering rulemaking. It is also disturbing that this legislation would require the CFTC to undertake exhaustive cost-benefit analyses without providing the agency with the necessary resources to fulfill those obligations.

The new cost-benefit analysis requirements also are likely to result in increasing opportunities to thwart CFTC regulations through legal challenges. The practical effect of the new heightened requirements will be that any time an industry participant objects to new rules, it will have several new bases for a lawsuit, and it will seek to defeat those rules by claiming that the agency did not undertake a proper economic analysis by considering, and then disposing of, all the possible theoretical alternatives. It is reasonable to believe that armed with such strong ammunition, industry-supported lawsuits seeking to dismantle any new regulations will be successful, a problem again made worse by the agency's lack of funding to effectively defend against such suits.

This legislation also subverts the CFTC's authority to regulate foreign derivatives activities that have a direct and significant effect on U.S. commerce. As our nation has learned painfully and repeatedly from the collapses of Long Term Capital Management, AIG, and Lehman Bros., and from the JPMorgan London Whale trading debacle, even when derivatives contracts are booked through a foreign subsidiary of a U.S. financial institution, the risks of those derivatives often flow back to the United States, threatening the U.S. economy and potentially putting U.S. taxpayers on the hook for any resulting losses. That is why Dodd-Frank gave the CFTC broad authority to regulate overseas derivatives when they put our national economic interests in peril.

Pursuant to that cross-border framework, the CFTC allows a foreign host country's regulations to substitute for U.S. regulations only after the CFTC has made a finding that the foreign host country's regulations are comparable to U.S. rules. However, this bill

would create a presumption that each of the eight foreign jurisdictions with the largest swaps markets automatically have swaps rules that are considered to be comparable to and as comprehensive as U.S. swaps requirements. The bill makes this determination despite the fact that the CFTC has found only six jurisdictions to be comparable for certain entity-level requirements, and has declined to make comparability determinations for transaction-level requirements for jurisdictions other than the European Union and Japan. Switching the presumption will subjugate the CFTC's authority and expertise on the matter. Furthermore, combining the reversed presumption and overwhelming cost-benefit analysis requirements could mean that the CFTC is effectively thwarted from applying the appropriate regulatory safeguards to certain foreign derivatives transactions. As a result, the CFTC's ability to protect the U.S. economy from the dangers resulting from foreign derivatives transactions could be impaired.

Derivatives markets affect the U.S. economy in profound ways, and the risks that derivatives pose to the U.S. economy are well-known. The Dodd-Frank Act brought meaningful reforms to increase transparency and accountability in the derivatives markets and provided the CFTC the necessary authority to properly oversee and regulate the market. However, this legislation would put those reforms at risk and hamper the CFTC's ability to adequately protect consumers, market participants, and the U.S. economy. We cannot afford to suffer the grave consequences of another derivatives-laced financial crisis, but this legislation makes it more likely that we will. Accordingly, we urge you to oppose H.R. 2289.

Sincerely,

MICAH HAUPTMAN,
Financial Services Counsel.
BARBARA ROPER,
Director of Investor Protection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that, as the gentleman just mentioned, I do serve as the ranking member of the jurisdictional committee on commodities and futures and trading that the CFTC comes under. I say that only to say that I have been in the vineyards on this issue and have been struggling with it and working on it over many, many years.

The whole derivatives and commodities and futures markets have changed dramatically. We have had a downfall in our economy because of a lot of activity that was wrong going on on Wall Street and in our financial community, out of which we are now emerging.

Mr. Speaker, what is urgent here is the fact that we cannot delay any longer. It is very important for people to understand that no legislation is perfect. I am the first one to say that. This is a glass that looks to be half empty or maybe half full. I look at it as half full.

I look at it as an urgent, urgent issue. We have got to get end-user relief. That is the major component of this reauthorization for the CFTC because it is the end users—our manufacturers, our farmers, those who produce the products, those who had nothing to do with the downfall of Wall Street, why should they be consistently held to the same intrinsic regulations and rules that our financial institutions have? We have got to have those financial institutions under strong regulation, but it is important that we move, and it is important meat of this bill that we give end-user relief.

Now, I share Mr. MCGOVERN's concerns about the financial situation, but let me just assure everyone, this is a reauthorization piece of legislation. It is not a funding mechanism. That is in the bosom, in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations; and nobody, absolutely nobody, has been a stronger champion, more consistent about getting the CFTC the funding they need. I bring it up all the time. I will still be a champion, but this isn't the bill in which to address that.

The other point is this, Mr. Chairman, once we get the funding out of the way. We talked about the cost-benefit analysis in this. We worked on it. This bill received bipartisan support in the last session. Mr. MCGOVERN brings up a very good point about possible litigation. We address that by adding a Democratic amendment by Ms. DELBENE that addresses that issue to make sure that there is no litigation.

As far as the cost-benefit analysis is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we put the same sort of cost-benefit analysis into this agency that the Obama administration has in every one of their executive agencies. Furthermore, it is not a mandate; it is an assessment. It is saying to assess the efficiencies, make sure we do it, and it does not put a requirement that any decision on the cost-benefit analysis outweighs one another as a requirement for them to make a decision.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must pass this bill, and we need to do it quickly because, in section 300 of this bill—I think it is section 323—we address a crucial issue. The European Union is eating our lunch. All across the world, we are losing our stature as the leading financial industry and system in the world. That affects every ounce of our security. We are number one in the world, and it is about time we stand up and ensure that by making sure that we address the European Union's harsh discrimination against our financial institutions abroad. This is particularly true when it comes to our clearinghouses, the standards that they are using.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yes, we are dealing with eight foreign countries, but they must have similar regimes, what we call equivalency. Now, why is that important, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. It is important because it is the CFTC that must determine if another nation, one of the eight top foreign nations, has an equivalency of a strong regulatory regime as does the United States, then certainly we can do business under their regime, but as long as we don't pass this legislation, the CFTC doesn't have that.

Finally, on all the cross-border situations, we need a definition of what a U.S. person is, and we need to give some backbone to our CFTC Commission to say: Look, why should the United States have to treat a foreign entity in a manner and with the respect that that foreign nation does not treat our industry?

Mr. Speaker, this country, the United States, is losing a tremendous amount of our prestige and our leadership on the world stage, and nowhere is that being pronounced more than in our financial system because for 3 years we have had this laid on the table. I urge a positive vote for this rule.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me the time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his many years of hard work on this very complicated issue. As you can see, he understands it well and understands the importance of passing this reauthorization legislation. I just want to thank him for his comments and hard work.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the esteemed former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the underlying bill, H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act. This bipartisan bill is the result of a series of hearings in which the Committee on Agriculture heard from stakeholders that do business with the CFTC as well as every CFTC Commissioner.

As chairman of the committee last year, I began the process of CFTC reauthorization, which resulted in the House-passed bipartisan bill, and I laud our committee chairman, Mr. CONAWAY, for his efforts in tackling the same subject and coming to the full House with another bipartisan CFTC reauthorization that passed the committee by a voice vote.

A chief selling point of this bill is its commitment to good governance reforms at the CFTC to increase transparency and efficiency. First, the bill closely follows an executive order by President Obama to improve the cost-benefit analysis performed by the Commission prior to promulgating rules. In addition, the bill would improve this oversight of Commissioners over activities which are outside the normal rulemaking process that still impact many futures market participants. Many of these activities, such as policy statements, guidance, and interpretation rules released by CFTC, would also be subject to public comment under the provisions of the bill when they have

the force of law. Furthermore, H.R. 2289 establishes an office of the chief economist at the CFTC to provide objective economic data and analysis.

The committee also heard from end users during this process and included several provisions to provide relief to those end users, such as a more workable definition of bona fide hedging and relief from burdensome recordkeeping rules for many businesses.

The CFTC has gone unauthorized since 2013, and it is time many CFTC activities were reformed by Congress. This rule will make possible the underlying bill that will improve the CFTC in many important ways. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

□ 1300

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

I just want to be clear on one thing. Yes, this is an authorization bill. It is not an appropriations bill. But the issue of funding for the CFTC is relevant in the discussion of this authorization bill because we are essentially proposing that we give additional responsibilities or require additional actions from the CFTC with no guarantee that we are going to provide the resources for them to do their job. We haven't provided them the adequate resources to do what they have been expected to do from the very beginning.

I also want to say that most end user relief in this bill is not objectionable, but the CFTC is already addressing them through rulemaking. A better way to address these concerns than in statute would be more flexibility for them to do rulemaking, which can be adjusted.

In addition to end user provisions, this bill also contains all the problems that we have already identified with regard to cost benefit and cross border. So there are some significant issues here.

The DelBene amendment was mentioned earlier. I want to make it clear that that does not prevent litigation. It just restates the standard of review from the Administrative Procedure Act abuse of discretion.

I will also point out to my colleagues that the cost-benefit analysis is mandated by section 202.

So, again, I would feel better about all of this if we addressed the funding shortfall in the CFTC. We are not doing that. And I don't expect that this majority is going to work with us on that.

I also will insert in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a letter that was sent to all Members of the House from Americans for Financial Reform strongly opposing H.R. 2289. Let me just read the opening paragraph:

''On behalf of Americans for Financial Reform, we are writing to express our opposition to H.R. 2289. . . . This legislation would have a severe negative impact on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and its ability to police commodity and derivatives markets. The new restrictions it places on the CFTC would require additional years of bureaucratic red tape prior to agency action, would enable numerous industry lawsuits against the agency, and would create inappropriate statutory restrictions on the agency's ability to properly oversee markets crucial to the financial system.''

AMERICANS FOR FINANCIAL REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Americans for Financial Reform, we are writing to express our opposition to HR 2289, ''The Commodity End User Relief Act.'' This legislation would have a severe negative impact on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and its ability to police commodity and derivatives markets. The new restrictions it places on the CFTC would require additional years of bureaucratic red tape prior to agency action, would enable numerous industry lawsuits against the agency, and would create inappropriate statutory restrictions on the agency's ability to properly oversee markets crucial to the financial system.

At the same time, this legislation includes no provisions that address the CFTC's most fundamental problem—the lack of resources to accomplish its mission. Due to the agency's massive new responsibilities under the Dodd-Frank Act for hundreds of trillions of dollars in previously unregulated derivatives markets, as well as the growth of traditional commodity markets, the size of CFTC-regulated markets has increased roughly 15-fold over the last decade. But the agency's funding lags far behind. As CFTC chair Tim Massad recently stated:

''The CFTC does not have the resources to fulfill our new responsibilities as well as all the responsibilities it had—and still has—prior to the passage of Dodd Frank in a way that most Americans would expect. Our staff, for example, is no larger than it was when Dodd-Frank was enacted in 2010. . . . Simply stated, without additional resources, our markets cannot be as well supervised; participants and their customers cannot be as well protected; market transparency and efficiency cannot be as fully achieved.''

While the CFTC's funding is appropriated, the agency authorization process is an appropriate mechanism for introducing mechanisms that would supplement appropriations with some form of agency self-funding. Such self-funding mechanisms are used by all other financial regulatory agencies and have been endorsed for the CFTC by every administration going back to the Reagan Administration, including the Bush and Obama Administrations.

Instead of addressing the pressing problem of funding, HR 2289 would instead load down the CFTC with additional mandates that would drain resources and act as a roadblock to necessary oversight and enforcement. Section 202 of HR 2289 would more than double the number of cost benefit analyses the agency must perform prior to taking any action. The CFTC already has a statutory requirement to consider the costs and benefits of its actions, and to evaluate these costs and benefits as applied to a number of significant considerations, including market efficiency, price discovery, and protection of the public.

However, Section 202 would massively expand this requirement. The section would enormously expand the number of different factors the CFTC must evaluate in any rulemaking, order, or guidance. It would also change the standard of evaluation from consideration of costs and benefits to a much more extensive and burdensome ''reasoned determination'' of costs and benefits. The section includes a particularly sweeping mandate that would require the agency to assess whether an action ''maximizes net benefits'' compared to all possible regulatory alternatives. This requirement alone, which seems to require comparison of any actual regulation to a potentially vast number of theoretical alternatives, could be read to require dozens of additional agency analyses.

Some of this language does replicate cost-benefit instructions from the Office of Management and Budget that already applies to agencies within the executive branch, although not to independent financial regulatory agencies like the CFTC. However, a crucial difference is that HR 2289 would add this language in statute, meaning that each and every additional instruction regarding cost-benefit analysis could become grounds for a Wall Street lawsuit against a CFTC rule. These extensive new cost-benefit requirements amount to a playbook for industry interests to tie up regulations in endless litigation, delays, and red tape. With critical rulemakings such as position limits to control commodity price manipulation still incomplete almost five years after they were passed, the addition of major new barriers to action would be dramatic movement in the wrong direction.

Section 314 of the legislation would also greatly weaken the authority of the CFTC to properly regulate derivatives transactions booked in foreign subsidiaries of U.S. banks, even when such transactions have a direct and significant connection to the U.S. economy. We need only look at the example of J.P. Morgan's ''London Whale'' transactions, or the London derivatives transactions of AIG Financial Products which resulted in the largest bailout in U.S. history, to see that derivatives transactions conducted through nominally overseas entities can have a profound impact on the U.S. economy. Over half of Wall Street derivatives transactions are currently booked in nominally foreign subsidiaries, and even more could be transacted in this way if there was an incentive to do so to avoid regulation.

Section 314 would force the CFTC to perform burdensome ''determinations'' in order to regulate foreign subsidiary transactions. Its discretion in performing these assessments would be limited in numerous ways by the legislation. To take just one example, the agency would be banned from considering the actual physical location of personnel doing swaps trading in determining whether a transaction was conducted inside the United States for the purposes of applying U.S. law. It defies common sense to impose such extraordinary restrictions on the discretion of a regulatory agency charged with oversight of the multi-trillion dollar derivatives market.

HR 2289 also includes many additional changes. Some of them, such as amendments to indemnification requirements for swaps data repositories, are reasonable. However, others create significant statutory loopholes that could permit evasion of derivatives regulations by large banks. For example, Section 301 of the legislation permits large financial institutions affiliated with commercial entities to take advantage of exemptions from key Dodd-Frank risk controls that were intended to apply only to commercial end users. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service has stated that the language included in Section 301 ''could potentially allow large banks to trade swaps with other large banks and not be subject to the clearing or exchange trading requirements as long as one of the banks had a nonfinancial affiliate.''

Some of the other problematic parts of the bill expand the definition of ''commercial end user'' to include financial entities (Section 306), create sweeping exemptions from

CFTC oversight for broad classes of complex financial instruments (Section 309), weaken Commission authority to require swap dealers to raise equity capital to back up their trades (Section 311), permit marketing of complex institutional commodity pools to retail investors (Section 312), and weaken limits on commodity market speculation (Section 313). All of these sections appear significantly overbroad and could enable evasion of appropriate regulatory oversight.

In general, the ''end user'' changes in this bill fail to recognize the very substantial administrative exemptions provided to end users by the CFTC. The CFTC has already exempted end users from numerous Dodd-Frank regulations in areas targeted by this bill. By acting through administrative processes the agency has maintained appropriate safeguards as well as the ability to act if market participants use exemptions to evade important risk controls. In contrast, many of the provisions in HR 2289 would provide sweeping statutory exemptions that lack appropriate controls on risk and could easily become dangerous loopholes.

But even before considering these issues, the major new restrictions on the agency created by the cost-benefit and cross-border provisions of this bill create overwhelming reasons to reject this legislation as currently written. So long as those provisions are a part of this legislation, supporting appropriate derivatives regulation requires opposing this bill.

We urge you to vote against HR 2289 and preserve the CFTC's capacity to properly regulate crucial futures and derivatives markets. For more information please contact AFR's Policy Director, Marcus Stanley at marcus@ourfinancialsecurity.org.

Sincerely,

AMERICANS FOR FINANCIAL REFORM.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, I would urge all my colleagues to look in their mail for the letter from the Americans for Financial Reform strongly opposed to this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the good gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and the underlying legislation, H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, I want to thank our chairman, Mr. CONAWAY, for his strong leadership and for making this reauthorization process a productive one through the full Ag Committee.

I also want to thank my colleague from Georgia and the ranking member of the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee, Mr. DAVID SCOTT. He has been a tremendous partner throughout this effort, and we certainly continue to work well together. I thank him for that.

Derivatives markets exist to meet the risk management needs of farmers, ranchers, utilities, manufacturers, and other end users. To be clear, these hedging activities directly benefit the American citizen by helping to keep consumer costs low and reducing the risk of manufacturing in the United States.

The ability of producers and end users to use the derivatives markets to hedge risk has a direct impact on the cost of living in my district, Georgia's Eighth Congressional District, and every other district around the country. It is essential that we have strong markets that our farmers, ranchers, and end users can utilize to meet their needs effectively.

Earlier this year, our subcommittee held three very productive hearings that built upon the work done in the past two Congresses on this reauthorization effort. In many hours of testimony we heard diverse perspectives from end users, market participants, and regulators that were instrumental in drafting this legislation. Their testimony included outlooks on the unintentional impacts that the market reforms enacted following the 2008 financial crisis were having on the end user community.

Despite congressional attempts to exempt end users from some of the more costly and cumbersome mandates, end users continue to face unnecessary regulatory burdens and uncertainty. With this legislation we have the opportunity to erase that.

H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, seeks to clarify congressional intent, minimize regulatory burdens, and most importantly, preserve the ability for those necessary risk management markets to serve those who need them.

I believe we have met these objectives of ensuring that our regulatory framework protects the integrity of our markets while not limiting the ability of end users to access these tools to conduct their business.

I am proud to support both this resolution and the underlying legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to join me in so doing.

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

In closing, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 2289 and just read a little bit of it so that my colleagues understand how strongly the administration is opposed to this:

''The administration strongly opposes the passage of H.R. 2289 because it undermines the efficient functioning of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission . . . by imposing a number of organizational and procedural changes that would undercut efforts taken by the CFTC over the last year to address end user concerns.

''H.R. 2289 also offers no solution to address the persistent inadequacy of the agency's funding. The CFTC is one of only two Federal financial regulators funded through annual discretionary appropriations, and the funding that Congress has provided for it over the past 5 years has failed to keep pace with the increasing complexity of the Nation's financial markets.

''The changes proposed in H.R. 2289 would hinder the ability of the CFTC to operate effectively, thereby threatening the financial security of the middle class by encouraging the same kind of risky, irresponsible behavior that led to the great recession.''

The statement concludes, Mr. Speaker:

''If the President were presented with H.R. 2289, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.''

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2289—COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

(Rep. Conaway, R–TX, June 2, 2015)

The Administration is firmly committed to strengthening the Nation's financial system through the implementation of key reforms to safeguard derivatives markets and ensure a stronger and fairer financial system for investors and consumers. The full benefit to the Nation's citizens and the economy cannot be realized unless the entities charged with establishing and enforcing the rules of the road have the resources to do so.

The Administration strongly opposes the passage of H.R. 2289 because it undermines the efficient functioning of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) by imposing a number of organizational and procedural changes and would undercut efforts taken by the CFTC over the last year to address end-user concerns. H.R. 2289 also offers no solution to address the persistent inadequacy of the agency's funding. The CFTC is one of only two Federal financial regulators funded through annual discretionary appropriations, and the funding the Congress has provided for it over the past five years has failed to keep pace with the increasing complexity of the Nation's financial markets. The changes proposed in H.R. 2289 would hinder the ability of the CFTC to operate effectively, thereby threatening the financial security of the middle class by encouraging the same kind of risky, irresponsible behavior that led to the great recession.

Prior to enactment of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, the derivatives markets were largely unregulated. Losses connected to derivatives rippled through that hidden network, playing a central role in the financial crisis. Wall Street Reform resulted in significant expansion of the CFTC's responsibilities, establishing a framework for standardized over-the-counter derivatives to be traded on regulated platforms and centrally cleared, and for data to be reported to repositories to increase transparency and price discovery. The changes proposed in H.R. 2289 would hinder the CFTC's progress in successfully implementing these critical responsibilities and would unnecessarily disrupt the effective management and operation of the agency without providing the more robust and reliable funding that the agency needs.

In order to respond quickly to market events and market participants, the CFTC needs funding commensurate with its evolving oversight framework. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to authorize fee funding for the CFTC as proposed in the FY 2016 Budget request, a shift that would directly reduce the deficit. User fees were first proposed in the President's Budget by the Reagan Administration more than 30 years ago and have been supported by every Democratic and Republican Administration since that time. Fee funding would shift CFTC costs from the general taxpayer to the primary beneficiaries of the CFTC's oversight in a manner that maintains the efficiency, competitiveness, and financial integrity of the Nation's futures, options, and swaps markets, and supports market access for smaller market participants hedging or mitigating commercial or agricultural risk.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2289, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I think that basically says it all.

While I respect the intentions of my colleagues who drafted this bill, I think it is a deeply flawed bill, and it creates hurdles for the CFTC that will not be fully funded and will cause all kinds of problems.

I think we ought to make sure that the CFTC can do its job. I don't want a repeat of the financial crisis that resulted in the Great Recession. And I think the American people don't want a repeat of that.

I get very worried when I see this Congress chipping away at Dodd-Frank and the provisions in Dodd-Frank that get us back to what got us into this mess to begin with. I think we can do a lot better.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let me just say I appreciate the good discussion here today over the past hour. People on both side of the aisles have made very good comments, very good points.

As it relates to the last comment from Mr. MCGOVERN that talked about chipping away at Dodd-Frank, everything we're doing around here is fine-tuning and improving what has been passed in Congresses—legislation, laws on the books that need improvement—and I see that as what we are doing here today.

So I appreciate very much the comments. And although we may have some differences, I believe that this rule and the underlying bill are very strong measures that are important to the future of our country.

This rule provides for ample debate on the floor, the opportunity to debate and vote on the bill and numerous amendments, which I would note are divided evenly between Democratic and Republican Members of this Chamber. It reflects the balanced deliberation that this rule will provide. This rule will provide for a smooth and deliberative process for sending this bill over to the Senate for their consideration.

H.R. 2289 is a solid and substantial measure that will address several critical issues that the CFTC and end users are facing.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to see the complete deregulation of our financial services industry and our commodities and derivative markets. And I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Massachusetts. However, it is critical that the regulations put in place are appropriate for our economy and as well for the users.

These rules have to provide safeguards and prevent systemic risk but cannot catch our entire economy in a one-size-fits-all regulation.

As we have discussed here today, the current rules place enormous paperwork and financial burdens on small businesses. And that cannot go unstated. Our small businesses, ranchers, utilities, and manufacturers all face these financial burdens. They take these small, risk-averse entities and place them under the same regulatory scheme as large financial institutions and hedge funds. H.R. 2289 will differentiate and exempt the end users who are not a cause of systemic risk and should not have been lumped into these rules in the first place.

The underlying bill would also make much-needed reforms in the CFTC to strengthen their rulemaking process and add commonsense consumer protections.

Overall, this is a strong rule that provides for consideration of this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 288 and the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 182, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

YEAS—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
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
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
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—182

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

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Forbes
Jackson Lee
Kaptur
McMorris Rodgers
Roe (TN)

□ 1340

Messrs. FARENTHOLD, HANNA, McCLINTOCK, and WEBSTER of Florida changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2578.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1342

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. LOUDERMILK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 98, line 20.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. PITTENGER of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. FARR of California.

Amendment No. 1 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

Amendment No. 9 by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. ROHRABACHER of California.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. McCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PITTENGER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 263, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—163

Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Curbelo (FL)
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—263

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Ashford
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Kaptur
Roe (TN)
Smith (MO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1347

Ms. MOORE changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 256, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—170

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

NOES—256

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

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Kaptur
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1351

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Vote No. 276 I am recorded as voting "no;" however, I intended to vote "yes."

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Chair, I was inadvertently absent in the House chamber for a vote on Wednesday, June 3, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 276 in support of the Nadler Amendment to remove language in the underlying bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer or release detainees held at Guantanamo Bay.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 153, noes 273, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—153

Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Yarmuth

NOES—273

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
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
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Grayson
Jackson Lee
Kaptur
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1355

Mr. CICILLINE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 257, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—168

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—257

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz

Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Carson (IN)
Hinojosa
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1358

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 278, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 232, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—195

Aguilar
Amash
Barletta
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brat
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graham
Graves (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Harris
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Takano
Tiberi
Torres
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yoho

NOES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter (TX)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gibson
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hill
Hinojosa
Honda
Huelskamp
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCaul
McGovern
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Pingree
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Reed
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Babin
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1403

Messrs. NORCROSS, SIRES, and CUMMINGS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 146, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—282

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce

Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—146

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Buchanan
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cole
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Lucas
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—4

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1407

Mr. REED changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 244, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—184

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

NOES—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
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—4

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1413

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 27, noes 399, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—27

Aderholt
Brooks (AL)
Burgess
Carson (IN)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Gabbard
Gibson
Gohmert
Grayson
Issa
Jones
Katko
LaMalfa
Lofgren
McKinley
Mooney (WV)
Nolan
Perry
Posey
Rohrabacher
Russell
Sensenbrenner
Takai
Titus
Visclosky
Yoho

NOES—399

Abraham
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Conyers
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1416

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 186, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—242

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack

Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—186

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—4

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1420

Messrs. RANGEL and TAKAI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 182, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—245

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harris
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—182

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Lance
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Hurt (VA)
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1424

Messrs. COLE and ASHFORD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 222, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—206

Aguilar
Amash
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1429

Mr. LOEBSACK changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 297, noes 130, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—297

Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador

LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—130

Abraham
Aderholt
Amodei
Babin
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cleaver
Cole
Comstock
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
Knight
Lamborn
Latta
Lucas
Lynch
MacArthur
Marino
McCarthy
McHenry
McKinley
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Palazzo
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Rush
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Walberg
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

NOT VOTING—5

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1433

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 196, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
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)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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

NOES—196

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

NOT VOTING—4

Adams	Boyle, Brendan F.	Jackson Lee
		Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1438

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I was unable to vote today because of the death of a close friend. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 274—"aye," rollcall No. 275—"aye," rollcall No. 276—"nay," rollcall No. 277—"nay," rollcall No. 278—"nay," rollcall No. 279—"nay," rollcall No. 280—"nay," rollcall No. 281—"nay," rollcall No. 282—"nay," rollcall No. 283—"nay," rollcall No. 284—"aye," rollcall No. 285—"nay," rollcall No. 286—"nay," rollcall No. 287—"aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 7606 (''Legitimacy of Industrial Hemp Research'') of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79) by the Department of Justice or the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1445

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with four of my colleagues to offer a bipartisan amendment that simply requires the DEA to comply with Federal law.

The passage of our amendment to the 2014 farm bill legalized the cultivation of industrial hemp for research purposes and has allowed for the establishment of industrial hemp pilot programs in States across the country. In fact, in my home State of Kentucky alone, nearly 1,800 acres of hemp are projected to be grown this summer in these pilot programs.

However, despite the clear language of our farm bill amendment that specifically states that State agriculture agencies and universities will be growing the industrial hemp for research, the DEA has continuously ignored the plain text of the Federal statute.

The DEA continues to waste valuable time and taxpayer dollars by holding up non-psychoactive hemp seeds destined for legitimate hemp pilot programs.

Last year, officials from the State of Kentucky were forced to file a lawsuit in Federal court to compel the DEA to release industrial hemp seeds for university pilot programs. This year, participants in hemp pilot programs in Kentucky and other States did not receive their seeds until just a few weeks before the start of the growing season.

The language is clear: State authorities, not the DEA, shall register the sites where hemp will be grown. The DEA's deliberate refusal to allow this simple fact has resulted in a broken process where the DEA obfuscates and delays.

Mr. Chairman, States cannot launch industrial hemp pilot programs if the DEA continues to violate Federal law by seizing and delaying shipments of hemp seeds before they reach their destination.

I urge a ''yes'' vote note on our amendment to require the DEA to follow Federal law, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. In 2013, the Kentucky General Assembly passed Senate Bill 50, which exempted industrial hemp from the State's Controlled Substances Act but also mandated that Kentucky follow all Federal rules and regulations with respect to industrial hemp.

So, last year, I was proud to support an amendment to the 2014 farm bill, sponsored by my fellow Kentuckian, Congressman THOMAS MASSIE, which authorized State departments of agriculture in States where industrial hemp is legal to administer industrial hemp pilot programs for the purposes of research and development.

The Kentucky Department of Agriculture Industrial Hemp Pilot Research Program, in collaboration with my constituent, the University of Kentucky College of Agriculture, has since facilitated through permitted farmers the cultivation of nearly 2,000 acres of hemp this year alone in Kentucky.

Hemp is an important crop that holds tremendous commercial promise in Kentucky. In fact, former Speaker of the House Henry Clay was a large producer of industrial hemp. It can be used for food, horse bedding, animal feed, textiles, oils, lotions, cosmetics, rope, pharmaceuticals, et cetera.

Just last week, I met with a very sophisticated partnership of entrepreneurs, tobacco farmers, botanists, and even former law enforcement officials who have put up their own capital to invest in permanent industrial hemp projects, which they believe can spark a very profitable business.

This is about jobs.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, even though I am not actually in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARRIS. I object. I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the job of the DEA is not simple. The job of the DEA is to stop drug use and drug abuse in the United States.

Sometimes the job isn't easy. When it comes to hemp, the job is not easy because, Mr. Chairman, hemp and marijuana are both cannabis, and you can't tell the seeds from one another. And it may be difficult for the DEA to determine because they are supposed to determine that the seeds used for hemp are below a certain level of THC—less than 0.3—and you can't tell by looking. You have to test and make certain that these seeds are in fact going to be used and qualify for the purposes of these pilot hemp programs.

The fact of the matter is there really is no evidence that the DEA does not comply with Federal law. They are fully complying with Federal law. The author of the amendment himself admitted that the seeds were there in time for planting. The fact of the matter is that this is not an easy job.

Under section 7606 of the 2014 farm bill, industrial hemp in pilot projects was authorized. Clearly, DEA licenses are not needed if they are granted through the State departments of agriculture or academic institutions. And the programs are proceeding.

The fact of the matter is that this amendment obfuscates the distinction between marijuana and hemp. It partially ties the hands of DEA to do what they need to do, which is to function as controllers of drugs in this country.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly agree with Dr. HARRIS. I rise also in opposition to this amendment.

Cultivation of cannabis for industrial purposes is governed by the Controlled Substances Act, and that includes hemp. It is permitted pursuant to the registration requirements found in title 21, United States Code.

In addition, the Agricultural Act of 2014 permits ''institutions of higher learning and State Departments of Agriculture to grow or cultivate industrial hemp.''

But let's make one thing clear. The DOJ says they have no intention at all of interfering with what has been provided for in this Department of Agriculture permit. But they still have control, they still have oversight responsibility, and as a result of that, they should do that.

Now, if there is any delay along the way, certainly we should help with that. We should facilitate administratively. But the potential for abuse here is very significant. The DEA and law enforcement must retain control and oversight of hemp, which is a cannabis, just like marijuana.

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

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

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

Mr. MASSIE. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. To my good friend from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS, just a quick response. We are talking about State-licensed programs where the law enforcement officials in Kentucky can identify permitted land where this hemp is grown. If it is on an unpermitted place, whether it is otherwise legal industrial hemp or marijuana, it would be illegal if it is not on a permitted piece of property. So there is no conflict with law enforcement.

But the fact of the matter is that last year the DEA delayed the seeds and delayed the planting of this legitimate, lawful, federally authorized industrial hemp project.

This is about jobs. This is not about marijuana. In fact, as my voting record just demonstrated in the last series of votes, I voted against every single amendment that would have decriminalized or facilitated marijuana. This is not about marijuana. This is about low-THC industrial hemp, and it is about jobs.

Mr. MASSIE. I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and I appreciate his leadership, focused like a laser on something that is not like marijuana.

For generations, Americans have used hemp. It has just been recently that it has been compromised. So we have to import hemp from overseas to make perfectly legal hemp products that you can buy in any American city.

This is an important step forward to be able to allow Kentucky and Oregon farmers to do something that they have done for generations. It is about economic development. It is about being rational. And it is about being able to focus on things that are important.

I deeply appreciate the gentleman's focus and patience keeping us on message here to be able to make sure that we are not having Federal interference for something that is State supervised and where States around the country want to allow this for their farmers and their ranchers.

I think it is an important step forward, and I appreciate his leadership in permitting me to speak on it.

Mr. MASSIE. I certainly thank the gentleman from Oregon, and I would just say that these hemp pilot programs have been tremendous in Kentucky. And they have answered all the questions, like the questions law enforcement had. They came and visited the fields. They said: ''You are right; there is no big deal here. This is okay.''

And so that is the important thing about these hemp programs, and we need to keep them going, and we need to take it to the level. We can't afford delays. You can't afford a delay when the weather is not always cooperating with you. A week, 2 weeks could ruin you.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment. It is just common sense. All we are asking is to follow the law. How hard is that?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, let's review what we have. What we have is a situation where last year it wasn't the DEA that held up the seeds; it was getting an import license. And then subsequent to that, obviously the DEA had to test those seeds.

The U.S. Congress has set out a very clear plan for how we are going to increase the use of industrial hemp in this country, and it involves, first, pilot programs in States where it is legal, like Kentucky, like Oregon, but subject to the oversight under the Controlled Substances Act of the DEA.

The DEA has to be certain, since all seeds are now imported. Eventually, under this plan, they won't be. Obviously, at some point we will progress to a point where our industrial hemp seeds are grown here in the United States, but they are not now.

Importing seeds and testing them is not a quick process, but it is a process that has to be done. The fact of the matter is hemp and marijuana are both cannabis. They are related. You can't tell the seeds apart. You have to test these seeds.

Our drug problem is serious. I am glad I don't have to do the job the DEA does dealing with controlling drugs that destroy lives in this country. Sure, is it a process that sometimes might take time? Yes. But that time is well worth taking.

Down the road, we are going to get to the proper industrial hemp production. It has got to be done under controlled processes. The DEA has these in place. The Department of Agriculture has these protocols in place. State departments of agriculture do.

This amendment is just unnecessary. And worse than that, it obscures the fact that it could tie DEA's hands from doing what it needs to do, which is controlling dangerous substances.

I urge the body to reject 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 Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat ammunition as armor piercing for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, except for ammunition designed and intended for use in a handgun (in accordance with 18 U.S.C. section 921(a)(17)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, back in March, the ATF backed off on a controversial proposal to restrict the use of so-called ''green tip'' ammunition, some of the most popular ammunition in the country. In fact, it is used in the popular rifle, the AR–15.

The BATFE received over 80,000 comments, primarily from citizens who opposed the Bureau's attempt to restrict their Second Amendment rights. And so the ATF rescinded its proposal.

In my opinion, the proposed restriction was based on a flawed application of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code. If you go back and look at the debate that occurred in Congress, you will see that the legislation that was written was clearly meant to cover handgun ammunition. It was never meant to cover rifle ammunition.

In fact, there was a debate at the time whether they should limit so-called ''armor-piercing'' ammunition by its functionality—in other words, its efficacy—or whether they should limit it by its design. And they chose to limit it by its design. Because if you limit it by its functionality, what you will find out is darn near all rifle ammunition, unfortunately, will penetrate the common vest. In fact, the most lethal are deer rifles. And so a deer rifle is more lethal in terms of penetrating a vest than would be, say, a so-called assault rifle that shoots a much smaller caliber.

In any case, what happened is one pistol was made and came on the market—or a few pistols were made, handguns were made—that could be chambered with this round, but the round was designed and intended for use in a rifle, not in a handgun.

□ 1500

The clear text of the statute, in my opinion, excludes rifle rounds, but what has happened is recently, the ATF—now, this is only one example that I have recently—they proposed to ban the green tip ammunition, otherwise known as M855 or SS109. This is 223, also known as 556 ammunition. Well, there was a lot of public backlash, and so they backed off of that.

What a lot of people don't know is they already did ban some ammunition with this flawed interpretation. They banned the 7N6, which is a 5.45 by 39 round, and so it was a mistake that happened, and we need to correct this mistake.

We need to prevent future mistakes. The best way to do this is to withhold funding for flawed interpretations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. I was in support of the gentleman's first amendment; but, in this instance, we are at a different point of view.

I note that the majority has a lot of enthusiasm for gun amendments on this appropriations bill, and it is making it almost impossible for us to deal with the challenges for the subcommittee around spending when we keep getting mired down in this, these gun policy riders.

I would just say that it is obviously the majority's view that this somehow is an appropriate vehicle to express your love for guns of all types, ammunition of all types.

I think that my view would be we should make it permissible for any gun that you could bring into the Capitol, you should be able to bring into schools or colleges, or any ammunition you could bring into the Capitol, you could use in any weapon. That might be a way to proceed.

The majority doesn't have any enthusiasm for the Second Amendment when it comes to people coming into the United States Capitol because we know that guns can be dangerous. We know that people can be harmed.

We know, in fact, that there were Members, when an attack happened right here on this floor—that is why we have, on the back of these chairs, certain protections—who were shot from this balcony.

We know the dangers of guns and ammunition, and it is unfortunate that we would use an appropriations vehicle to move these policy matters, which are controversial.

You want to attach them to a must-pass appropriations bill, one that is about our economy and about innovation, and an appropriations bill that is dealing with a whole set of issues. You make it challenging for Members who have a different point of view on some of these controversial policy issues, like guns and the access to them.

Some might interpret the Second Amendment that says, if you want a bazooka or MX missile or whatever you want to have at your home, that somehow you have a right to have it.

There are others of us who think that reasonable regulation might be a better course of action, like the kind of reasonable regulation we have at the Capitol, which is that you can't bring a gun into this facility, unless you have some lawful reason to do so, and we regulate that very strictly.

I am in opposition to this amendment. I have nothing against my colleague, whom I enjoy working with on a whole range of issues. I agree with him on hemp, and I disagree with him on guns.

I hope that we can move this bill forward, as we have been trying to do since the chairman's mark in the subcommittee, and not get it mired down in unnecessary, controversial items that are not attached to how much money we are going to spend for these various accounts to move these agencies of our government forward.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania. I do, as he knows, support this amendment because it has become necessary to put restrictions like this on the bill because the ATF, under President Obama, did attempt to prohibit 223 ammunition, which is used in one of the most popular and widely available sporting rifles in the United States.

The new Director of the ATF, Tom Brandon, I want to thank him and professional law enforcement officers at the ATF. They came in to see me when I was the brand-new chairman of the subcommittee earlier this year.

We had a very good visit. We looked at the statute, and Director Brandon and his chief counsel understood that the guidelines that they had created went beyond the statute. They recognized that they were going to have a very difficult budget year if they persisted in this effort to interfere with American's lawful, constitutional Second Amendment rights.

I was very grateful that Director Brandon chose to drop their attempted prohibition on 223 ammunition after our meeting and in response to the 80,000 letters and all the requests from Members of Congress. The ATF did the right thing here by dropping their attempt to ban ammunition.

Mr. MASSIE's amendment is necessary because I think it is important to make it clear that we don't want the Obama administration coming back and attempting to ban ammunition again.

I remember, as a student of American history, that General Gage, in Boston, didn't go after the weapons first. They went after the powder and the ammunition, I believe, Mr. MASSIE, in Lexington and Concord.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time with just a question, Mr. Chairman, maybe you could inform me, but I believe that the restrictions on armor-piercing bullets predate the administration that you just named. Is that accurate?

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, but the ATF was attempting to use—the statute says you cannot use armor-piercing ammunition that includes depleted uranium, beryllium, and it has some very specific things.

As Mr. MASSIE said, the Congress was focused on the content of the bullet, rather than what type of weapon it could be used in. In the ATF's guideline, actually, the ATF created a legal framework for analysis, which is fairly standard for this administration.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BLACK). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. I gladly yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let me say that it is important to have Mr. MASSIE's language in this bill because the ATF, in this instance, just as in the EPA's attempt to regulate every square inch of the United States by saying navigable waters include any piece of ground on which the water drains off into a navigable stream, the EPA, the ATF, the Obama administration routinely uses what they call a legal framework for analysis to expand their executive authority far beyond what Congress intended.

In this instance, I was successful with the help of my colleagues. As the new chairman of the subcommittee, I was successful in persuading Director Brandon and the ATF to drop their attempt to ban 223 ammunition, and I will be monitoring them closely. I will be exercising very aggressive oversight over the ATF to ensure that they don't try it again.

I welcome Mr. MASSIE's amendment to help drive home the point that the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution is written in plain English, and it guarantees, absolutely, the right of Americans to keep and bear arms.

I welcome your amendment, Mr. MASSIE, and encourage Members to support it.

Mr. MASSIE. I appreciate that. I appreciate the effort that the chairman put in to making sure that our 556, 223 ammunition did not get banned. I appreciate my colleague from Pennsylvania's comments as well.

Let me say something. I am sympathetic to the ATF's job. We write some bad legislation here, okay. It is clear it has got gray areas. What I am trying to do is to clear up a gray area for them so that, when they go to work in the morning, they don't have to wonder should this apply to this or should this apply to this or not.

Even with the chairman's great efforts, the reason why this is necessary is because the same rationale that they were going to use to ban 556, they actually used a year or two ago to ban 5.45, which is a very similar round in composition and size and capacity. That is why this amendment is necessary.

My colleague from Pennsylvania is right. I do love guns; I have an enthusiasm, but the reason I am doing this is my respect for the Constitution. I understand you have respect for the Constitution as well; I do. We just interpret it a little bit differently.

This is not a bazooka amendment. This is just an ammunition amendment, and I am just trying to make sure this very popular caliber and other popular calibers are still able to be bought.

I appreciate the efforts that everybody puts in to making sure these laws are enforced. I just want to clear up this law. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FATTAH. I am going to yield to the gentleman from New York on this point. I just want to say something.

The point I made was that this restriction on armor-piercing bullets did not emanate with this administration, even though some might want to suggest somehow that this is President Obama's effort.

This dates back to a different period of time, when we had a Republican President, and it was put into place to protect law enforcement because the children who have been unfortunate victims of gunshots in their schools or in movie theaters and other circumstances where we have had these mass shootings, they haven't been wearing bulletproof vests.

Bulletproof vests are used by our law enforcement officials. There was a concern to make sure that they could be protected while they were out protecting us, right? I just want to be clear, as we go forward, what we are doing here and so that everybody who takes an action on this and, however they may vote, understands that they are voting to provide a circumstance in which there won't be any restriction on the piercing power of the projectile, right?

When it is pointed at a human being, it can be deadly, so I just want us to be clear.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), and I will keep track that he doesn't go over 2 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I must rise and oppose this amendment.

Earlier this year, ATF recognized the threat posed by armor-piercing handguns and tried to limit the sale of the green tip 556 round, which is the military-made armor-piercing round that fits into pistols. This would have made sense.

When ATF tried to make that change, the industry decried executive overreach and hidden administrative agendas and shouted down this commonsense proposal. I supported the ATF's proposal then, and I still believe that this and other commonsense regulations on armor-piercing handguns are sorely needed.

I introduced the APB Act to enact the ATF's proposed change into law because we have a responsibility to protect our police and our communities from these unreasonably dangerous weapons.

A hunter does not need a Sig Sauer P556 or an Extar EXP or any of the other pistols that can fire these armor-piercing rounds. These concealed weapons serve only one purpose: to kill human beings wearing body armor.

ATF needs the authority to monitor and regulate firearms and ammunition. When technology advances, like it did with the green tip, ATF needs to be able to act to protect our neighborhoods and our law enforcement. This amendment, I believe, would needlessly strip ATF's authority to regulate dangerous armor-piercing bullets and put cops, kids, and our communities at risk.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Text is most helpful when put in context. It is true that the Constitution says that it is a citizen's right to keep and bear arms, but it says that as part of a well-regulated militia.

When we want to focus in on the Second Amendment, it may be helpful for us to have a contextual framework in which the right is connected to responsible and regulated activity on behalf of our community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word for a very important clarification.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. My colleague, Mr. ENGEL, I think may not have the exact amendment in front of him because all Mr. MASSIE is attempting to do is enforce existing law and make it clear that the ATF has to enforce existing law, as written, and that armor-piercing ammunition cannot be used in handguns.

□ 1515

That is what the law says. The law says an armor-piercing round is one that uses depleted uranium or other materials and is used in a handgun. And that is all this amendment says.

So we, by accepting this amendment, are enforcing existing law, which is to prevent the use of armor-piercing ammunition in a handgun. So it is important that, I think, everyone understand that that is all this amendment is intended to do. And I will, as subcommittee chairman, make certain that the ATF does not interfere with Americans' Second Amendment rights under the Constitution and that the ATF is enforcing the law, as written by Congress, which is precisely what the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) is doing, and I urge Members to support his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk regarding the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. 543. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Institute of Standards and Technology to consult with the National Security Agency or the Central Intelligence Agency to alter cryptographic or computer standards, except to improve information security (in accordance with section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3(c)(1)(A))).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, In December of 2013, news broke—and this was in a Reuters article—that, as a key part of a ''campaign to embed encryption software that it could crack into widely used computer products, the U.S. National Security Agency arranged a secret $10 million contract with'' a private company—in fact, ''one of the most influential firms in the computer security industry.''

It was further disclosed that ''an algorithm called Dual Elliptic Curve . . . was on the road to approval by the National Institute of Standards and Technology as one of four acceptable methods for generating random numbers.''

The company adopted this algorithm, knowing that it would be used as a standard, and it was, as expected, approved by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. But ''within a year, major questions were raised about Dual Elliptic Curve. Cryptography authority Bruce Schneier wrote that the weakness in the formula 'can only be described as a back door.' ''

This is just one example of the NSA exploiting its relationship with NIST to weaken encryption standards.

Look, NIST, we would like for them to set the highest standards for our country, particularly when it comes to encryption. Weakened encryption standards allow the NSA to snoop on Americans without a warrant.

So these back doors in encryption products are bad for privacy. It makes it just way too easy to violate our Fourth Amendment.

But back doors in encryption software are also bad for security. Think about this: Don't you want the best security available that the minds in this country can create, produce, to safeguard your health records, maybe to safeguard your gun records, maybe to safeguard your bank accounts and your credit cards.

We are more safe when we have better security and better encryption. So it makes no sense for the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with the NSA to weaken our encryption software.

Finally, putting back doors in products is bad for business. It is bad for privacy. It is bad for security. And it is bad for business.

Why is it bad for business? Why would somebody buy a product made in America if it is known that the standards in America are weaker than the standards elsewhere? You know, if there are back doors in products, it is not just the government that can use them: hackers will find them. In fact, once the weakness was exposed in this Dual Elliptic Curve, it made it very easy for people to hack into that, and the company had to say, Quit using this software. We found a weakness in it.

So I would urge people to vote for this amendment. What it does is it prevents the spending of money at the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with the NSA to weaken our encryption.

The amendment does nothing to keep them from making better encryption, but they cannot weaken it. They cannot compromise it. They can't spend your tax dollars making American products and our government standards worse.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I support the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, we accept the amendment, agree with the reasoning that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) has laid forth. I believe the amendment is acceptable to the minority as well. So the amendment is agreed to unanimously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. What is the balance of my time remaining, Madam Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I will just summarize why this is an important amendment.

We trust the National Institute of Standards and Technology to perform their constitutionally mandated responsibilities. That is one of the great things about NIST: its authorization is in the Constitution, to set the standards of weights and measures. So I appreciate the job they do. But we put a lot of trust into them when they set these standards. And a lot of people make business decisions. It is kind of like the Good Housekeeping seal of approval, if I may use that analogy.

So, when we stamp something as a government-approved standard, we want to know it is the best in the world, that the United States has the best encryption in their products, the best encryption. We want the products that our government buys to be safe. So it would be wrong for NIST to spend money working to put back doors in our products. That is why I urge our colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. POE), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chair, I would like to try to interpret what has been said in a simpler way.

Assume that the builders in the United States get together and they are given a new requirement: that when they build a new house, the Federal Government wants the option to have a master key to a back door—not only a back door but a secret back door so that at some time down the road, maybe the Federal Government would like to enter that secret back door for some purpose. And that is what this amendment is preventing.

Just like we wouldn't let the Federal Government have a key to our back door or require builders to put a master key in all of the new homes that they build in the country and give the key to the government, we would never allow that. That would certainly be in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution.

All this amendment does is it prevents technology—when technology is growing at a rapid rate—to prevent the Federal Government from requiring companies that make cell phones, for example, that there be an ability of the Federal Government to go in the cell phone and look around, even without the knowledge of the person who owns the cell phone. This is very similar to the bill that passed unanimously last night. So I urge the adoption to this amendment as well.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on the gentleman from Kentucky's amendment, since he ran out of time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am glad to do so.

Madam Chair, again, the amendment is agreed to unanimously. I strongly support the gentleman from Kentucky's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives Special Advisory entitled ''Test, Examination and Classification of 7N6 5.45x39 Ammunition'', dated April 7, 2014. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to stand with my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and with sportsmen and law-abiding gun owners throughout the country.

Over the course of the last year, we have seen numerous misguided attempts by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to misclassify ammunition as ''armor-piercing'' and infringe on the Second Amendment rights of our citizens.

At a forum I held at the end of March in Prescott, Arizona, a large number of my constituents expressed their outrage about ATF reclassifying the imported 7N6, commonly known as the 5.45 x 39 ammunition, as ''armor-piercing,'' thus preventing this ammo from being imported.

7N6 ammo is very affordable and has been used for target practice by sportsmen for years. The administration—especially the ATF, as we have seen with Operation Fast and Furious and recent attempts to ban the green tip ammo—has a penchant for interpreting the law as it sees fit or as it is most convenient for them.

Fortunately, we have at least temporarily beaten back the attempt to ban the .223 green tip ammo after 230 different Members of this body, Chairman CULBERSON, and myself encouraged ATF to drop this misguided attempt. But the 7N6 ammunition ban is yet another example of Federal overreach on the part of the administration.

After years of having a sportsmen exemption, 7N6 was reclassified after ATF found an extremely rare and obscure Polish-made pistol that could supposedly use and shoot the 7N6 cartridge.

I strongly applaud the committee for including four other commonsense provisions in this bill that protect the Second Amendment.

I ask that this body stand with sportsmen throughout this country. I ask that my colleagues support this additional, commonsense provision to protect the Second Amendment and allow the 7N6 ammo to be used for target practice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I guess redundancy has some utility here because we have been around the rosie a number of times on this same issue, both late last night and now early this afternoon, one amendment after another amendment after another amendment, trying to make sure that our fascination with armor-piercing bullets doesn't escape this debate.

□ 1530

So here we have another one, and maybe there is something different about this one than the one before, but I am not able to discern what it is. I am opposed to it.

I think that people have a right to weapons under our Constitution. I think common sense suggests people should have a right to weapons, long guns, rifles, for both sports activities and for their own protection. I also think that it is a responsible thing for those who are governing our country to put in place reasonable regulations and restrictions just like the regulations and restrictions that we have here on the Capitol campus.

Not only do we spend hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money for our own police force to protect us, we also say that you can't bring a firearm into the buildings that we work in each and every day.

Now, we do this even though we come to the floor and profess our undying love for the unfettered notion of the Second Amendment as interpreted by some that you can have a gun anywhere, in a bar, in a park, in a school, in a daycare center, and at church. Take your gun and ride off into the wind with it. But we won't allow it here.

I am just waiting for a Member of the majority, since we have multiple amendments, to come to the floor and to say that people should be able to exercise their Second Amendment here when they visit the people's House, when they visit their elected Representatives, that somehow we want to welcome them and their guns with their armor-piercing bullets, and then I would know that you truly love the Second Amendment and that you see it as an unfettered right anywhere, anytime, and under any circumstances.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I strongly support the gentleman's amendment, and it is necessary because the ATF, once again, here attempted to ban ammunition that could be used in a handgun that is otherwise commonly available for rifles. In the statute, the Congress intended to prohibit the use of armor-piercing ammunition for handguns. So the gentleman's amendment is necessary, and I strongly support the amendment as, again, additional protection for Americans' constitutional Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms.

I would point out to my good friend from Pennsylvania that at the Texas Capitol, concealed-carry permit holders are actually given a separate line so they can get into the capitol even more rapidly because law enforcement officers in Texas recognize that a concealed-carry permit holder is their best backup because they have had a background check and they are trained in the use of the weapon.

I coauthored the legislation in Texas in the 1990s to allow Texans to get a concealed-carry permit, and we have prevented a lot of crimes and saved a lot of lives. I don't think there has even been a fistfight among concealed-carry permit holders in Texas in all these years. They are given expedited access to the Texas Capitol because law enforcement recognizes an honest, law-abiding American with a concealed-carry permit is their best friend.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge its passage.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my friend.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arizona's leadership on this issue, and my profound gratitude and immense respect to Chairman CULBERSON for making sure that this interpretation that was applied to 5.45 ammunition was not applied to 5.56. He has the gratitude of millions of gun owners in this country—law-abiding gun owners, I should say.

This travesty of justice still applies to this other caliber, using the same reasoning. I won't impugn the motives of the ATF. I won't do that. I think they are just trying to enforce the law. There is a gray area here, and I think this bill clears up that gray area for the benefit of millions of gun owners—law-abiding gun owners—in this country, and I thank Representative GOSAR for leading on this.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, what I would like to do is highlight that only an obscure pistol could use this 7N6 ammunition. So I was going out of the way for a very popular round that is used for target practice all over this country. So I would ask for support for my amendment.

I thank the gentleman for helping me, 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. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to operate or disseminate a cell-site simulator or IMSI catcher in the United States except pursuant to a court order that identifies an individual, account, address, or personal device

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer this amendment, and it becomes necessary because selective spying by using these devices commonly called StingRays or cell site simulators or IMSI catchers has become a reality.

These sophisticated, affordable mobile devices in fact spoof or convince your phone that they are a valid cell tower and allow for the gathering of communications content, including texts and emails.

What is disturbing is that Federal dollars may be being used to capture tens of thousands of Americans' information without a warrant. The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, the Associated Press, and more have, in fact, uncovered cases of nationwide use by the FBI and other agencies working to cover up StingRay use in instances in which they have, among other things, dropped criminal cases to avoid having to disclose their use of them. Additionally, they have entered into nondisclosure agreements at times in order to not do so.

Just a month ago, this House—and the Senate, a few days ago—passed, overwhelmingly, a new authorization of the PATRIOT Act. We did so with a careful balance between what our government can do to us and what protections we have, and particularly the Fourth Amendment.

This is a narrowly crafted amendment. It in no way stops the use of these devices when a Federal court has ordered and allowed the use, either a FISA court or a common warrant issued by a judge.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I concur with the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, I rise in support of our amendment today that I am working on with Mr. ISSA.

Madam Chair, the Associated Press reported yesterday that they confirmed reports that the FBI is flying surveillance cameras in aircraft over the U.S. with these devices. They are operated sometimes through shell companies that use video and StingRay technology to capture data on Americans

in bulk both visually and from our cell phones.

This flies in the face of every concept of liberty and privacy that we cherish in this country. Our Founding Fathers would be sickened if they found out how far we have slipped. As much as I have been encouraged by the fact that both Houses of Congress have passed the USA FREEDOM Act to end bulk surveillance under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, reports like this show me we still have a long way to go.

This secretive FBI program to hack into our cellphones seems far from appropriate and constitutional, and it must be curtailed. This amendment would ensure that any usage of this program would only happen through a court order targeting a specific individual and never as a dragnet for bulk surveillance.

I am happy to hear that there is very little opposition to this, and I look forward to working to continue to regain our liberty from mass and unconstitutional surveillance.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers. I urge passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise to assert a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, this amendment does not change existing law. It just removes the funding for an unconstitutional, unstatutory action by the President.

□ 1545

Madam Chair, it seems like I have caused some excitement with the Parliamentarian this afternoon, so why don't I do this.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and go to the second Flores amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Executive Order 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes), including the National Ocean Policy developed under such Executive Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a simple amendment to address an ongoing overreach by the executive branch of our government.

My amendment bans the use of Federal funds for the implementation of Executive Order 13547. That executive order, which was signed in 2010, requires that 60-plus bureaucracies, as shown on this chart, essentially zone the oceans and the sources thereof.

This amendment addresses a critical executive branch encroachment into the powers of Congress as set forth in our Constitution. The activities being conducted by Executive Order 13547 have not been authorized by Congress, nor have appropriations been made by Congress to fund those activities.

Madam Chair, since 2010, this body has voted six times in support of this amendment in a bipartisan manner. This language was also included in the base text of the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. Today, I am offering my amendment again because concerns have been raised that the effects of the National Ocean Policy extend well beyond restricting ocean activities and encroach into inland activities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I visited Chicago a few years back for the coastal zone conference to talk about how important it was that this administration has finally put forward, and we support, an ocean policy. There have been since 2012 over 15 different amendments seeking to undermine responsible ecosystem-based management of our oceans.

As appropriators, we have not been willing to accept these efforts to undermine this. We understand we have a responsibility as stewards. In fact, as a Nation we have more responsibility for the world's oceans than any other Nation in terms of territorially in the world.

We have some challenging circumstances. It is good that we now have a policy going forward. I would ask that the House oppose this amendment.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the former mayor and a great Congressman.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Flores amendment, which would prohibit the implementation of the National Ocean Policy, which permits better coordination among Federal agencies responsible for coastal planning.

This amendment, in particular, would undermine NOAA's participation in planning, it would hurt States and communities, businesses, and would impede States like Rhode Island from managing their own resources in a way that best fits their needs and priorities.

This administration has made it clear that the National Ocean Policy does not create new regulations, supersede current regulations, or modify any agency's established mission, jurisdiction, or authority. Rather, it helps coordinate the implementation of existing regulations by Federal agencies to establish a more efficient and effective decisionmaking process.

In the Northeast, our regional ocean council has allowed our State to pool resources and businesses to have a voice in decisionmaking and has coordinated with Federal partners to ensure all stakeholders have a voice in the process.

It is astounding to me that since 2012, 15 riders undermining ocean planning have been introduced to House bills, including riders on two previous CJS appropriations bills.

Allowing Federal agencies to coordinate implementation of over 100 ocean laws and giving States and local governments a voice in the ocean planning process is smart public policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided amendment and to understand and accept our responsibility to be good stewards of our oceans. That is what the administration's policy does. This is allowing agencies to coordinate that work in a thoughtful, strategic, and smart way.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I again reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, first of all, I think it is important to set the record straight. The issue here is not whether or not we want to take care of our oceans. All of us want to take care of our oceans. All of us believe in managing the ocean economy, the ocean

ecology. We also believe in trying to make sure that we have a government that adheres to this Constitution. Under article I of that Constitution, all legislative powers are reserved to this body, to this Congress, not to the President. That is the issue at stake here. The President has overstepped his constitutional statutory bounds.

Now, in the year 2000, Congress did pass something during the 106th Congress to create an ocean commission to review and make recommendations. Since then, the 108th, 109th, 110th, and 111th Congresses each looked at those recommendations and decided to take no legislative action.

That is what caused the President to move forward with his executive order to try to go around Congress. There are no appropriations. We have asked the Department for this function specifically. We have asked the Department of Interior specifically to provide their statutory support for the President's actions. They have provided none. So the President has gone around Congress by signing these executive orders.

There are 67 groups that include fishing, agricultural, farming, energy, and other industries that are concerned about the impact of this Federal overreach—and again, I would say an unconstitutional Federal overreach.

Again, this is a simple amendment that just stands up for the constitutional rights of this Congress to create the statutes under which this activity can be conducted and to transparently appropriate the funds for this activity should it so choose.

We are not against ocean planning, as I said at the outset of this. What we are for, though, is for the Constitution and to stand up for our congressional rights to enact the statutes related to this activity and for the appropriators to be able to transparently appropriate the money.

Again, this amendment has been adopted with bipartisan support six times over the last 4½ years and is already included in the base text of the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

I want to thank Chairman CULBERSON for considering this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, can I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What selective memory you have. You say that the President is abusing his authority. Do you know who first asked for this? President Bush. He is the one that created the Commission and asked for those recommendations.

And guess what? Five Republicans authored that bill—Republicans Greenwood, Bilbray, Gilchrest, Horn, and Franks. That was in 2000 and 2004 they introduced it. The bill went to committee, and the committee never heard the bill. So don't say that Congress never had a chance to enact this thing. Congress refused, just like Congress refuses to respond to the President's ask that we ought to decide whether we ought to go to war in the Middle East.

You are very selective. You say, Don't let the President make these executive orders, and then when he does you want to sue him because it is about immigration or issues like that. You criticize this President because Congress fails to take action, even after Presidents—Republican and Democratic Presidents—have asked Congress to take action, and we refused. And now you get up and say, Well, because we refused, you took executive action, therefore, we ought to not allow it to be implemented.

The Acting CHAIR. Members will address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am referring the remarks to the Madam Chair.

Look, deleting this ability for the National Ocean Policy—by the way, we haven't appropriated money. No money is being spent on it. But we are smart about getting 70 or 80 Federal agencies together to have one stop to figure out how we can get all these permits. That is why the fishermen support it.

I live in a coastal community. The author of this does not. We make our living off the ocean. And, by God, we want all the regulatory agencies to be in sync. And one of the policies here is, let's have a healthy ocean. What is wrong with that?

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, if the oceans die, it is impossible for us to live.

The Pew Foundation in Philadelphia has put hundreds of millions of dollars behind efforts around ocean science. My friend, Gerry Lenfest, has put a lot of his own fortune behind this effort. When I first got to the Congress, I was chair of the Friends of the Caribbean Caucus. We should do better by our oceans.

I ask that we oppose this, 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. FLORES).

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

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prosecute or hold liable any person or corporation for a violation of section 2(a) of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, the question we should ask ourselves is, should green energy companies be held liable for incidental deaths of birds of prey or migratory birds as a result of them flying into wind turbines or onto solar arrays.

As you may know, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, while well-intentioned, are significantly outdated.

Under current law, the accidental death of a protected bird is punishable as a misdemeanor; a second offense can be charged as a felony. This includes accidental deaths caused by wind turbines and solar panels.

The MBTA covers over 1,000 different species of birds. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act were written to target the intentional killing of migratory birds and birds of prey. I don't think anybody believes that accidental deaths as a result of solar panels or wind energy production warrants felony prosecution.

Every year, cars, trucks, skyscrapers, windmills, oil platforms, airplanes, and houses with big windows cause the deaths of hundreds of thousands of these protected birds, doing things that are otherwise well within the law but that make drivers, pilots, property owners, and green energy companies potential felons under a strict interpretation of an outdated law.

As you can imagine, the enforcement of this law is pretty spotty, with bureaucrats selectively enforcing these regulations, creating uncertainty in the green energy marketplace.

President Obama's Fish and Wildlife Service recently announced plans to study the possibility of creating a permitting regime under the MBTA, which would allow for incidental and accidental take without criminal penalty, and they have suspended prosecutions until this is worked out. I agree with this approach. That is consistent with a bill I introduced—my CLEAN Energy Producers Act, H.R. 493.

My amendment today to the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill will suspend further prosecutions for incidental avian deaths under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act until this incidental take permitting regime is implemented.

I believe this is the right step as we move toward permanent reforms of the MBTA and the BGEPA as a part of the

national all-of-the-above energy independence strategy.

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

□ 1600

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, what is broken that needs fixing? These are laws that have been in place for 100 years. In fact, they are laws that have been implemented because the United States has signed treaties with other countries that share our migratory fowl, countries like Canada, Mexico, Japan, and Russia. These are treaties that require that we be responsible for the wildlife that flies over our air space and lands in our soil.

Migratory birds are integrated into a healthy, natural system. In many ways, they affect the predators, the prey, the seed dispensers, and the pollinators. They are really actively appreciated by millions of people. We have a society in America called the National Audubon Society. We make an awful lot of money in my district off watchable wildlife.

Why would we want to stop the laws that protect that wildlife? I think this is all about responsible management; but to have an amendment that says that none of the funds may be available to prosecute or hold liable any persons who have violated the law, you are dismantling law enforcement's ability to enforce the law where people have violated it—violated it.

I think the public of this country does appreciate their watchable wildlife, whether they are hunting it or whether they are viewing it, and a lot of people make money off of it. I don't think this amendment is at all constructive. You are upsetting 100 years of law and international responsibility that we have as a country in this hemisphere.

I oppose the amendment and ask people to vote against it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I am in full support of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. I am an avid water fowler; I am an avid hunter, and I see how the Migratory Bird Treaty Act has benefited the species from the heyday of the market hunting and what we saw in the early 1900s.

I believe that the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act were designed to talk about the intentional killing or overharvesting of migratory birds and potential killing of birds of prey.

Even the Obama administration recognizes that there is something wrong with how we prosecute these cases of incidental and accidental deaths. This simply takes what they are already doing and says let's just have a pause until we can work this out in permanent law. That is all my amendment does.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Well, with all due respect, that is not what your law says. It says:

> None of the funds made available by this act may be used to prosecute or hold liable any person or corporation for a violation of the provision of law found in section 703(a) of title 16 of the United States Code.

There is no language in here about working anything out. There is no language about being responsible managers of the land or flyways.

Yes, we have a lot of new equipment up in our energy business, our wind energy and our solar energy. Those things, obviously way before you build them, you are supposed to take into account whether they are being built right in a flyway.

We have condors in our area that we have obviously spent a lot of money trying to revive. People actually spend money to come to very expensive hotels so that they can come see a condor. These are things that you want to protect.

To say that none of the funds can be made available to hold liable people that are violating the law seems to me just a reckless act to upset 100 years of wildlife management.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if somebody has intentionally violated law, absolutely, they ought to be prosecuted. This amendment is in order because we are dealing with justice and how this is prosecuted. We are saying that the Justice Department can't expend any money to prosecute these incidental accidental deaths.

We need an interpretation of law. There is no doubt in my mind that we ought to revisit the MBTA and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and we will. I am on the Natural Resources Committee. I promise you, this issue will come up; but I think it is appropriate to say we are going to hold off on expending any money by prosecuting these accidental incidental deaths.

I would urge my colleagues to vote for this. I think it is the right place and the right time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, in closing, to say that the law says that those who are in violation of law—I mean, how many golden eagles do you have to kill and tell the law enforcement you can't do anything about it? This isn't about accidental death. This is people violating the law with an intent. You have to have an intent to do wrong.

I think this is a reckless amendment. I hope we defeat it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to collect information about individuals attending gun shows, by means of an automatic license plate reader, or to retain any information so collected.

Mr. FARR. I reserve a point of order on this issue.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, an email uncovered by the ACLU revealed that the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or ATF, collaborated on a plan to use automatic license plate readers to monitor and collect information about law-abiding citizens attending gun shows.

Under this program, mere attendance at a gun show would have been enough to have one's attendance recorded in a massive DEA database. As if that weren't bad enough, the primary purpose of this database is asset forfeiture, a controversial practice of seizing motorists' possessions if police suspect they are criminal proceeds.

In response to inquiries about the uncovered document, the DEA has said that the proposal was rejected by superiors and never implemented. Keep in mind that this was taking place in Phoenix in 2009 at about the time of Fast and Furious, and there were, I believe, rogue projects going on in that part of the country at the time.

We have litigated that as a House against the Department of Justice, and they have not supplied the documents that they were supposed to have supplied to Congress.

We also held former Attorney General Eric Holder in contempt of Congress for not providing those documents. This was at a time when, perhaps, rogue projects were actually going on in Phoenix. I believe that they were, and I believe that this is one of those.

However, the DEA never supplied any documents saying that they rejected this project. They blamed it on an underling, and they said it was never implemented. While this assurance is welcome, the fact that such a proposal was even considered raises very serious privacy concerns.

My amendment would prohibit any funds from being used to collect or retain information about individuals attending gun shows by means of an automatic license plate reader. This

amendment is supported by the NRA, the National Rifle Association; the Gun Owners of America; and the ACLU.

Automatic license plate readers should not be used to target law-abiding citizens who are engaged in their constitutionally protected rights. Without strong regulations and greater transparency, this new technology would only increase the threat of illegitimate government surveillance.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment in order to rein in the illegal surveillance of Americans and to send a clear message to agencies like the DEA and the ATF that automatic license plate readers must not be used to collect information during constitutionally protected activities.

This includes Second Amendment activities, like attending gun shows.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

That rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law''

One of the provisions is that it ''requires a new determination.''

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to that by saying that The Wall Street Journal published an article on January 27 of this year which quotes what the ACLU uncovered through a Freedom of Information Act request to the Department of Justice.

In pertinent part, this revelation that was obtained by the ACLU reads:

> The DEA Phoenix Division Office is working closely with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives on attacking the guns going to ''blank''—that is redacted—and the gun shows to include programs-operations with license plate readers at the gun shows.

At least some agent or agents within the DEA's Phoenix region believed that they had the authority to go to gun shows and use automatic license plate recognition technology to, basically, throw out a dragnet and take in the identities of everyone who was attending a constitutionally protected activity.

That is what this amendment attacks. At least some elements within the DEA thought that they had this authority. They thought they had this power.

I don't think this is creating any new legislation, because it is going after a power they believed they already had and believed that they had the ability to exercise.

So the withdrawal of funding to something they thought they had the power to do is not creating a new oversight or provision. I forget the word the gentleman used. It is not legislating in the sense of giving them a power they didn't already have. They thought they had this power. This amendment would withdraw the funding for that.

I would urge the Chair to reject the point of order raised by the opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by the relevant Federal officials of whether an individual is attending a gun show. The gentleman from Colorado has not proven that this determination is required by existing law.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 2.48 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple and straightforward amendment, as has been laid out, which is to, in essence, make an across-the-board cut of this particular appropriation by 2.48 percent.

I think it is important to do so simply for this reason. I was in a Budget hearing this morning, and the new Director of the Congressional Budget Office came by.

In his testimony, what he talked about was the way in which the American civilization and the Federal budget was nearing a tipping point beyond which there would be substantial consequence to that which we can budget here at the Federal level; to the value of the dollar; to future interest rates; and, ultimately, to the American way of life.

□ 1615

I think what is interesting is that, indeed, Admiral Mike Mullen, a military man, observed the same, because when he was asked what is the biggest threat to the American way of life and to American security, his answer was the American debt.

You can look at a long list of different authors who have talked about this theme in different ways. You know, Reinhart and Rogoff talked about it in their book entitled, ''This Time is Different,'' wherein, again, you look at economies that get to around 90 percent debt to GDP and, frankly, the wheels start to come off. Bad things begin to happen both to the economy and to the government's ability to perpetuate funding for programs that are important.

We have gone through a long list of well-discussed programs within this particular appropriation bill that are important, but for our government's ability to sustain those programs, we need to look beyond 10 or 15 years out. We need to look at the long run, and ultimately that is what this bill is about.

I think it is interesting from a nonpartisan standpoint that Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson said, if you look at our financial picture, it is the most predictable financial collapse or calamity in the history of man. I could go through a lot of other reasons numerically as to why I think it is important, but the short answer is we are nearing that tipping point that was talked about in the Budget hearing this morning.

I see my colleague standing, so I will reserve the balance of my time and come back to a few other points in a moment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to across-the-board cuts.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's presentation, but I think we ought to put it in full context. We do have an across-the-board cut. It is a huge cut. It is called sequestration. Although Admiral Mullen did admonish the Congress for the fact that we were running a deficit and it was a threat to our national security, he also opposed sequestration, across-the-board cuts.

I think the problem is—and this bill certainly is an across-the-board cut from what we used to spend, with the exception of the protection of one program, but I oppose this. We are on the Committee on Appropriations. We try to go through these things with a fine-tooth comb to figure out how to adjust the spending of the United States of America. The worst thing you can do is just do an across-the-board cut because that harms good programs, and you aren't necessarily cutting enough to really make a big dent in the national debt.

Frankly, the spending of America has come down quite dramatically, and the economy has improved, and our national debt is, in the recent years, at an all-time low. I think, frankly, we in Congress talk about this debt but don't put it into context.

I like to put it in the context that I talk to my constituents about that what we have at the national level, just like you have at the local level and your own personal life, you have

sort of two debts. You have a short-term debt, which is that credit card, you spent too much that one month, so you are going to pay it slowly off in the next couple months. That is the annual deficit.

The long-term debt is that big mortgage that we have on our houses. We don't panic because of a mortgage. We made an agreement over a period of time—15, 30 years—that we are going to pay off this mortgage, and we know what those payments will be.

Wall Street doesn't worry about a deficit when we have a plan to pay it off. Wall Street worries about when we take a meat-ax approach to not running the government efficiently, not having enough people to process people when they need permits and they need access to licenses and things like that.

So I wish Congress would get off this sort of let's just use a meat-ax approach to solving these problems because we won't spend the time to get into the weeds. And although I respect the gentleman and his approach, I just don't think this is the proper way to do it, and I would oppose the across-the-board cut.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join in opposition to this amendment. I share my colleague's concern about government spending, but two-thirds of the problem is in Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, and in ObamaCare, the national debt, the interest on the debt. That is what is drowning us.

We, in the appropriations process, handle about a third of Federal spending, and we have cut spending here in this bill. We have limited resources; and as chairman of the subcommittee, we have prioritized that money to go, first and foremost, to law enforcement.

The gentleman's amendment would cut $683 million out of Federal law enforcement, which is something I just simply cannot support. The gentleman's amendment would cut $212 million out of the FBI and just eviscerate their ability to deal with cyber espionage and to deal with terrorism. The gentleman's amendment would cut $450 million from NASA, essentially crippling our efforts to get Americans back into space on an American-made rocket, something we simply have to do as quickly as possible.

We have in our bill prioritized the limited, very precious, and scarce, hard-earned tax dollars that our constituents have entrusted us with and made sure that Federal law enforcement is taken care of, scientific research is protected, NASA is protected. But first and foremost, we protected public safety with the way we have prioritized our spending.

I have to urge Members to oppose this amendment because we have already followed the Dave Ramsey approach in spending money where it is most needed. We have got to focus on the two-thirds of the problem that is drowning us: the mandatory, automatic spending programs—Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid—that are drowning this economy. That is where the deficit and the debt is coming from. While we continue to do our part in Appropriations on the one-third that we have got control over, we are continuing to cut and prioritize, let's focus on the two-thirds that is actually hurting the American economy. I would urge Members to oppose this amendment and defeat it.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FATTAH. It is good to see my good friend on the floor. I, unfortunately, can't support his amendment, but I appreciate his work here in the Congress.

In the past, unlike those rhetorically who offer notions of support for Simpson-Bowles, I actually supported it and voted for it. I am the only Member of the House that has offered a bill to get rid of the income tax and pay our debts.

I wanted to set up a consumption tax, which 150 other countries in the world use. We have got a consumption-based economy. It might be a good notion to find our revenues where the action is.

I don't take a backseat to anyone when it comes to fiscal responsibility, but unless we have a global budget deal, it is going to be impossible for us to manage the accounts of what you agree are very important Federal agencies that have very important responsibilities.

We are running the most important, the most powerful country in the world. We can't do it on the cheap and be number one. China builds 100 science-only universities in 5 years. It would take us 20 years to build one. We don't have the same kind of decision-making process, obviously, and it takes us a while to formulate our decision package; but even when we get there, we have this debate about whether or not we are going to stand up and be the leading country in the world, whether in space exploration or in any of the areas of scientific enterprise in which we have always had the absolute lead. Now we have only a relative lead.

There are those who are working in ways that are adverse to insisting on America being number one. Those are people who want to tell the American public that we can continue to have the best military in the world and not pay for it or the best education system and not pay for it. Or you look at our national laboratories, and I have visited Oak Ridge, I have visited Los Alamos and Sandia and Fermi and Argonne. You look at these laboratories. These were major investments. Now, some might call it spending, but it helped America win wars, but also win the economic fight against our competitors by making these investments.

I just think that it is not a matter of what we can cut. It is where does our country want to end up. Do we want to be something less than number one in the world? Is that the legacy we want to leave our children and grandchildren? Or are we going to make the decisions that others before us have made, which is that we have to make tough decisions, and we are going to have to carry our own pail of water up the hill, and we are going to have to pay for all that we get. It was Abraham Lincoln who said you may not get all that you pay for, but you will pay for all that you get.

So this notion that somehow America can be number one on the cheap, I am not buying it. The world's not going to buy it. We are competing with countries that have a billion-plus population. They are making investments, and they want to eat our lunch, economically. There may be challenges in other ways for our country down the road, and we have to be prepared as leaders to make some tough decisions and to tell the American public that, in order to retain our position, we might have to actually stand up to the bar and pay our fair share.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I admire the earnestness of my colleagues who, in good faith, are pressing forward in terms of trying to protect a whole host of programs that I think we all recognize are of great importance to the American people.

Churchill once observed that the beauty of the American political system was that it always did the right thing—after it had exhausted every other possible remedy. My fear in this is, if we wait late in the game, and this is exactly what the Budget Director was talking about this morning, if we wait, the consequences to waiting, in numerical terms, become horrific. We are dealing with a math trap that compounds with time. Einstein, in fact, was once asked what is the most powerful force in the universe, and his reply was compound interest. The numbers become, I think, absolutely compelling.

So I would agree with my colleagues that across-the-board cuts are absolutely not the best way to go. When I was involved in State politics, I worked earnestly against across-the-board cuts. It is only out of desperation that I offer a proposal that entails across-the-board cuts because, again, if we wait, what the Budget Director this morning says was that there will be real consequences.

I would make four additional points:

One, if we are serious about addressing the entitlement problem, then we shouldn't be borrowing from entitlement spending to fund mandatory spending, and that is exactly what this particular appropriation bill does to the tune of about $10 billion. So I think

that if we are really going to get earnest about entitlement spending, this would be a place to start, which is part of the reason as to why we focused on this particular appropriation bill.

Two, my colleague from California mentioned national debt is at an all-time low. That is incorrect. In fact, we are at an all-time high if you look at the numbers. Roughly, it took us 200 years to get to $5 trillion in debt. Over the Bush administration, we went from 5 to 10. It doubled. And now, during the Obama administration, it is going to double again from roughly 10 to 20. It is at an all-time high.

I think the key to a mortgage is your ability to pay it off. It is not, again, is there a mortgage or isn't there. It is can you pay it off. If you look at the numbers—and increasingly rating agencies around the world have suggested that when you get up around that 90 percent number, there is less and less probability that you will be able to perpetuate that spending, which goes to the heart of can we perpetuate our ability to fund these worthwhile programs, which is what this amendment is about.

Lastly, I would say Admiral Mullen, when he spoke against the sequester, he did so, in large measure, because what he recognized was the way in which sequester disproportionately impacted the military.

For a host of reasons, again, I would ask support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to the case State of Texas, et al. v. United States of America, et al. (No. B-14-254 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas and No. 15-40238 in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Iowa and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

□ 1630

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an amendment, in short form, that says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used with respect to the case State of Texas, et al. v. United States of America.

I point out to the body, Mr. Chairman, that that is the case that was filed by then-Attorney General of Texas Greg Abbott, now Governor of Texas, to protect the interest of Texans. It has been signed on to now by 25 States, I believe. And this is in reference to the President's November 20 DAPA policy, his executive amnesty policy.

We have watched as this Congress has three times voted to reject the President's initiative, and the debate has been centered on constitutional grounds. The position of this Congress has three times been that the President of the United States is the leader of the executive branch of this government, and the legislative powers are all vested here in the United States Congress, in a House and in a Senate. That is article 1 of the Constitution.

That is what the President taught through his 10 years as an adjunct professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago, and that is what he also uttered at least 22 times as President of the United States—that he didn't have the authority to establish in advance an executive amnesty that would waive the application of the law for some 5 million people.

Not only does this Congress agree with the President's 22 statements that he has since changed his position on—by the way, the President has a 33-page Office of Legal Counsel opinion that is written, I think, very loosely—and I read every word of that—but the President's convictions, I believe, were reflected prior to this political decision.

And so my amendment prohibits any of the funds from being used to further defend this unconstitutional executive amnesty position.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that not only has Congress voted three times but also the President's 22 statements, as I said, and then it is backed up by Federal Judge Hanen, who ruled on the side of the Constitution and the rule of law and the separation of powers. And on the administration's appeal, a three-judge panel in the Fifth Circuit also ruled and indicated that the State of Texas and the other coplaintiffs were likely to prevail, and granted standing to the State of Texas.

And now we have an administration that appears to be willing to continue this debate further and go with an appeal to the Circuit Court again. They actually have the opportunity to go directly to the Supreme Court.

So, Mr. Chairman, I go through this long list of things that have happened because a lot of money has been spent and wasted in an attempt to, let's say—the gracious way to say it would be to stretch the Constitution beyond any bounds that it had been stretched before.

This amendment simply directs that none of the funds made available shall be used to continue that endeavor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. So when the gentleman references the Congress acting three times, when you say ''the Congress,'' do you mean both Houses of the Congress? Or, are you referring to one House?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would have to go back and look at the record in the Senate to give you an accurate count. I can tell you that it is an accurate count for the House. It may not be a full three times in the Senate.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman, and if he would continue to yield, we can continue for one second. Because I know that you appreciate the construction of our government and the way the Constitution framed it. It is not the law of the land that one House acts on something. We need the House to act, the Senate to act, and then we need a Presidential signature or an override by a Presidential veto.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his insight, Mr. Chairman, I would state that the Constitution is very clear. It was very clear to the President of the United States for 10 years while he taught it, and it was very clear when he made his statements 22 times.

So this is the Congress reasserting itself. Our Founding Fathers expected we would do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time in that colloquy. I look forward to being able to do the same in return, but I do appreciate the opportunity to communicate with my colleague, because I don't want anyone to misinterpret the facts here.

Every single President has acted in this area. And these actions by this President are no different than the actions by previous Presidents in this trade space around providing amnesty.

And what the gentleman strenuously and sincerely objects to is that this has benefited a large number of people whom the President has a different view of, in terms of their circumstances, because they were brought here as young children. And the President says, well, they are here, they went to school here, and this is the only country they know, and they have abided by our laws, and he is granting them this ability to stay. And the gentleman objects.

But I don't want anyone to think that the Congress has taken some different view, because the Congress is

two Houses—the House and the Senate—and even if both Houses were to act, the way our laws are structured, you need a Presidential signature.

So, in fact, one House may have a difference of opinion. When Ronald Reagan was President, the Democrats had a difference of opinion. It didn't change the law so that we voted in some particular way.

I don't want anyone to misinterpret the comments of my colleague as he has articulated his sincere objections to these issues.

And then to get to the point of his amendment, what he is saying is that it is wonderful that the judiciary is responding, they are interpreting the law the way he thinks it should be interpreted, but here what he wants to do is to deny the executive branch appropriate resources to pursue its policy objectives by saying that none of the funds here can be used by DOJ in furtherance of their position.

So I think it is fair for the House to have a view. The House is even suing the President about his point of view on some things. But it is unfair for us to deny the executive branch an opportunity to put forth its arguments in court on any of these matters so that we can get a proper ruling from the third branch of our government.

And even though there have been rulings in the gentleman's favor, he and I both know that we are not at the final rendezvous here, and that the wheels of justice grind slowly, but there will be a final decision probably by the highest court in the land. But we should not deny the DOJ an opportunity to go into court and argue the administration's position. I think that would be unfair.

Therefore, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of the amendment. I strongly support Mr. KING's amendment because what the President has done is clearly illegal.

The President does not have the ability to change the law by himself. As my good friend from Philadelphia points out, one House of Congress cannot change the law all by itself. And similarly, the Chief Executive cannot change the law enacted by Congress and signed by the President all by himself.

The law is very clear that people who are in the country illegally, who have violated the immigration laws of the United States, need to be deported. And the President by this illegal executive action has attempted to override the Federal law enacted by Congress and signed by previous Presidents.

The District Court agreed that President Obama's action is illegal and that an injunction lies against it. The District Court suspended the President's executive order because it was illegal. The Federal Court of Appeals in New Orleans suspended the President's executive order because it was illegal. We expect the full Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals to suspend the President's executive order because it is illegal. We expect the Supreme Court to suspend the President's order because it is illegal, because the Constitution clearly says that as chief executive you have an obligation to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

You cannot make a law all by yourself with the stroke of a pen. And that is exactly what President Obama has done. In addition, it has placed an incredibly unaffordable financial burden on the people of Texas, the people of Tennessee, and the people of all the States of the Union that would have to deal with these folks that are here illegally.

All that we ask is that the law be enforced. All that we ask is that the law be respected, because, as our Founding Fathers understood, the law is the foundation of all of our liberty. Without law enforcement, there can be no liberty. Because there is just simply anarchy. If you look at northern Mexico today, it is in a complete state of anarchy. Mexico is essentially a failed state because they have no law enforcement.

In the United States of America we cannot expect to preserve this great Republic handed down to us by our Founders without enforcing the law. The fundamental question that this lawsuit, Texas v. United States, is pursuing—and winning—is respect for the rule of law as the foundation for all our liberties.

So I strongly support Mr. KING's amendment as an important tool in the ongoing effort to overturn the President's illegal executive amnesty. We expect the Supreme Court will stand behind the State of Texas and agree that the President's order must be suspended because it is illegal, because without law enforcement, without respect for the law, there can be no liberty. That is the issue here.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would just reiterate that the President of the United States has signed a document. It is a November 20 document that says that he is going to impose executive amnesty. This House disagrees. Many in the Senate also disagree.

They have been chasing down an expensive rabbit trail to advance an operation of imposing amnesty in the United States of America, in contravention of our laws.

This Congress is reserved the right by the Constitution to write immigration law, and our Founding Fathers imagined we would jealously guard that power. That is what this amendment is about.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I think that we are at a point where it is difficult to reconcile what we are trying to do here—that is, in an appropriations bill—with these policy riders.

Now, I have heard my chairman claim that the President of the United States has done things that are illegal three or four times. I think that that kind of language is not useful in the debate, nor is it factual, because I think that the President has been acting well in concert with the precedents of former Presidents who have provided clemency and amnesty.

And I have heard Members like Mr. KING criticize those other Presidents who have provided amnesty, like Ronald Reagan and others, and I have never heard anyone claim that President Reagan acted illegally in those matters. So I find it unusual that we would be in this type of circumstance.

I heard the chairman run through a litany in which he also has the Supreme Court finally make some decision, which they have obviously not done yet.

So I would like to try to get back on the tracks of moving an appropriations bill. And the point that we have to understand here is that, if we are a coequal branch of the government—that is, the President is coequal to us, but we are one-half of the Congress—then the idea that what the House says goes is nonsensical.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just make the point that this Congress passed an amnesty act in 1986, and Ronald Reagan signed that. It was an act of Congress that brought amnesty in 1986. I think it was a mistake, but I believe it was constitutional.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's point.

Like I was saying, it is nonsensical to assume that whatever the unfettered action of the House is, that it, number one, represents the action of the Congress, because it doesn't. We have two Houses. We have a Senate and a House. And then we are coequal to the President, but the President has certain rights provided to him under the Constitution.

If you find no exception in the actions of other Presidents, it is unusual that we would have such enthusiastic language in condemnation of this President's very similar actions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

□ 1645

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to negotiate or finalize a trade agreement that includes provisions relating to visas issued under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)). The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Iowa and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses the circumstances around the trade promotion authority and later on, perhaps, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, but it also addresses any of our trade negotiations that might take place that would be funded under this bill.

The rationale is that there has been much concern about the negotiations with regard to trade promotion authority in particular, enabling the discussion about immigration visas as being part of the trade negotiations.

It is a longstanding pattern and practice of this Congress to assert our constitutional authority over immigration visas. When our U.S. Trade Representative or other negotiators bring in negotiations that have to do with visas, it complicates our trade negotiations and puts us in a place where, when we see a trade agreement come before us, perhaps it is under a trade promotion authority that would be negotiated and this House votes on it, then it may well have within it visa agreements that have been negotiated with the multiple countries and taking out of the hands of Congress the ability to directly establish, although there is an indirect inference, but directly establish our immigration policy.

A lot of the opposition to the trade negotiations that have been taking place in the Trans-Pacific Partnership have been about concerns of news reports that have come from places likes Australia that have pointed out that there are negotiations going on that have to do with visas.

There was a circumstance several years ago, under a previous administration, where they had negotiated immigration provisions in a trade agreement, and even though it was a nonamendable trade agreement, we went before the Judiciary Committee and had a full hearing. I offered two amendments that passed, and ultimately, there were changes made in that agreement. There is a long history on this with me.

It has been an important issue to maintain the separation of immigration policy and the Congress from the executive branch negotiations in trade. That is what this amendment does. It says no immigrant visas will be negotiated in trade agreements. That means all of them.

Again, the Constitution enumerates this power to the Congress, not the executive branch. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. I think that the hopes of having some bipartisan support for this bill is waning. I think it is very unfortunate that we are now at a point where we are trying to intrude in an entirely different area of the President's prerogatives. He can negotiate all he wants.

Now, I may not support what he negotiates, but to say you can't even discuss something in a negotiation, I think, is unfortunate.

I am in opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would reiterate this point, that this Congress and a lot of the American people lack confidence in the negotiations of our President. A lot of this angst has flowed forth from the Iranian negotiations and their march towards a nuclear capability that has undermined his credibility and made it significantly more difficult for a Congress that is in favor of trade, especially on my side of the aisle.

I am a natural-born free trader. I have always believed that I can compete with anybody in the world, and I think America and American companies can compete with anyone in the world. I think that we need to have a level playing field.

What is happening is that lack of confidence in the President's negotiations and the willingness to, I believe, give away some of the positions that would better enhance our national security with regard to Iran, in particular, has made it far more difficult for those like me, who are pro-free trade, pro-smart trade, and because of that and the discussions about immigration visas being part of the negotiations and the indications from other countries that that is taking place, the secrecy around these negotiations is another component of it.

When we have to go into a secure room and give up our iPhone and leave our notes there in order to be able to see what the administration will present us as far as these negotiations are concerned, it is hard to have confidence that we are getting all of the straight story.

This is a way to put some containment around the negotiations. If the administration says there are no visas being negotiated, there should be no reason to oppose this amendment. That is really the bottom line.

If the administration opposes my amendment, that is a strong indication that they are not giving us the full story, but we are getting more of the full story from places like Australia.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining, please?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time here and reiterate that this amendment addresses a lack of trust that these trade negotiations are focused on the things that trades are supposed to be discussed about.

I have a strong suspicion that they have included immigration visas in their trade agreements. This amendment is drafted consistent with the position of this Congress that immigration should not be part of trade negotiations.

If the administration says that it is not part of trade negotiations, they should say, Fine, I am happy to support the King amendment; and they will be happy to prove it in that fashion.

Meanwhile, a lot of us are not going to a secure room to see if there is anything in there, and we won't know what is presented to the this Congress until it is too late to resist.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the House I have no intention of taking 4½ minutes to make the comments that I intend to make.

I was at SelectUSA, which is a gathering of people that the administration has brought together from around the world who were businesspeople and about investments in America. I was there with a number of Members of the U.S. Senate, Senator NELSON and others.

I got a chance at the lunch to sit next to a gentleman who has businesses in the United States—manufacturing businesses—and in South Africa and his home country in Asia and a number of other places.

He was saying that, when he travels to America, even though he has got 3,000 employees here, it is almost impossible for him to get the kind of visas and to get back and forth post-9/11 that can make it an efficient business trip for him. It requires such advance planning and so on.

I could imagine, in a negotiation, that there could be some consideration when there is a person who has got a multinational business and is employing Americans in Iowa or some other

State about their entry and exit from our country. In fact, he indicated that, in these other countries, he has such arrangements, just not in our own. I think that America has got to think about where it is on these issues.

This is not the appropriate bill for this. This is a bill to determine the appropriation levels that we are going to fund in certain accounts. We are well off the tracks, and I hope that we vote this amendment down. I am opposed to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Iowa and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the funding that might be used in contravention of section 642(a) that is designated in the amendment.

642(a) is the section in the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as I know it, that prohibits the political subdivisions in America from establishing sanctuary policies we often refer to as sanctuary cities. These are the political subdivisions that establish a policy that prohibit their law enforcement officers and their other agents from cooperating with Federal immigration officials.

It seems illogical to me to think that any local government would want to prohibit their law enforcement officers from assisting in, cooperating with, and transferring information to the Federal law enforcement officers who are enforcing immigration law.

That section, it reads, in part, but with the thought being contained here: ''Notwithstanding,'' the language says, ''the political subdivisions may not prohibit, or in any way restrict any government entity or official from sending to or receiving from the INS''—at the time, that is ICE today—''information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.''

Mr. Chairman, I grew up in a law enforcement family. I looked at the men around me as a little boy, and I just thought that all adult men put on a uniform of some kind or another. I was steeped in respect for the supreme law of the land—the Constitution—and the rule of law.

When there was an issue that came forward, whether it was a bank robbery or some tragedy that took place, all levels of law enforcement cooperated with all other levels of law enforcement. No one that was a member of the city police said: I am not going to be serving papers here because that is the county's job.

No county deputy decided that he wouldn't pull somebody over for speeding because that was the city speed limit on a city street. No highway patrol officer decided that he wouldn't enforce local law.

No one that came in from the Division of Criminal Investigation or the FBI decided that it was their bailiwick, that it was exclusively their law to enforce and that no one should help them with that.

Law enforcement, to be effective, has to be a cooperation from all levels; and, of course, the public has to respect the rule of law; and they have to respect those who are there to protect and serve and to also enforce that law.

For me, I cannot understand how or why a city would establish these policies, but they are doing so. In the process of that, they are undermining the rule of law and eroding the respect for the rule of law and leaving their citizens vulnerable, when we could be helping them with Federal officers who need to get this information.

This is an amendment that has been offered in multiple years. It has passed this House multiple times. The number that I saw last year with the identical language passed the House by a vote of 214–94.

We have been consistent in defending the rule of law. This amendment says that no funds shall go to these political subdivisions from this bill, if they establish sanctuary city policies, to put it in short summation.

I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, the description of the amendment, as we understand it, prohibits the use of these funds that contravene section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

The facts are that the States and localities around the country that have adopted laws and policies to limit immigration enforcement by law enforcement are focused on protecting public safety. We have this in California. We have it in many border States. There is a level of cooperation that does take place between local law enforcement agencies as well as our Federal enforcement officers.

Surely, we don't believe it is good public policy to force an unwanted role upon police through the threat of sanctions, which is what this amendment does, or withholding police funding. Frankly, if you believe in Federalism and if you believe in that relationship between local, State, and Federal Government, this is really top-down and I think runs contrary to the notion that law enforcement agencies at all levels collaborate and cooperate.

Holding this sort of a sword of Damocles, so to speak, over the head of local law enforcement agencies simply, I think, is not good public policy.

In an op-ed piece that was published in Roll Call last year, the police chief of Dayton, Ohio, explained why his department instructs its officers not to check the immigration status of witnesses and victims or to question their status in minor traffic stops.

He says:

These policies allow us to focus our limited resources on our primary mission, which is crime solving and community safety.

We know that local law enforcement agencies are clearly stretched very thin across the country. They also said victims of crimes should never be afraid to reach out for help due to the fear of immigration consequences because, notwithstanding the fact of their status, crimes are perpetrated upon these people as well.

Since Dayton adopted these policies and innovative ways of addressing crime problems, their crime rates have significantly declined; and, in the past 3 years, serious crime has declined nearly 22 percent, while serious property crime has gone down 15 percent. It is simply, we believe, perverse to punish communities that want to prioritize because they know best what their challenges are within their communities to protect the public against crime and to enact community-based policing activities. To deny them this funding through this threat of the SCAAP funds simply is, we believe, inappropriate.

Finally, I think that this amendment focuses on a problem that doesn't exist.

With those statements, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to speak in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the objection of the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) to this amendment is that he does not believe current Federal law is good public policy. As a Member of Congress, he has the privilege of filing amendments and filing

legislation to change current Federal legislation, but we cannot, as lawmakers, encourage law breaking.

All the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) says is that if a local or State government expects to receive Federal money, they should comply with Federal law. It is really that simple.

Mr. KING's amendment simply says that, if you expect to receive funding from the Department of Justice, if you expect to receive funding under the SCAAP program—the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program—to compensate local jurisdictions for housing illegal aliens who have broken State law and are housed in a State or local jail at local taxpayer expense, if you want to be compensated for that and if you want to apply for grant funding from the Department of Justice, all Mr. KING's amendment says is follow Federal law. If you want Federal money, follow Federal law.

The Federal law is very clear. The law Mr. KING is referencing here is very simple. It simply says that a State or local government may not prohibit or in any way restrict a government entity or official from sending or receiving any information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of any individual to the Immigration Services. That is all this law says.

It is a very important piece of law because, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) quite correctly points out, we expect all our local and State and Federal law enforcement officials to work together seamlessly.

Because we are a Nation of laws, we understand that all our liberty depends on the enforcement of the law, with equal protection and due process for everyone. All our liberties depend on local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers using their good hearts, their good sense, and their ability, as law enforcement officers, to recognize when and where they need to cooperate and communicate with the State law enforcement officials, with Federal law enforcement officials to protect the life and liberty of the people of the United States. That is what is really at stake here.

That is the objection that we have had to the President's unlawful actions. That is the concern and the objection we have in the State of Texas to the uncontrolled flow of people and drugs and guns and illegal material across the border. Our concern is not with the lawful free flow of people back and forth over the Rio Grande River. Our concern is with the illegal, criminal conduct.

We recognize in Texas the importance of free trade with Mexico and with Canada, but you cannot have free trade and a strong economy without safe streets, and you cannot have safe streets until the law is enforced. We in Texas, first and foremost, recognize that, in order to have that good relationship with Mexico, the law has got to be enforced.

We need workers from Mexico to come here lawfully. We need our laws to be respected so that we can ensure the economy stays strong, so that our liberty is protected. Our liberty can only be safe when the law is enforced.

All Mr. KING's amendment says is, if you expect to receive Federal money, follow Federal law. It is not complicated. That is very, very simple. Under the law that has been on the books since 1996, a State or local unit of government cannot restrict in any way the ability of a government official to either send information to Immigration Services or receive information from Federal immigration regarding the citizenship or unlawful status of any individual.

If my colleague from California (Mr. COSTA) objects to that law, it is his privilege, as a Member of Congress, to file an amendment or file legislation to amend it or change it. In the meantime, our responsibility as lawmakers and my responsibility as chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee is to ensure that the law is enforced.

If agencies of the Federal Government or State or local governments expect to receive Federal money, if they expect to have the privilege of spending our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars, they should expect to follow the law.

If you want Federal money, follow Federal law. It is that simple. That is all Mr. KING's amendment does, and I urge Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate the positions that were taken by the gentleman from Texas. We have political subdivisions, primarily, as sanctuary cities that are violating Federal law, and all we are saying is follow the law.

The point hasn't been made here that the Department of Justice could enforce this law, but they choose not to, and that empowers the political subdivisions, particularly the cities that continue to advance these sanctuary policies.

Can you imagine being a police officer and being told that, if you pick up people who are unlawfully present in America, that you can't tell the INS—even if you are having coffee with them—that you have got a jail full of people who are unlawfully present in America that are required by law to be placed into removal proceedings? That is just illogical.

I would point out that, if you disagree with this section of the code, you are here in this Congress, bring a bill to try to change it.

In the meanwhile, I am for full funding of the SCAAP funding. I think that, when we have people in the country and we are not enforcing immigration law, we should make sure that local jails are funded when they are picking up people that are unlawfully present in America.

I support the Byrne JAG grants. I want to give that to them, but we cannot do that under provisions if the local subdivisions are violating law.

Then with regard to the statement that this is a problem that doesn't exist—no, it is a problem that exists all over this country. It is growing. It is replete in city after city. We need to restore respect for the rule of law. That is what this amendment does. I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the program known as ''Operation Choke Point''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, question: How does the Federal Government get rid of an industry it doesn't like?

Answer: Simple, it cuts off that industry from the financial services sector.

Sounds impossible, doesn't it? However, that is exactly what the Department of Justice is doing in conjunction with the FDIC right now. Their name for this action is called Operation Choke Point. It is designed to force legally operating entities out of business by choking them off from the financial services they need to operate their businesses.

What started with nondepository lenders has spread to other industries, including pawn shops, tobacco retailers, and the firearms and ammunition industries, to name just a few, as well as the businesses that provide services and products to these industries.

This amendment would ensure that Operation Choke Point is ended and that the DOJ returns to their proper job, targeting companies based on fraudulent actions, not entire industries based on political motive. An identical amendment was offered by a bipartisan group of lawmakers during fiscal year 2015 debate, and it was passed by voice vote.

This isn't a partisan issue. This is an issue of DOJ abusing its authorities. I urge support for this amendment.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chair, soon, we will vote to end funding for a government program that is, at best, unethical and, at worst, illegal. The program known as Operation Choke Point forces banks to discriminate against legitimate, legal businesses.

Today, we know that banks are closing their customers' accounts under a directive by the U.S. Department of Justice. There is no appeals process.

That is right; the enforcer of the law of the land is backing this potentially unlawful program. Hard-working American businessowners are having their livelihoods ripped out from under them by a law established by this administration, not by Congress.

Operation Choke Point is another example of how the Obama administration has gone around Congress to create laws, rather than do their job to enforce the laws we already have on the books.

As a businessowner myself, Operation Choke Point worries me greatly. Operation Choke Point is un-American. It is deceiving and simply wrong. It is time this Congress uses its power of the purse to rein in government overreach and restore government accountability.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to defund Operation Choke Point.

In God we trust.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

□ 1715

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, now I think that there may be some mutuality of interest if what the gentleman says is true about what is at stake here. However, this is not a process in which we can discern all of that at this moment. This is an appropriations bill. I think that this is probably an area where the Congress should hold some hearings and look into it, take some testimony and figure out exactly what is going on before we would shut down what might be a very important program.

It may be, as the gentleman describes, that is something where DOJ is just moving in ways that make little or no sense. But I think that to come at the final point in the bill and seek to restrict DOJ in this way, I would be reluctant to support it, and therefore, I stand in opposition to it.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my friend, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and I thank the chairman. What we are up here talking about is a program where the government is trying to put legal businesses out of business—that is what Operation Choke Point is—legal businesses that some people don't like especially within the administration, pawnshops, payday lenders, ammunition manufacturers, gun shops, but legal businesses.

With all due respect to my friend from Pennsylvania, we have had hearings on this. In fact, the Department of Justice has claimed they have stopped this program. They have agreed with us that they shouldn't be doing this. Now, we don't believe they are actually doing that. We have indications from what is happening back in our districts that even though the Department of Justice says they have stopped Operation Choke Point, that it is still going on.

So here is my question, Mr. Chairman: Who supports this program? The Department of Justice says it is wrong. The Department of Justice says it is not even doing it. So who would get up here on this floor and say: ''I think Operation Choke Point is a great idea. I think we should go ahead and continue to use means within the Department of Justice to drive legal businesses out of business''? I'm not really sure how you defend that position.

This is real for me in my district, Mr. Chairman. I have a woman-owned business in my home county who cannot get money to expand her pawnshop. I have businesses elsewhere in South Carolina that have a little tiny piece of their large financial services business in payday lending. They have been cut off from their financial relationships of 25 years. They can't get banking services. That is why the DOJ said they were going to stop. We just don't happen to believe them.

Mr. Chairman, we should support this amendment because it is the appropriate thing to do, to my good friend from Pennsylvania, because that is how we work. We defund programs that we don't like. And if the DOJ says they are not doing it anyway, what is the harm in voting for the amendment?

So I would ask again, who could possibly be against the amendment? Who could possibly be for Operation Choke Point?

I hope we have overwhelming and broad support for Mr. LUETKEMEYER's amendment later on this evening.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) for purposes of a colloquy.

Since the Republicans are in the majority, you have held hearings on this. Is there legislation that is coming forward to end these practices?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Yes. There have been hearings in the Financial Services Committee. There also have been hearings in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. In fact, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has an extensive report on both the DOJ and FDIC activities that include emails and internal memos from those agencies indicating these activities. They can't be denied. They admit this in discussions with the FDIC. In a follow-up hearing to the report, they admit doing this. They have put in place a number of provisions of a bill that I am offering.

Mr. FATTAH. Let me restate my question.

Is there legislation coming forward that would end the practice?

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. That is what I was getting to.

As a result of these reports, we have come up with a bill. I have a bill filed. It will be coming up later on this month for a hearing in committee.

The FDIC has put in place many of the same provisions of the bill already as protocols for their operations on how they handle situations like this. I think we are making progress.

The problem is that DOJ has flipped the model of using FIRREA, which is a bank law that banks use to protect themselves against fraud, to now use that law against them. As a result, we need to stop that. That is part of the bill as well.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate your answering my question.

So what I hear is that you held some hearings, that you have legislation, that you are making progress, and that the administration has already curtailed some of these practices that you are concerned about. However, you would still like to proceed with this prohibition of funds which might be entirely appropriate.

I don't have enough information, standing here today, to agree with you that that is the right thing to do, so I stand in opposition to the amendment even though I may not be, in spirit, in opposition to what it is that you are attempting to do. I just don't have enough information to join you in this effort as robustly as you are engaged in it.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that I think my two other spokespeople here, with regards to this, have expressed concern.

There are businesses across this country that are being choked off from financial services, and as a result, they are doing legal business but yet not being able to do that business because of the actions of the FDIC and the DOJ, which the OGR report indicates that they are doing. They admit this wrongdoing in different committee hearings as well as meetings on campus here. What we are trying to do is protect legal businesses to be able to continue to do a legal business

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to implement in the California Central Valley Recovery Domain any existing recovery plan for salmon and steelhead populations listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) as threatened species or endangered species if that recovery plan does not address predation by non-native species.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will help protect native salmon and steelhead species in California. My amendment would increase the effectiveness of recovery plans for species of salmon and steelhead listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 by ensuring an appropriate focus on predation control efforts.

Predation has long been recognized as a source of significant mortality for endangered and threatened species. In fact, according to NOAA, nonnative species are cited as a cause of endangerment for 48 percent of the species listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This is especially true for marine species, and along the Pacific coast salmon and steelhead juveniles.

Recently, the National Marine Fisheries Service found protection of salmon and steelhead required ''significantly reducing the nonnative predatory fishes,'' and that reducing the number of nonnative predatory fishes was necessary to ''prevent extinction or to prevent the species from declining irreversibly.''

In my own State, as far back as 1995, the State Water Resources Control Board recommended in its water quality control plan for the Bay Delta that the State and Federal fish agencies pursue programs to determine the impacts of predation by nonnative fish on salmon and steelhead. Unfortunately, despite such recognition, nothing has been done, and there are currently no programs in California to remove these nonnative predator fish.

Today in California, species such as the nonnative striped bass, introduced into California from New Jersey, consume up to 95 percent of the salmon and steelhead juveniles along the Sacramento and San Joaquin River System. These bass are not suppressed but, rather, managed by local State officials for abundance and sport fishing.

Mr. Chairman, predator control efforts can and do work. Currently, control of predator fish is being successfully used in a number of locations in North America. In the Great Lakes, control efforts of sea lamprey have reduced predation on lake trout, whitefish, salmon, rainbow trout, and others. In the Wood River System of Alaska, control of the arctic char reduced predation on sockeye salmon. In the Columbia and Snake Rivers, control of pike minnow reduced predation on salmon. In Cultus Lake, British Columbia, sockeye salmon increased after an eradication program focusing on pike minnow.

Recovering threatened and endangered salmon and steelhead populations has been a critical priority for Congress for years. This amendment simply ensures that controlling nonnative predators is a top priority for NOAA and all other stakeholders interested in maintaining healthy and sustainable salmon and steelhead populations.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment even though my opposition is not as apparent as it might otherwise be.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my great colleague here.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlemen from California and from Pennsylvania for allowing me this time, and the gentleman from California for offering this important amendment.

Let me give a little perspective here. Clearly, everyone is aware of the disastrous drought that is having catastrophic impacts in California, not only in the San Joaquin Valley but throughout the State. There are a number of factors that have caused the challenges that we face with a lack of water in California. Obviously, it hasn't rained very much or snowed very much in the mountains for 4 years.

In addition to that, we have a broken water system in the sense that, designed in the fifties and the sixties, both the Federal and State water projects, for a State of 20 million people, today we have 38 million people, and we have a lot of demands not only for the use of agriculture, but for people in our cities and for the environment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to our requirements under the law to protect the environment, those endangered species, salmonoid and steelhead that are native to California.

What happened is some 100 years ago, before we had a better understanding and before California was a much bigger State, there was the introduction of striped bass from the East Coast, bound from the Gulf of Saint Lawrence Seaway all the way down to Alabama. These are native fish on the East Coast, but they were not native to California. They were introduced in a small number but became very successful in propagation, so much so that in the early 1900s, after 10 years of introduction, over 1 million pounds a year was being harvested of these nonnative striped bass fish in the San Francisco Bay-San Joaquin-Sacramento-Delta River systems.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the State has changed a great deal to present day. The current water system is unable to meet the demands under the current restrictions that are required under the Endangered Species Act to maintain and to try to increase the population of salmonoid and steelhead.

We have determined, as my colleague and friend from California stated, that these fish, these predator fish, are responsible for a large amount of the takings of both the native California salmon and steelhead, and yet we have no program to balance this.

What this amendment would do is it simply requires that for a recovery plan to be effective, it must incorporate and address all factors involved in species recovery, those of particularly high concern.

Some of the studies have indicated on the Sacramento River over 95 percent of the juvenile salmon and steelhead are eaten by these predator striped bass, these nonnative fish and other invasive species. This amendment ensures that the recovery plan for endangered salmon and steelhead takes these factors into account, including the predation by the nonnative species such as striped bass.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from California.

□ 1730

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out one thing. Turlock Irrigation District, which is in my district, was forced to do a federally ordered study which actually showed, on the lower Tuolumne, 42,000 snook were killed by nonnative fish. This nearly eliminated the entire population. This is a federally ordered study.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for offering this very important amendment.

When you look at what is going on in Central Valley, my hometown, and you hear stories—and I see for myself because I was there this past week—cities, houses, running out of water, wells

going dry. There was a news article a couple of days ago about a city in my district named Lemoore where wells are going dry that supply homes there the south side of town. That is a frustrating situation.

We fought for the last couple of years to bring legislation to the floor. We delivered it to the Senate a few times to help resolve this.

What makes this more frustrating than anything is we have got a situation here where we could actually make a difference. There are studies here that prove that 95 percent of the fish that we are trying to protect are being eaten by species that we are doing nothing about. The tools are there.

This is a simple amendment that actually helps deliver and force these agencies which should be looking out for the best interests of the people of the United States, it forces them to actually use every single tool in their toolbox to actually address the situation instead of wasting water.

When I saw the story not too long ago about water being diverted or released in these pulse flows to trick some of our species to try to protect instead of actually doing something to make a difference, it is a waste of water that could have made a real difference for the people in my district, people who are unemployed. We are starting to see unemployment numbers again upwards of 50 percent in some of these communities, houses where they are actually delivering water by truck so they can bathe. This is a real dire situation.

This amendment is a step in the right direction that actually allows these government agencies which, again, are supposed to take the interests of the American people at heart first to use all the tools in their toolbox.

This is a good idea, this is a good amendment, and this really truly makes a difference.

Again, thank you for this amendment, and I urge support.

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

Mr. FATTAH. 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. DENHAM).

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, an amendment was passed, King No. 077, and passed by a voice vote. I requested a recorded vote. I ask unanimous consent that my request for a recorded vote on the amendment that it be withdrawn and allow the voice vote on which it passed to be the fact.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FATTAH. We have arrived at our final moment in this bill where my colleague from New York, who is an extraordinary Member, has a very important amendment to offer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the monitoring or review of electronic communications between an inmate and attorney or attorney's agents who are traditionally covered by attorney client privilege except as provided in 28 CFR 501.3(d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member from Pennsylvania, for his leadership.

This amendment would prohibit the use of funds in connection with the monitoring or review of electronic communications between an inmate detainee and his or her attorney or attorney's agents who are traditionally covered by the attorney-client privilege, except in circumstances where reasonable suspicion exists that a particular inmate's communications with attorneys or their agents may be designed to further or facilitate acts of terrorism.

This amendment is designed to protect the legally sacrosanct attorney-client privilege. It would protect the Sixth Amendment right to counsel of individuals who are using electronic communications to share privileged information with their designated court advocate.

The attorney-client privilege is one of the oldest recognized privileges in American jurisprudence. It is intended to encourage the full and frank communication between attorneys and their clients and thereby promote the broader public interests in the observance of the law and the administration of justice. It, of course, is anchored in the Sixth Amendment.

Currently, in-person attorney visitations in facilities that are run by the Bureau of Prisons can take place in attorney-client rooms which provide the privacy to share information necessary for a lawyer to adequately defend his or her client in court.

However, this is not the case for correspondence collected through electronic means. Waiver notices in Federal prisons vary from facility to facility, with some having clearly posted notices which state that by using the Trust Fund Limited Inmate Computer System, otherwise known as TRULINCS, inmates are waiving their privilege rights. Other facilities, however, provide no indication on the level of privacy that a detained individual can expect when using electronic prison resources.

The TRULINCS system also does not provide an option for a detained individual who hasn't been convicted to contact his or her attorney without subjecting electronic communications to external review.

The reading and collecting of privileged information in instances where clients are having electronic exchanges with their attorneys is a clear invasion of the traditional attorney-client privilege.

In this great country, there is a presumption of innocence, as one of our Founding Fathers, John Adams, has eloquently set forth. It is a foundational principle of our democracy.

It seems unreasonable to require in the 21st century that protection of the attorney-client privilege at a detention center only occurs through in-person visitation. These correctional facilities are often located in distant locations that cannot be easily accessed. We live in an era of modern technology and communication. The technology is available in these facilities, and our laws should reflect and adapt to the modern age.

This amendment would prohibit the prison system from compromising the attorney-client privilege, as anchored in the Sixth Amendment constitutional right to assistance of counsel.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is prepared to withdraw the amendment. We will work together to resolve this problem, so I do claim the time in opposition.

I think the gentleman from New York has raised a very valid concern. Certainly we do not want to see any exception to the attorney-client privilege. It can't be limited to just those circumstances where an attorney is actually present with the individual

interviewing him at the facility. I think the gentleman has identified a legitimate problem that we need to address.

As I discussed with Mr. JEFFRIES earlier, we got the language very late, and I want to be certain that we are not creating any unanticipated problems. Mr. JEFFRIES wants to be sure to exclude the very reasonable exception in current law that if a court order, on a finding of a judge, sees that there is potential or reasonable cause for concern that there may be furtherance of a terrorist plot in the course of those communications between an attorney and a client, the Department of Justice would have the right under that court order to listen to that conversation.

We want to make sure that we protect that exception but make sure we take care of the one he has identified, so if I could, with my colleague from Philadelphia Mr. JEFFRIES' help, we appreciate, as we just discussed earlier, if he would withdraw this amendment. I will work with my colleague Ranking Member FATTAH from Philadelphia to help address the concern you have got when we move to conference. I think it is a valid concern and one that we will work closely with you, sir, to resolve.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to concur with the chair's every utterance on this amendment that we will work together and help facilitate what I think is a very righteous effort on behalf of Congressman JEFFRIES to protect the rights of all Americans to have privileged conversations and interactions with their attorneys so that their rights can be fully protected.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to hear from my colleague from New York for the purpose of completing the discussion.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for their willingness to work together on this very important issue in terms of the preservation of the attorney-client privilege in the detainee context and look forward to working with the two of them and Members of this august body to resolve this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. SANFORD of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. DENHAM of California.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 132, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—289

Aguilar
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—132

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cole
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Guinta
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Lynch
MacArthur
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Ruiz
Rush
Russell
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—11

Adams
Bilirakis
Cartwright
Fattah
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Nugent
Roe (TN)
Sinema
Stewart
Stivers

□ 1812

Messrs. FORBES, CALVERT, LYNCH, SESSIONS, KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. DEUTCH, HASTINGS, ISRAEL, DANNY DAVIS of Illinois, GUTIÉRREZ, CLYBURN, ELLISON, HUFFMAN, Mses. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, MAXINE WATERS of California, and WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SIMMS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 288 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, During rollcall vote No. 288 on H.R. 2578, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "nay" when I should have voted "aye."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chair, I rise for the purpose of making an announcement.

Members are advised that no more votes are expected in the House tonight.

The House will begin debate on the fiscal year 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill immediately following this vote series. Debate will continue late tonight, so any Member wishing to offer an amendment should be prepared to do so at the appropriate point in the bill.

Our next votes are expected at approximately 11 a.m. tomorrow.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 171, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—250

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
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)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
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

NOES—171

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

NOT VOTING—11

Adams
Bilirakis
Capps
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Conyers
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1818

Mr. PITTENGER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 289, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 43, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—383

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—43

Brady (PA)
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cooper
Delaney
Donovan
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Harper
Keating
Kennedy
Kind
King (NY)
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
MacArthur
Meeks
Moulton
Pascrell
Payne
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schiff
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1825

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. CLYBURN, SWALWELL of California, BUTTERFIELD, LOEBSACK, CÁRDENAS, RUSH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. GUTIÉRREZ, and HINOJOSA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. LANGEVIN changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair announces to all Members that 2-minute voting will be strictly enforced.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 190, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
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
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
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
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)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—190

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer

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

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1828

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 290, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—134

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harris
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Olson
Palmer
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Stutzman
Tiberi
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoho
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—290

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Adams
Bera
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1831

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 204, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
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)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
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

NOES—204

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

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1835

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 198, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—227

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
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
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
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
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
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

NOES—198

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart
Vela

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1838

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 181, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
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
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Takano
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

NOES—181

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

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1841

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016''.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REED) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, 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. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2578 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 23, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,000,000)''.

In the ''Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs'' account, on page 38, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

In the ''Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs'' account, on page 39, line 22, after the dollar amount relating to sexual assault victims assistance, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

In the ''Juvenile Justice Programs'' account, on page 47, line 10, after the dollar amount relating to missing and exploited children programs, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 2578, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment would provide an additional $3 million for Violence Against Women prevention and prosecution programs, increasing resources for sexual assault victims' assistance. My amendment would also provide an additional $3 million for Juvenile Justice programs, directed to the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force program.

Mr. Speaker, there is more than ample room within the budget cap for this bill to do more to help sexual assault victims and prevent the exploitation of children. I hope we can all agree that these critical programs are worthy of added resources.

The Sexual Assault Services Program was authorized through the Violence Against Women Act and was the first Federal program dedicated to the provision of direct services to victims of sexual violence.

Across the country, the Sexual Assault Services Program supports critical, lifesaving, safety net services. Support services are offered to both adult and minor survivors of sexual assault and to family members who are helping them cope with the mental health issues and physical trauma of sexual assault.

The program also funds intervention and advocacy services, providing survivors with the help that they need to navigate through the medical and criminal justice systems.

For many survivors of sexual assault, this program is a critical and necessary source of support at the most vulnerable time in their lives. We must support these lifesaving programs and stand up for survivors of sexual assault.

Additionally, we must do more to protect vulnerable children from predators who despicably exploit children on the Internet. That is why my amendment will provide a much-needed increase for the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force program, which funds State and local law enforcement who investigate online child exploitation.

The program also provides forensic, prevention, and investigative assistance to law enforcement, educators, prosecutors, and families. The program also ensures law enforcement officers are trained to deal with online child pornography and child enticement so that these cases will be fully investigated and prosecuted.

In 2014 alone, 7,800 individuals were arrested, and the task forces around the country conducted over 60,000 forensic investigations. Clearly there is an urgent and compelling moral need to address these heinous crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit, to vote ''yes'' to protect women and girls from sexual assault and violence, to vote ''yes'' to protect children from online predators.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my friend who is a champion in protecting children.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's motion to recommit because there are children out there who need to be saved. They are waiting to be saved.

This motion provides additional funding for the Internet Crimes Against Children program, a national network of 61 coordinated law enforcement task forces investigating and prosecuting those who sexually exploit our most vulnerable constituents, our children.

With the proliferation of the Internet and wireless technology, online child pornography has become an epidemic. And let's not forget that these are not just heinous images. They are crime scene photos. The ICAC needs resources to go after these criminals now.

According to estimates, half of these arrests lead us to the door of a hands-on offender, and that is a child waiting to be rescued. Yet in one recent year, the ICAC only had the resources to investigate a mere 2 percent of all leads.

Previous increases in Federal funding have directly resulted in thousands more arrests, contributing to many more thousands of children who are outright rescued or who will be spared contact with an abuser.

Let's take this opportunity to help the ICAC rescue more children. Please, think about these precious babies being victimized. Let's rescue as many of them as possible. If you are a parent, God forbid it was your own child.

I urge Members' support for the motion to recommit, and I thank the gentlewoman for her commitment to making sure that we can rescue America's victimized children.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, before I begin—and I will be very brief—I want to make sure to thank the majority staff who have worked so hard on this bill. I want to thank our chief clerk, John Martens; Leslie Albright; Jeff Ashford; Taylor Kelly; Colin Samples; and Aschley Schiller for their tireless work drafting this bill, along with Bob Bonner and Matt Smith on the minority's staff and Corey Inglee and Megan Olmstead in my personal office. And a personal thank you to my good friend, the Congressman from Philadelphia, who has done such a great job. We have worked together arm in arm on this bill.

Starting at about 2 o'clock yesterday afternoon, we have worked through over 80 amendments. All the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) would have had to do was to show up here. During the course of that debate, any Member could have offered an amendment, and that is one of the great things about this process.

I want to thank our majority leader and our Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, for opening up the legislative process. Unlike in the past, any Member of this Congress could stand up and represent their 700,000 constituents. You could take a Big Chief notepad and a pencil and just write out an amendment and walk right down there and give it to the Clerk.

All the gentlewoman from California had to do was just write the amendment up and present it to the Clerk. Why, we would have even accepted it. But instead, she offers it up here today as a procedural trick to confuse and confound.

We produced a great bill. The ranking member and I have worked together arm in arm to produce a good

bill that protects this Nation's investment in space exploration and scientific research but, above all, invests in the good people of the law enforcement community.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I am the whip. I wanted to make that perfectly clear.

The fact of the matter is, did the gentleman just say if this amendment had been offered previously that you would have accepted it?

Mr. CULBERSON. Absolutely, because it would have been done properly.

Mr. HOYER. But you are now urging——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has the time.

Mr. CULBERSON. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is exactly right. We would have accepted this amendment earlier in the process because it is an open process. Anyone has a chance to come down here and offer an amendment in an open and free House of Representatives. That is why this amendment should be defeated.

We have got a good bill. I urge Members to vote ''no'' against this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 240, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—184

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
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
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
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
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
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—8

Adams
Comstock
Jackson Lee
Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Rush
Stewart

□ 1859

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
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
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—183

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

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Comstock
Jackson Lee
Keating
Nugent
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1905

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the last two votes in this evening's series. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: 1) Democrat Motion to Recommit—"no," 2) Passage of H.R. 2578—FY16 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Act—"yes."

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 3577, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 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. 2577.

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

□ 1908

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. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah 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 Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present to the House today for consideration H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016.

The committee has put forth a bill that conforms to our 302(b) allocation of $55.3 billion in budget authority and is in line with the budget cap of 1.016, "ten sixteen."

Under such an allocation, we prioritized programs and spending to achieve, really, three very important basic goals: first, we continue the ob lim funding levels of MAP–21 contingent upon reauthorization; we keep the commercial airspace running smoothly; and also we preserve the housing option for all current HUD-assisted families.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a balanced bill with the allocation that has been given to us by the chairman. The Department of Transportation is funded at $17.2 billion in budget authority and $70.6 billion in total budgetary resources to ensure, Mr. Chairman, the safe and effective transportation of goods and people in America.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is funded at $42 billion to provide housing opportunities and assistance to the most vulnerable in both cities and rural areas across our great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are a diverse body and this is a very diverse bill, and I know some Members will speak for increased funding. I would like to remind my colleagues that if you are going to be voting against this bill, you are voting against the commercial airspace system and our air traffic controllers and control system; against housing programs for the most vulnerable, including the elderly and families; and frankly, you would also be voting against community development block grants that are vital to the cities and counties that we all represent.

Some, however, Mr. Chairman, will speak for lower spending. Here it is also important to remember that the House passed a budget resolution, which this bill adheres to, Mr. Chairman, and the Congress and the President are currently bound by the Budget Control Act, which does include sequester. So this bill takes the responsible steps of setting funding priorities for the next fiscal year, many of which are shared, frankly, between both parties, and again, very important, without doing it with across-the-board cuts or across-the-board sequester.

The whole House of Representatives now has the opportunity for full consideration of this legislation. It is imperative that we move this bill to final passage reflecting the amendments obviously adopted by the House, and we move this bill to conference in time for the new fiscal year.

I really need to first thank my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina and the ranking member of this

subcommittee, Mr. PRICE, for his ideas and his support in drafting this piece of legislation. The gentleman, as anyone who has dealt with him knows, gives a lot of thought and careful consideration to the many programs under our jurisdiction, and I appreciate his willingness to collaborate on this bill that is now before us.

I would also like to thank, in particular, Chairman ROGERS and also Ranking Member LOWEY plus the members of the committee, and yes, I must say, especially the members of the subcommittee for the hours and hours spent in hearings, markups, and meetings, working together in a cooperative effort to bring this bill to the floor and eventually signed into law. Finally, as we can never do enough, I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for their incredible hard work.

I urge the expeditious adoption of this bill, Mr. Chairman, and at this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	105,000	113,657	105,000	---	-8,657
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(2,696)	---	(2,734)	(+38)	(+2,734)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(1,011)	---	(1,025)	(+14)	(+1,025)
Office of the General Counsel	(19,900)	---	(20,066)	(+166)	(+20,066)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	(9,800)	---	(9,310)	(-490)	(+9,310)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(12,500)	---	(12,808)	(+308)	(+12,808)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,500)	---	(2,500)	---	(+2,500)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(25,365)	---	(26,029)	(+664)	(+26,029)
Office of Public Affairs	(2,000)	---	(2,029)	(+29)	(+2,029)
Office of the Executive Secretariat	(1,714)	---	(1,769)	(+55)	(+1,769)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(1,414)	---	---	(-1,414)	---
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response	(10,600)	---	(10,793)	(+193)	(+10,793)
Office of the Chief Information Officer	(15,500)	---	(15,937)	(+437)	(+15,937)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Innovative Finance	---	---	---	---	---
Research and Technology	13,000	14,582	11,386	-1,614	-3,196
National Infrastructure Investments	500,000	1,250,000	100,000	-400,000	-1,150,000
Infrastructure Permitting Center	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
Financial Management Capital	5,000	5,000	1,000	-4,000	-4,000
Cyber Security Initiatives	5,000	8,000	7,000	+2,000	-1,000
DATA Act Compliance	---	3,000	---	---	-3,000
U.S. Digital Services	---	9,000	---	---	-9,000
Office of Civil Rights	9,600	9,678	9,600	---	-78
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development	6,000	10,019	5,976	-24	-4,043
Working Capital Fund	(181,500)	---	(181,500)	---	(+181,500)
Minority Business Resource Center Program	925	933	933	+8	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,367)	---	(18,367)	---	(+18,367)
Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilizaton and Outreach (Minority Business Outreach)	3,099	4,518	4,518	+1,419	---
Safe Transport of Oil	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	155,000	175,000	155,000	---	-20,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	802,624	1,612,387	400,413	-402,211	-1,211,974
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations	9,740,700	9,915,000	9,847,700	+107,000	-67,300
Air traffic organization	(7,396,654)	(7,505,293)	(7,505,293)	(+108,639)	---
Aviation safety	(1,218,458)	(1,258,411)	(1,258,411)	(+39,953)	---
Commercial space transportation	(16,605)	(18,114)	(16,605)	---	(-1,509)
Finance and management	(756,047)	(764,621)	(725,000)	(-31,047)	(-39,621)
NextGen	(60,089)	(60,582)	(60,089)	---	(-493)
Staff offices	(292,847)	(207,099)	(282,302)	(-10,545)	(+75,203)
Security and Hazardous Materials Safety	---	(100,880)	---	---	(-100,880)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,600,000	2,855,000	2,500,000	-100,000	-355,000
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund	156,750	166,000	156,750	---	-9,250
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,200,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,600,000)	(+400,000)	(+100,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Administration	(107,100)	(107,100)	(107,100)	---	---
Airport cooperative research program	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research	(29,750)	(31,000)	(31,000)	(+1,250)	---
Small community air service development program	(5,500)	---	---	(-5,500)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rescission of contract authority	-260,000	---	---	+260,000	---
Pop-up contract authority	130,000	---	---	-130,000	---
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	12,367,450	12,936,000	12,504,450	+137,000	-431,550
Limitations on obligations	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Total budgetary resources	(15,717,450)	(15,836,000)	(15,854,450)	(+137,000)	(+18,450)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on Administrative Expenses	(426,100)	(442,248)	(429,348)	(+3,248)	(-12,900)
Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(40,995,000)	(50,807,248)	(40,995,000)	---	(-9,812,248)
(Limitation on obligations)	(40,256,000)	(50,068,248)	(40,256,000)	---	(-9,812,248)
Fixing and Accelerating Surface Transportation					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations	(40,256,000)	(50,568,248)	(40,256,000)	---	(-10,312,248)
Exempt contract authority	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total budgetary resources	(40,995,000)	(51,307,248)	(40,995,000)	---	(-10,312,248)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(271,000)	(329,180)	(259,000)	(-12,000)	(-70,180)
(Limitation on obligations)	(271,000)	(329,180)	(259,000)	(-12,000)	(-70,180)
Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(313,000)	(339,343)	(313,000)	---	(-26,343)
(Limitation on obligations)	(313,000)	(339,343)	(313,000)	---	(-26,343)
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations	(584,000)	(668,523)	(572,000)	(-12,000)	(-96,523)
Total budgetary resources	(584,000)	(668,523)	(572,000)	(-12,000)	(-96,523)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and Research (general fund)	130,000	179,000	150,000	+20,000	-29,000
Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(138,500)	(152,000)	(125,000)	(-13,500)	(-27,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(138,500)	(152,000)	(125,000)	(-13,500)	(-27,000)
Subtotal, Operations and Research	268,500	331,000	275,000	+6,500	-56,000
Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(561,500)	(577,000)	(561,500)	---	(-15,500)
(Limitation on obligations)	(561,500)	(577,000)	(561,500)	---	(-15,500)
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402)	(235,000)	(241,146)	(235,000)	---	(-6,146)
National priority safety programs (23 USC 405)	(272,000)	(278,705)	(272,000)	---	(-6,705)
High visibility enforcement	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses	(25,500)	(28,149)	(25,500)	---	(-2,649)
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	130,000	179,000	150,000	+20,000	-29,000
Limitations on obligations	(700,000)	(729,000)	(686,500)	(-13,500)	(-42,500)
Total budgetary resources	(830,000)	(908,000)	(836,500)	(+6,500)	(-71,500)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and Operations	186,870	203,800	186,870	---	-16,930
Railroad Research and Development	39,100	39,250	39,100	---	-150
Rail Service Improvement Program	---	2,325,000	---	---	-2,325,000
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	250,000	---	288,500	+38,500	+288,500
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	1,140,000	---	850,000	-290,000	+850,000
Current Rail Passenger Service	---	2,450,000	---	---	-2,450,000
Subtotal	1,390,000	2,450,000	1,138,500	-251,500	-1,311,500
Administrative Provisions					
Rail Safety Grants	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,625,970	5,018,050	1,364,470	-261,500	-3,653,580
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative Expenses	105,933	114,400	102,933	-3,000	-11,467
Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(9,500,000)	(13,800,000)	(9,500,000)	---	(-4,300,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(8,595,000)	(13,800,000)	(8,595,000)	---	(-5,205,000)
Fixing and Acceleration Surface Transportation (Liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
Transit Research	33,000	---	26,000	-7,000	+26,000
Technical Assistance and Training	4,500	---	3,000	-1,500	+3,000
Transit Research and Training	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
Rapid-Growth Area Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Program (liquidation of contract authorization)	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
(limitation on obligations)	---	(500,000)	---	---	(-500,000)
Capital Investment Grants	2,120,000	3,250,000	1,921,395	-198,605	-1,328,605
Rescission	-121,546	---	---	+121,546	---
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Capital and Preventive Maintenance	150,000	150,000	100,000	-50,000	-50,000
Total, Federal Transit Administration	2,291,887	3,599,400	2,153,328	-138,559	-1,446,072
Limitations on obligations	(8,595,000)	(14,800,000)	(8,595,000)	---	(-6,205,000)
Total budgetary resources	(10,886,887)	(18,399,400)	(10,748,328)	(-138,559)	(-7,651,072)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	32,042	36,400	32,042	---	-4,358
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program	186,000	211,000	186,000	---	-25,000
Operations and Training	148,050	184,637	164,158	+16,108	-20,479
Ship Disposal	4,000	8,000	4,000	---	-4,000
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses	3,100	3,135	3,135	+35	---
Total, Maritime Administration	341,150	406,772	357,293	+16,143	-49,479

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Operational Expenses:					
General Fund	22,225	22,500	20,725	-1,500	-1,775
Pipeline Safety Fund (transfer out)	(-1,500)	(-1,500)	---	(+1,500)	(+1,500)
Subtotal	22,225	22,500	20,725	-1,500	-1,775
Hazardous Materials Safety:					
General Fund	52,000	64,254	60,500	+8,500	-3,754
Special Permit and Approval Fees	---	-6,000	---	---	+6,000
Subtotal	52,000	58,254	60,500	+8,500	+2,246
Pipeline Safety:					
General Fund	---	1,500	1,870	+1,870	+370
Pipeline Safety Fund	124,500	152,104	124,500	---	-27,604
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	19,500	19,500	19,500	---	---
Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund	2,000	2,000	---	-2,000	-2,000
Pipeline Safety information grants (by transfer)	(1,500)	(1,500)	---	(-1,500)	(-1,500)
Subtotal	146,000	175,104	145,870	-130	-29,234
Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	220,225	255,858	227,095	+6,870	-28,763
Pipeline safety user fees	-124,500	-152,104	-124,500	---	+27,604
Pipeline Safety Design Review fee	-2,000	-2,000	---	+2,000	+2,000
Emergency Preparedness Grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	---	---
(Emergency preparedness fund)	(188)	(188)	(188)	---	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	93,725	101,754	102,595	+8,870	+841
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and Expenses	86,223	87,472	86,223	---	-1,249
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and Expenses	31,375	32,499	31,375	---	-1,124
Offsetting collections	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board	30,125	31,249	30,125	---	-1,124
Total, title I, Department of Transportation	17,801,196	24,008,484	17,180,939	-620,257	-6,827,545
Appropriations	(18,183,992)	(24,015,734)	(17,182,189)	(-1,001,803)	(-6,833,545)
Rescissions	(-121,546)	---	---	(+121,546)	---
Rescissions of contract authority	(-260,000)	---	---	(+260,000)	---
Offsetting collections	(-1,250)	(-7,250)	(-1,250)	---	(+6,000)
(By transfer)	(1,500)	(1,500)	---	(-1,500)	(-1,500)
(Transfer out)	(-1,500)	(-1,500)	---	(+1,500)	(+1,500)
Limitations on obligations	(53,485,000)	(69,665,771)	(53,459,500)	(-25,500)	(-16,206,271)
Total budgetary resources	(71,286,196)	(93,674,255)	(70,640,439)	(-645,757)	(-23,033,816)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Executive Offices	14,500	14,646	14,500	---	-146
Administration Support Offices	518,100	577,861	547,000	+28,900	-30,861

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Program Office Salaries and Expenses:					
Public and Indian Housing	203,000	210,002	203,000	---	-7,002
Community Planning and Development	102,000	112,115	102,000	---	-10,115
Housing	379,000	397,174	372,000	-7,000	-25,174
Policy Development and Research	22,700	23,907	22,700	---	-1,207
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	68,000	81,132	73,000	+5,000	-8,132
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes	6,700	7,812	6,700	---	-1,112
Subtotal	781,400	832,142	779,400	-2,000	-52,742
Total, Management and Administration	1,314,000	1,424,649	1,340,900	+26,900	-83,749
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	17,486,000	18,333,816	18,151,000	+665,000	-182,816
Tenant protection vouchers	130,000	150,000	130,000	---	-20,000
Administrative fees	1,530,000	2,020,037	1,530,000	---	-490,037
Incremental rental vouchers	---	277,000	---	---	-277,000
Incremental family unification vouchers	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Veterans affairs supportive housing	75,000	---	---	-75,000	---
Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals	83,160	107,643	107,643	+24,483	---
Special purpose vouchers	---	215,000	---	---	-215,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-20,000)	---	---	(+20,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year)	19,304,160	21,123,496	19,918,643	+614,483	-1,204,853
Advance appropriations	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill	19,304,160	21,123,496	19,918,643	+614,483	-1,204,853
Rental Assistance Demonstration	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Public Housing Capital Fund	1,875,000	1,970,000	1,681,000	-194,000	-289,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Drug elimination (rescission)	-1,101	---	---	+1,101	---
Public Housing Operating Fund	4,440,000	4,600,000	4,440,000	---	-160,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-18,000)	---	---	(+18,000)
Choice Neighborhoods	80,000	250,000	20,000	-60,000	-230,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-2,000)	---	---	(+2,000)
Family Self-Sufficiency	75,000	85,000	75,000	---	-10,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Native American Housing Block Grants	650,000	660,000	650,000	---	-10,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-5,000)	---	---	(+5,000)
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant	9,000	---	---	-9,000	---
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account	7,000	8,000	8,000	+1,000	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(744,047)	(1,269,841)	(1,269,841)	(+525,794)	---
Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account	100	---	---	-100	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(16,130)	---	---	(-16,130)	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing	26,439,159	28,746,496	26,792,643	+353,484	-1,953,853
Community Planning and Development					
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS	330,000	332,000	332,000	+2,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-3,000)	---	---	(+3,000)
Community Development Fund:					
CDBG formula	3,000,000	2,800,000	3,000,000	---	+200,000
Indian CDBG	66,000	80,000	60,000	-6,000	-20,000
Subtotal	3,066,000	2,880,000	3,060,000	-6,000	+180,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-20,000)	---	---	(+20,000)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Youth Build (rescission)	-460	---	---	+460	---
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-200,000)	---
Rescission	---	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program	900,000	1,060,000	767,000	-133,000	-293,000
Transfer from Housing Trust Fund	---	---	133,000	+133,000	+133,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-8,000)	---	---	(+8,000)
Subtotal	900,000	1,060,000	900,000	---	-160,000
Housing Trust Fund (transfer out)	---	---	-133,000	-133,000	-133,000
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
Homeless Assistance Grants	2,135,000	2,480,000	2,185,000	+50,000	-295,000
Brownfields (rescission)	-2,913	---	---	+2,913	---
Total, Community Planning and Development	6,477,627	6,752,000	6,392,000	-85,627	-360,000
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	9,520,000	10,545,000	10,504,000	+984,000	-41,000
Contract administrators	210,000	215,000	150,000	-60,000	-65,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-20,000)	---	---	(+20,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year)	9,730,000	10,760,000	10,654,000	+924,000	-106,000
Advance appropriations	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill	9,730,000	10,760,000	10,654,000	+924,000	-106,000
Housing for the Elderly	420,000	455,000	414,000	-6,000	-41,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-3,000)	---	---	(+3,000)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities	135,000	177,000	152,000	+17,000	-25,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Housing Counseling Assistance	47,000	60,000	47,000	---	-13,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Rental Housing Assistance	18,000	30,000	30,000	+12,000	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund	10,000	11,000	11,000	+1,000	---
Offsetting collections	-10,000	-11,000	-11,000	-1,000	---
Total, Housing Programs	10,350,000	11,482,000	11,297,000	+947,000	-185,000
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)	---
Offsetting receipts	-7,951,000	-7,003,000	-7,003,000	+948,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM)	-36,000	-97,000	-97,000	-61,000	---
Additional offsetting receipts (Pres. Sec. 244)	---	-29,000	---	---	+29,000
Administrative contract expenses	130,000	174,000	130,000	---	-44,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-15,000)	---
Offsetting receipts	-876,000	-657,000	-657,000	+219,000	---
Rescission	-10,000	---	---	+10,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-8,743,000	-7,612,000	-7,627,000	+1,116,000	-15,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses	23,000	28,320	23,000	---	-5,320
Offsetting receipts	-94,000	-118,000	-118,000	-24,000	---
Offsetting receipts	-742,000	-747,000	-747,000	-5,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM)	-28,000	-21,000	-21,000	+7,000	---
Additional contract expenses	1,000	1,000	---	-1,000	-1,000
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association	-840,000	-856,680	-863,000	-23,000	-6,320
Policy Development and Research					
Research and Technology	72,000	50,000	52,500	-19,500	+2,500
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair Housing Activities	65,300	71,000	65,300	---	-5,700
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes					
Lead Hazard Reduction	110,000	120,000	75,000	-35,000	-45,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Information Technology Fund	250,000	334,000	100,000	-150,000	-234,000
Office of Inspector General	126,000	129,000	126,000	---	-3,000
Transformation Initiative	---	---	---	---	---
(by transfer)	---	(120,000)	---	---	(-120,000)
General Provisions					
Unobligated balances (Sec. 233) (rescission)	---	---	-7,000	-7,000	-7,000
Rural Housing and Developement unobligated balances (Sec. 234) (rescission)	---	---	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000
Management and Administration unobligated balances (Sec. 234) (rescission)	---	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development	35,621,086	40,640,465	37,739,343	+2,118,257	-2,901,122
Appropriations	(40,972,560)	(44,923,465)	(42,007,343)	(+1,034,783)	(-2,916,122)
Rescissions	(-14,474)	---	(-14,000)	(+474)	(-14,000)
Advance appropriations	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts	(-9,727,000)	(-8,672,000)	(-8,643,000)	(+1,084,000)	(+29,000)
Offsetting collections	(-10,000)	(-11,000)	(-11,000)	(-1,000)	---
(by transfer)	---	120,000	---	---	-120,000
(transfer out)	---	-120,000	---	---	+120,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(40,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(-30,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(931,260,177)	(931,569,841)	(931,569,841)	(+309,664)	---
TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board	7,548	8,023	7,548	---	-475
Federal Housing Finance Agency, Office of Inspector General (legislative proposal)	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Offsetting collections (legislative proposal)	---	-50,000	---	---	+50,000
Federal Maritime Commission	25,660	27,387	25,660	---	-1,727
National Railroad Passenger Corporation Office of Inspector General	23,999	24,499	23,999	---	-500
National Transportation Safety Board	103,981	105,170	103,981	---	-1,189
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	185,000	182,300	177,000	-8,000	-5,300

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2577)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.....	3,530	3,530	3,530	---	---
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies....	349,718	350,909	341,718	-8,000	-9,191
Grand total.....	53,772,000	64,999,858	55,262,000	+1,490,000	-9,737,858
Appropriations.....	(59,506,270)	(69,340,108)	(59,531,250)	(+24,980)	(-9,808,858)
Rescissions.....	(-136,020)	---	(-14,000)	(+122,020)	(-14,000)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	(-260,000)	---	---	(+260,000)	---
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-9,727,000)	(-8,672,000)	(-8,643,000)	(+1,084,000)	(+29,000)
Offsetting collections.....	(-11,250)	(-68,250)	(-12,250)	(-1,000)	(+56,000)
(by transfer).....	1,500	121,500	---	-1,500	-121,500
(transfer out).....	-1,500	-121,500	---	+1,500	+121,500
(Limitation on obligations).....	(53,485,000)	(69,665,771)	(53,459,500)	(-25,500)	(-16,206,271)
Total budgetary resources.....	(107,257,000)	(134,665,629)	(108,721,500)	(+1,464,500)	(-25,944,129)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as we begin consideration of H.R. 2577, the fiscal year 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, I want to start by thanking our chairman, Chairman DIAZ-BALART, for the hard work he has put in on this bill. He has been open and accessible throughout this year's process, and he has been receptive to my concerns and the concerns that other subcommittee members and other colleagues have raised. It has been a pleasure working with him, and I look forward to continuing to do that throughout this process.

I also want to echo the thanks he just expressed to our hardworking staff, to Dena Baron and her colleagues in the majority, to Kate Hallahan and Joe Carlile on our side of the aisle, as well as Laura Thrift and Kate Roetzer from my personal staff.

Now, unfortunately, I have to add that there is going to be a lot of further work to do. It is necessary, and it is going to be difficult. That is not the chairman's fault. He was dealt an impossible hand in the Republican budget and an allocation that is simply unworkable.

At first glance, it might appear that this bill is a relative winner when compared to other appropriations bills, as Chairman ROGERS did increase the subcommittee's allocation by $1.5 million. However, the reality is that once you factor in declining Federal Housing Administration receipts, increased Section 8 renewal costs, and other inflationary adjustments, this bill is actually $1.5 billion below last year's funding level, resulting in fewer services and less capital investment than last year.

Mr. Chairman, the programs under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee are critical to our Nation's economic and social well-being: providing necessary funding to improve housing and transportation options, creating infrastructure jobs for hardworking American families, and ensuring safe and adequate transportation networks for goods, commuters, and travelers. But our Nation's transportation and housing systems face daunting challenges, and on almost every count, this bill falls short.

□ 1915

The President requested a robust increase for this bill for fiscal 2016, calling on Congress to provide the critical investments necessary to accelerate and sustain economic growth. Unfortunately, the bill before us would not even begin to address our infrastructure needs.

In transportation, the bill levies deep cuts to capital programs. As we learned from the Amtrak derailment last month in Philadelphia, these cuts can have clear, direct consequences for the safety of our transportation system. The bill before us cuts Amtrak by 18 percent—18 percent—below last year. There is no funding for the expansion of safety mechanisms, including Positive Train Control, which regulates the excessive speeds that caused the Philadelphia derailment.

Now, no one can say whether Positive Train Control would have prevented the tragedy in Philadelphia, but cutting funding certainly isn't making our transportation system any safer. How many train derailments, how many bridge collapses is it going to take before the majority agrees that we must invest in our crumbling transportation infrastructure?

The bill before us would also reduce funding for the New Starts program in the Federal Transit Administration by 8 percent below this year, 40 percent below the President's request. It would cut DOT's enormously popular TIGER program by 80 percent. It cuts the Federal Aviation Administration's capital program by $355 million below the President's request, $100 million below last year. That will hamper FAA's ability to maintain and improve aging facilities and will slow down progress on the critical NextGen program.

The bill doesn't just provide insufficient funding for critical investments; it also contains toxic provisions completely unrelated to the appropriations process. For instance, riders on truck length and weight have no place in this bill. They should be left to the authorizing committees. The bill also continues to delay full implementation of the Department of Transportation's hours-of-service rule for driver safety by including additional, unmanageable study requirements. These riders, I regret to say, value the bottom line of the trucking industry over driver safety. They will actually make our roads more dangerous.

The bill also attempts to undermine President Obama's new policy related to the United States' relationship with Cuba. Some of the riders aim to prevent scheduled air services and cruise ship travel to Cuban ports of entry.

On the housing side, the bill fails to adequately address the capital needs of public housing. For example, the bill provides only the token amount of $20 million for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Choice Neighborhoods Initiative. At such a low funding level, the program won't be able to fulfill its mission—transforming clusters of poverty into functioning, sustainable mixed-income neighborhoods and allowing the children who live there to have the opportunities that all Americans deserve.

The bill contains $1.68 billion for the Public Housing Capital Fund, which is a $194 million cut from last year. If enacted, this level would be about the same as the funding level in 1989. That is 26 years ago! Given that new maintenance needs accrue at $3.4 billion per year, this level of funding would cover less than half the need while doing nothing to address a backlog that now amounts to $25 billion.

The majority's bill transforms—or, more accurately, devolves—the Housing for the Elderly and Housing for the Disabled programs into purely rental renewal programs. Without capital funding, the supply of safe, decent, and affordable housing for the elderly and for the disabled will not keep up with the demand.

Mr. Chairman, for centuries, our country's economic competitiveness has been built upon a world-class infrastructure that enabled innovation and ingenuity to flourish. This bill and the budgetary levels it reflects undermine the continued viability of our Nation's infrastructure and our economic vitality. We simply cannot write a credible bill until we have a new budget agreement.

This bill clearly illustrates the folly of dogmatically insisting on domestic appropriations cuts as the sole focus of deficit reduction—that is the majority's strategy—while leaving the main drivers of the deficit unaddressed. Under sequestration funding levels, any advancement of appropriations bills is simply delaying the day of reckoning. So let's stop this charade now. Let's not wait for Presidential vetoes or for governmental shutdowns. Let's confront it now! Let's begin serious, broad budget negotiations.

I know we can responsibly chart a course to fiscal balance; we have done it before, as recently as the 1990s. We achieved budget surpluses as the result of a concerted, bipartisan effort to balance the budget through a comprehensive approach. And I mean comprehensive. Revenues, entitlements, military and domestic appropriations, everything was on the table. We balanced the budget 4 years in a row. We paid off more than $400 billion of this Nation's debt. Why is that lesson so hard to recollect?

By contrast, the current Republican budget gives us the worst of both worlds. It fails as fiscal policy, and it decimates the investments a great country must make.

In its current form, Mr. Chairman, I cannot support the fiscal 2016 T-HUD Appropriations bill. I do remain hopeful, however, that this bill could be improved as it goes through the appropriations process. I will continue working with the chairman as we move forward. I am confident that a new agreement on funding levels can give this bill and America's transportation and housing infrastructure the resources that our national interest requires.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield as much time as he may use to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), a friend, a leader, a teacher, and the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, obviously, the fiscal 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud that we have this piece of legislation. It is our fifth appropriations bill of this year on the floor today. It is the next step in our ongoing effort to fully fund the government before the end of the fiscal year, as is our congressional duty.

This bill, as the chairman has said, funds a wide range of Federal programs that affect every citizen of every district of every State. From the transportation infrastructure that moves goods, people, and businesses around the country to the housing options that help most those in need, the benefits of the programs in this bill are felt far and wide.

In total, the bill provides $55.3 billion in discretionary spending due to reduced offsets, including lower FHA receipts. The bill represents a $25 million increase above the current year.

This is a tight budget, Mr. Chairman. Yet the bill targets funds to provide adequate investments in critical infrastructure and much-relied-upon housing programs.

Of the total, $17.2 billion goes toward discretionary funding for DOT, prioritizing projects that have great benefits to our Nation as a whole and that will help make this Nation's transportation systems safer and more efficient.

This includes $15.9 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration. A portion of that money will go to what is called the NextGen program to improve efficiency in our airways and reduce congestion and delays.

The Federal highway program gets $40.2 billion from the highway trust fund, an amount equal to last year, but that is subject to continued authorization. This funding will ensure our roadways, bridges, and tunnels can safely and smoothly facilitate the flow of American commerce.

The Federal Railroad Administration is funded at $1.4 billion. That includes $289 million for Amtrak operations, the same as last year, and $850 million for capital grants, as well as $187 million for critical safety and research programs. Total FRA funding is reduced by $262 million, but rail safety, which is so important, is held harmless from any reductions.

In fact, safety was a priority throughout the bill, and that is evident in the funding levels. For instance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration received $6.5 million more than last year, and the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration receives a $6.9 million bump up to help address safety concerns regarding the transport of energy products.

Beyond these important infrastructure investments, the bill also includes a total of $42 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This level will guarantee that all individuals and families currently receiving housing assistance will continue to be served by this program, and it ensures that the 77,000 VASH vouchers which support our veterans remain in circulation.

Important housing programs for some of our most vulnerable citizens, the elderly and persons with disabilities, also receive targeted increases. To help bolster economic growth in local communities, the bill provides $6.4 billion in grant funding for economic development. Investing in our communities through programs like Community Development Block Grants will allow funds to be targeted to local areas to meet their unique needs.

Now, as with all appropriations bills, particularly in these tight budget times, we had to take a close look at what was mission critical and what was lower on the priority list. Some tough choices had to be made and some programs had to be reduced. Overall, I believe this bill puts everything in its proper place and does the very best within its allotted resources.

I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman DIAZ-BALART. This is his maiden voyage as a cardinal, a chairman of a subcommittee, his first voyage at sea. We hope it is a safe and smooth one. And I am proud to say to him, ''Job well done so far.'' So we wish for you the very best.

Thanks to DAVID PRICE and the members of the committee, subcommittee, all the staff; my counterpart Mrs. LOWEY. I thank all of you for working hard on this bill.

I am proud to support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), our distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to congratulate Chairman DIAZ-BALART and Ranking Member PRICE in their new roles on the subcommittee. You have worked so hard, you have worked together, and I really do want to express my appreciation. And to Chairman ROGERS, thank you for your work. I would particularly like to thank the chairman for his support of my grade crossing safety requests.

However, the Republican bill to fund transportation and housing priorities drastically shortchanges job-creating investments critical to hard-working American families, like roads, bridges, rail systems, and access to safe and affordable housing. At the same time, it includes special interest giveaways for the trucking industry and other policy riders that make our roads less safe and our rail system less competitive and meddles foolishly in foreign policy.

Despite the fact that our infrastructure needs are increasing, the bill before us takes a giant step backward. We cannot meet tomorrow's challenges by slashing investments in TIGER, transit, and air traffic modernization.

Even though the bill was considered in full committee the morning after last month's tragic Amtrak crash in Philadelphia, the majority voted down amendments to increase funds for Amtrak capital investments and positive train control, which the NTSB has said would have prevented the derailment. Yet it does not receive any funding in the bill.

□ 1930

While we do not yet have all of the answers to the horrific accident in Philadelphia, we do know that starving Amtrak of funding will inhibit safety upgrades, track, and capital improvements. Our continued failure to invest in road and rail infrastructure is not just unwise; it is plainly a public safety hazard.

Before I turn to housing, it is important to mention the plentiful legislative riders. Christmas came early for the trucking industry: longer, heavier trucks; the stalled enforcement of hours-of-service rules; and inadequate insurance requirements.

Controversial riders have no place in an already difficult appropriations process. At a time when roads and bridges are crumbling and when there is a national crisis of affordable housing, it makes no sense to use this critical bill to meddle in foreign policy by including riders on Cuba.

With regard to housing, adequate funding to renew existing vouchers is provided, but it isn't sufficient to meet our country's actual housing needs.

Significantly cutting Lead Hazard Control will slow the progress on eliminating household toxins despite the fact that the successful program has resulted in lower lead poisoning and in better educational and behavioral outcomes.

Slashing Choice Neighborhoods by $230 million, or 92 percent below the President's request, guts resources to transform clusters of poverty into functioning, sustainable mixed-income neighborhoods; and it prevents the children who live there from having the opportunities that all Americans deserve.

Employing gimmicks to fund HOME through the housing trust fund perpetuates another gap in the spectrum of affordable housing.

Democrats are more than willing to support bills that make investments to grow our economy and create opportunity for hard-working Americans. Unfortunately, this bill falls far short of that goal.

Again, in conclusion, I want to thank the chairman, the ranking member, and all of the hard-working staff. Although I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' I do hope we can move forward and get to real bills so we can work together and complete this process on especially this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), an indispensable member of the subcommittee.

Mr. YODER. I appreciate the chairman for yielding time in this debate.

I want to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART, Chairman ROGERS, Ranking

Member PRICE, and Ranking Member LOWEY for their work in putting together what is, I think, one of the best bills to come through Congress as we debate how to balance our challenges with our budget and how to make sure we enhance safety and improve our economy all at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the earliest opportunities we have had to debate this piece of legislation in the appropriations process since 1974, which is a commendable achievement. I want to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART for his leadership, and I ask for the body to support this good piece of legislation.

There are really three great reasons to support this bill.

First of all, it is great for the economy as we invest in our Nation's critical transportation projects and programs and invest in housing projects to help America's poverty families all across our districts.

It helps to promote safety enhancement on our infrastructure by ensuring that our roads, rails, and airways are safe for all Americans. It increases funding for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; it increases funding for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and it increases funding for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration—all to help protect the safety of Americans.

It works to enhance the responsible efforts to spend money in this capital. Most Americans know Washington is spending too much money, and our budget is not in balance. It is a tough job, and I commend the committee for doing the hard work to ensure that we are good stewards of taxpayer dollars, so as to keep to the balanced budget agreement that the House and Senate passed for the first time since 2001.

The bill also works towards needed policy achievements that would help farmers in my State of Kansas or that would help keep the cost of goods down for hard-working Americans because the prices at the grocery stores are too high.

In Kansas, for example, the bill helps to ensure that Kansas laws are in parity with States like Nebraska and Oklahoma when it comes to the length of a trailer that custom harvesters can use. This is a provision that is supported by the Kansas Highway Patrol, the Kansas Department of Transportation, the Kansas Department of Agriculture.

I would ask my colleagues from across the aisle to listen to the leaders in Kansas. The leaders of public safety in Kansas and those within the highway patrol support this provision. Let's not subject the will of Washington over the will of people in Kansas when it comes to helping farmers with truck length for custom harvesters.

It works to eliminate the number of trucks that are on the road. This bill's actually extending the trailer length will eliminate 6.6 million truck trips; it will save 1.3 billion miles driven; it will reduce carbon emissions by 4.4 billion pounds annually, and it will eliminate the need for every ninth truck in our economy. Truck tonnage is projected to grow by 23 percent over the next 12 years, so it makes sense to move freight in fewer trucks.

The bill also works to enhance a program we started last year for short line rail safety, which would help short line rail companies across this country have the ability to have a stronger and sustainable safety culture as they move more and more of our goods.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It promotes safety; it promotes our economy, and it creates jobs.

I urge the bipartisan support of this legislation to help the American economy.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), our colleague who is the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard about America and American exceptionalism, and tonight, we see here a great new example for the 21st century the Republican majority version of American exceptionalism. A country that used to be the envy of the world with its infrastructure has now become a laughingstock of the industrial world because it is falling apart.

There are 150,000 bridges on the National Highway System that need repair or replacement, and with this bill, next year, it will be 160,000 that will need repair or replacement. There is 40 percent of the road surface on the National Highway System that needs not just resurfacing; it is so bad that it has to be dug up. Next year, there will be more miles that are deficient.

And our transit? There is an $80 billion backlog just to bring our existing transit systems up to a state of good repair. It is so bad that we are killing people unnecessarily here in the Nation's Capital on the mass transit system; and what does the Republican budget do? It cuts the allocation to the Metro system here in D.C. In the greatest country on Earth, it will be dangerous to ride on the Metro system because we can't afford to fix it.

They failed to distinguish between investment—investment in moving our people and our goods more efficiently—and spending. They rail about spending, but they cut indiscriminately, and they add money in places we don't need it.

Let's go down the list.

In aviation, we want to build a 21st century air traffic control system, but they cut that budget $100 million.

The Coast Guard is spread so thin it can't meet its own criteria for search and rescue, but they are $17 million below what the President proposed, and there is no money in here for a new Coast Guard icebreaker. We are a great maritime nation. We are down to one 50-year-old, decrepit icebreaker. That is not going to serve our country too well.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Then Amtrak, they cut Amtrak by $251 million in its capital accounts. On the day that we had the Amtrak crash, they cut the capital acquisition account for Amtrak by $251 million, despite the fact that Amtrak has a $20 billion backlog.

There are 140-year-old tunnels that are near collapse, which will paralyze the East Coast. There are bridges that are 100, 110, 120 years old—and, yes, we do not yet have the positive train control system on all of Amtrak's routes.

That has been something that has only been recommended for 25 years by the National Transportation Safety Board. This is pretty pathetic.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. I thank the chairman.

I am proud to lend my full support to the chairman's bill to fund our transportation systems that are so vital to moving this country forward.

Mr. Chairman, important needs of our industries and countless businesses in North Carolina are addressed by this legislation.

First, a marginal increase in the length of twin trailers carrying freight over North Carolina's roads will allow more freight to be carried per trip, thus decreasing the number of trucks on the road. This modest change to 33 feet in length has a large impact on productivity. Slightly longer trailers improve stability because you have a longer wheelbase.

More productivity means a slower growth rate of truck trips on our roads. With this change, there would be 6.6 million fewer truck trips per year; and, according to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's data, it would prevent at least 912 highway accidents every year.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that the North Carolina Troopers Association is focused on supporting policies that promote safety and improve law enforcement in the State of North Carolina and across this country. They support modernizing freight transportation regulations to allow for 33 feet in length.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD their letter in support of this change.

MAY 6, 2015.

Secretary ANTHONY FOXX,
Department of Transportation,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY FOXX: The North Carolina Troopers Association, founded in 1977, is focused on supporting policies that promote safety and improve law enforcement in the state of North Carolina and the United States of America. We are grateful for your leadership on policies at the intersection of

safety, law enforcement and transportation. From the Charlotte City Council and Mayor's Office to the Department of Transportation and the President's Cabinet, the central questions remain the same. Which policy choices will do the most to keep people safe?

We often work alongside the North Carolina Trucking Association on matters concerning the transportation of freight on the national highway system as well as the extensive network of North Carolina highways and roads. From Murphy to Manteo, we partner with professional drivers to keep everyone safe on the roads.

We support truck safety advances such as lane departure technologies and adaptive speed controls and encourage the continued adoption of modern technology and training techniques.

The less than truckload (LTL) market has a significant footprint in North Carolina not least in the areas around Greensboro and Charlotte. We understand the American Trucking Associations along with other leading LTL companies, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers, back a proposal to increase the length of twin trailers in the LTL freight market by five feet with no change to federal weight limits. We support the proposal for several reasons.

First, a marginal increase to the length of twin trailers carrying freight on North Carolina's roads will result in an increase in cubic capacity allowing more freight to be carried per trip, thus decreasing the number of trucks on the road. A modest change in length has a large impact on productivity. More productivity makes it easier to slow the growth rate of truck trips on our road system.

Modernizing freight transportation regulations to allow for 33-ft. doubles means 6.6 million fewer truck trips per year and according to Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration data it would prevent at least 912 highway accidents every year.

Second, studies from the experts at the University of Michigan and the federal Department of Transportation show that an increase to the length of the wheel base without an increase to weight limitations creates a more stable truck for both straight line driving and cornering. Indeed, the proposal for five more feet on twin trailers came from a 2002 analysis from the Transportation Research Board (Special Report 267, 2002).

In addition, fewer trucks on the road will inevitably lead to much needed relief for North Carolina's infrastructure. In 2013, some 9.7 billion tons of freight was carried by truck. The proposal for twin 33s would shift a portion of that freight—the LTL market—into trailers with a slightly longer wheelbase providing benefit for North Carolina bridges.

We are encouraged by your advocacy for better, smarter, safer transportation policies. When the proposal for a five foot extension—with no change in weight limits for twin trailers—comes before Congress we ask you to provide the full support of your office.

Sincerely,

Daniel S. Jenkins, Jr.,
President, North Carolina Troopers Association.

Mr. ROUZER. I am also pleased to support the committee's language that would continue to prohibit the use of funds to enforce the restart provisions of hours-of-service rules for our truck drivers. The trucking industry does not need more regulations imposed upon them in the name of safety.

Safety is an absolute priority for their industry. Trucking companies know that, without good safety records, they will not be the carriers of choice for businesses that need to move freight.

Mr. Chairman, each of these provisions will help spur economic growth throughout our Nation and enable us to better compete and thrive globally. My constituents in the manufacturing and agricultural industries are interested in making Federal transportation policies more conducive to the productive and efficient movement of the goods, and these provisions will help facilitate that.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As for the ideas that are being thrown back and forth here tonight about highway safety and driver safety, the advocates for highway and auto safety who are looking at this bill and evaluating this bill include the Teamsters and the Short Line Railroad Association.

My own highway patrol in North Carolina came to see me; they came on their own volition, and they had pictures, Mr. Chairman, of carnage on our highways. It left no doubt that they were not interested in seeing heavier and longer trucks and relaxed rules on our highways.

I suggest that Members might want to check in with safety advocates and with law enforcement in their own States and see what kind of assessments they get of this highly irregular effort that is going on here tonight of writing into appropriations bills provisions that haven't had hearings, that haven't had thorough evaluations.

In some cases, they overturn evaluations that are already in the process—evaluations that this body has ordered up—prejudging the consequences and the conclusions of those studies and are moving ahead with ill-advised relaxations in truck and auto safety.

I suggest that Members will want to take a critical look at that.

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

□ 1945

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), one of those additional speakers, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding but also for his very thoughtful leadership on the subcommittee as our ranking member.

I rise to express my grave concerns regarding the funding levels for our transportation and housing programs provided in this bill. Once again, the majority has brought a bill to the floor that includes drastic and misguided sequester cuts to programs that are critical to the American economy and to the lives of the most vulnerable and to creating jobs.

Under the transportation title, the bill funds TIGER grants $1.15 billion below the President's request. Similarly, Small Starts and New Starts are underfunded from the President's request by over $1 billion. These are programs that create jobs and create economic growth. It is completely nonsensical to starve our communities of the proven Federal investments in transportation that we so desperately need.

The bill before us drastically underfunds our critical housing programs, including $25 million less than the President's request for elderly and disabled housing. Yes, that is elderly and disabled housing. It zeroes out the housing trust fund, which helps the lowest income Americans, and it is $320 million less than the request for Choice Neighborhoods. These cuts keep people living on the margins and push more people into poverty and homelessness.

Before I conclude, let me just say how inappropriate it is in this bill, like all these bills that we are seeing, they contain language that would turn, now, this bill, the Treasury-HUD bill, into an ideological and wrongheaded foreign policy document by restricting travel to Cuba. I introduced an amendment to strike this language and will be introducing a bipartisan amendment with my friend Representative MARK SANFORD to do the same on this bill. We need a 21st century approach to our relations with the nation that is 90 miles from our shores, not to cling to cold war era policies.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield an additional 1 minute to my colleague.

Ms. LEE. Americans deserve the right to travel to wherever they would so desire. They travel to China and Vietnam; Americans have that right. Why shouldn't they have the right to travel to a country 90 miles off of our shores? Cold war era policies are just that, 50-year-old policies that have failed. They are wrong, first of all. They are very ridiculous at this point, and they don't make any sense. So to keep trying to put these amendments into nongermane bills where it makes no sense is mind-boggling to me. I hope that we can get that amendment out.

I just want to thank the ranking member for his efforts, given the tremendous constraints allotted by Republican austerity budgeting.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a

distinguished member of our Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. PRICE, for the leadership that he has provided in this committee, and also, thank you to his staff.

I also want to thank my friend Chairman MARIO DIAZ-BALART for his leadership in working on this bill in a bipartisan way. There are a couple things I just want to point out that are important to the State of Texas. First of all, one of the issues that we worked on together was to make sure that we direct the Federal highway authority to continue to develop a freight network that connects to our high-volume land ports of entry.

Some of the maps that I have seen show that they don't connect to the land ports; but just to give you an idea, in my hometown of Laredo, the largest inland port, if you look at the trucks that come in, those are 12,000 trailers every single day. This is why this particular language got added: to make sure that the freight is connected to land ports of entry and will make sure that American communities are able to get products that are coming into the United States.

The other thing I do want to emphasize that was put in in this particular bill has to do with encouraging the standardization of passenger rail standards between the U.S. and Mexico, which means basically from the San Antonio area to the Laredo area to the Monterrey area, and this is something that will be one of the first. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for putting in that language.

Finally, the last thing I want to bring up is the language that helps HUD pay a little bit more attention to colonias. As you know, colonias are third-world communities that have no water and no sewage. Putting in this type of language will help thousands of people that live in third-world conditions. After speaking to Secretary Castro and speaking to the chairman and the ranking member, Mr. PRICE, this will put a focus on that.

I want to thank the ranking member for his good work. I also thank my friend, the chairman, so much for working with me on this language.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I also yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this bill for many reasons, but one short-sited cut stands out. This bill cuts HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes by $35 million. Let me explain in the simplest terms I can what a $35 million cut would mean: thousands of children in the United States will be poisoned.

Thousands of housing units identified as containing lead paint hazards will not be made safe for the children who live there. Thousands of children will be needlessly subjected to decreased IQ and cognitive function across their entire lifespan, developmental delays, behavior problems, learning disabilities, seizures, coma, and even death. Lead poisoning impacts the decision making center of the brain. Children with lead poisoning are 7 times more likely to drop out of school, more likely to engage in risk-taking behaviors, and more likely to engage in criminal activity.

Lead poisoning is entirely preventable—but to save a few dollars, this Majority will let them suffer. And it doesn't even save a few dollars. The total annual costs of lead poisoning to society are over $50 billion. Every dollar spent on lead hazard control activities has a benefit of $17 to $220 in medical, educational, and criminal justice costs. A $35 million cut will create a minimum of $600 million, and possibly nearly $8 billion in additional costs to society.

In my district in Rochester, NY, 200 children were confirmed with lead poisoning in 2014. Two hundred children. That's ten kindergarten classrooms full of kids. That is simply not acceptable. This $35 million cut would let another 119 children be poisoned in my district alone. When lead poisoning is entirely preventable, I do not know how we can stand to have the lifelong negative impacts on those children's lives on our conscience.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

During consideration of the bill for amendment each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2577

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, $105,000,000, of which not to exceed $2,734,000 shall be available for the immediate Office of the Secretary; not to exceed $1,025,000 shall be available for the immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary; not to exceed $20,066,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; not to exceed $9,310,000 shall be available for the Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy; not to exceed $12,808,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs; not to exceed $2,500,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs; not to exceed $26,029,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; not to exceed $2,029,000 shall be available for the Office of Public Affairs; not to exceed $1,769,000 shall be available for the Office of the Executive Secretariat; not to exceed $10,793,000 shall be available for the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response; and not to exceed $15,937,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for any office shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That notice of any change in funding greater than 5 percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $60,000 shall be for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, excluding fees authorized in Public Law 107–71, there may be credited to this appropriation up to $2,500,000 in funds received in user fees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

Mr. DENT. I have an amendment at the desk I would like to offer.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $9,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 56, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Mr. DENT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment to increase Amtrak's capital account by $9 million, which is the amount that we are told it will cost to equip all of Amtrak trains with inward-facing cameras in their engine cars.

It has been over 3 weeks since Amtrak Northeast Regional number 188 derailed just north of Philadelphia, killing at least eight people and injuring over 200. We still do not know exactly what caused this tragic accident, but had the train been equipped with an inward-facing camera, we very well might.

This is a simple and relatively inexpensive reform that the National Transportation Safety Board has been advocating for years, and it is past time that we act. Like the infamous black boxes on airplanes, inward-facing cameras on trains would provide inspectors with critical information after an accident.

Northeast Regional 188 was traveling over twice the posted speed limit on the stretch of track where it derailed. I should also let you know, I rode on that same regional train that morning, from Wilmington, Delaware, down to Washington, so I know this particular line, the Northeast corridor. I travel it regularly, so I am very much personally interested, as are so many of my constituents and friends in the northeastern part of the United States.

Had an inward-facing camera been installed on that train, we might now know whether that was due to some mechanical failure, negligence on the engineer's part, or perhaps some medical incident beyond his control. With that information in hand, we would be that much closer to taking the appropriate steps to ensure that this never happens again.

Our thoughts and prayers remain with the victims of this tragedy and their loved ones, and we owe it to them to do everything we can to prevent future incidents like the one we saw in Philadelphia. The installation of inward-facing cameras in all Amtrak trains is an important step in that direction.

I would like to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART and his staff for their support and for working with me to identify an acceptable offset, especially given the extremely tight constraints under which this bill was drafted. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

I also would like to say, I know that the offsets are of some concern to some of the Members. We are going to do our best to try to work with them on that matter.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition so as to raise objections about the offsets proposed in this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, my friend Mr. DENT has proposed an increase in an appropriation for a worthy purpose, to install inward-facing cameras on Amtrak locomotives, but his amendment offers another example of why the overall allocation in this T-HUD bill is completely inadequate.

The offsets may represent relatively small reductions in DOT's administrative accounts, each of these accounts: the DOT Secretary's salaries and expenses, the Federal Transit Administration's administrative expenses account, the Saint Lawrence Seaway. All of these would be cut below last year's level.

At this point, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my colleague from the full committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, respectfully, and I implore the majority to take a close look at where they have obtained the money for this important Amtrak investment. Amtrak is important to Ohio, to the Pennsylvania-Ohio corridor, and there would be nothing I would do to hurt Amtrak. I have been one of Amtrak's greatest advocates.

Of the $9 million to fix this problem for Amtrak, you don't take the majority of it, $3 million, from the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Administration, the Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. In effect, what they have done is they have taken $3 million of the $9 million they need for Amtrak out of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, which is, in effect, a 10 percent cut to the smallest entity inside of the Department of Transportation.

Why is the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation important? First of all, the current funding level is the smallest budget within the Department of Transportation. Our amendment inside the full Committee on Appropriations allowed that budget not to be cut any further.

The seaway is the only binational instrumentality between Canada and the United States. It connects an entire region of the country from Duluth to Massena, New York, to global markets. They have threatened problems within the seaway, such as locks collapsing and inadequate areas for our ships to pass through. Sailing on the Great Lakes can be very, very dangerous, as many of our sailors know.

That corridor is the shortest distance between Europe and the United States, and last year, the seaway had an 8 percent increase in its shipping growth. It serves a part of America that has been battered economically. Manufacturing has been fighting its way back. This really isn't the time to tamper with the seaway's budget.

I understand the problems of Amtrak, and I know that it needs funding, but I am just asking the majority to please look at the budget you have offered. Your offsets in the case of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation are truly unacceptable, and in doing so, the seaway will be harmed. It will harm ports like Erie, Pennsylvania; Massena, New York; Duluth, Minnesota; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Gary, Indiana; Toledo, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan. The list is a very, very long list.

We have an aging infrastructure in the Great Lakes as well. We don't have the power of the Intracoastal. We wish we did. But I have to raise my voice in strong objection to the offset related to the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

I respect very much the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I know what you are trying to do for Amtrak. I want to help you in that effort, but not at the expense of the seaway.

□ 2000

I am hoping that the respective staffs can work together as this bill moves forward to find a more reasonable offset. I have many more ideas about that, but the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation should be allowed to remain functional and not be harmed by a 10 percent cut.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I understand the difficult choices here. I do intend to work with her and any other concerned Members about these offsets and maybe find a way to alter them at some point, but I just didn't have time to do it tonight.

Again, I believe this is a reasonable amendment and it will do what we need to at least help with respect to the inward-facing cameras on Amtrak trains.

At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), my friend, who is a frequent Amtrak rider himself.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, 3 weeks ago, the tragic Amtrak accident in north Philadelphia led to deaths, injuries, and destruction. Those who were injured included two of my constituents with whom I had been meeting with earlier in the day here in Washington.

While the circumstances surrounding the incident remain under investigation, we do know that certain measures can be taken to ensure safety and preparedness, and changes can be implemented moving forward for public safety.

Inward-facing cameras are an appropriate step in modernizing train transportation safety. The National Transportation Safety Board has been advocating for this simple and relatively inexpensive reform for years.

I urge support of Mr. DENT's amendment to bring this reform to fruition.

Mr. DENT. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that would provide $9 million for inward-facing cameras on Amtrak trains. This is absolutely essential, I believe, to helping us hopefully prevent and—certainly, after the fact—determine the causes of these types of tragedies when they occur.

I wish we weren't at this point, but we need to do this. It is important.

Amtrak wants to move in this direction. The National Transportation Safety Board has urged this for some time. And it is now time that Congress act.

So, again, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BUSTOS

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 2, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 60, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART and Ranking Member PRICE for their hard work on this legislation.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to join with me in improving rail and pipeline safety by supporting my amendment to increase funding by $500,000 to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. This important agency's mission is to protect our communities from the risks of hazardous materials transportation, including moving crude oil by rail and pipeline.

Until just a few years ago, our Nation's railroads transported very little crude oil. Now, in part due to the boom in oil production from the Bakken formation in North Dakota and in other areas, approximately 1.1 billion barrels are transported by rail in the United States every single day.

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration conducted tests on Bakken crude and found it to have a higher degree of volatility than most other U.S. crudes.

Last year, railroads carried almost 650,000 carloads of oil, compared to only 9,500 carloads in 2008. This impact is especially felt in Illinois, my home State, where we have the second-most number of miles of rail track in the entire country. In fact, about 25 percent of all U.S. rail traffic passes through Chicago, Illinois.

Improving rail safety is extremely important to our region, our State, and to our entire country. This issue is especially personal to me and the people I serve in my congressional district. That is because in March, earlier this year, a train carrying crude oil derailed near Galena, Illinois. It is in the northwest corner of my State and is one of the most beautiful regions of not only my congressional district but the entire State of Illinois—and I think in the entire country.

While we were lucky that no one was harmed, several tanker cars exploded and the Bakken crude spilled just a few feet from a slough that flows straight into the Mississippi River, which is the drinking water supply for millions of people.

Because of the bravery and the dedication of first responders and local, State, and Federal cleanup crews, no water was contaminated. We were also lucky that the derailment took place in a largely rural and uninhabited area. Imagine what would have happened if a derailment like this were to occur in Chicago, Los Angeles, or New York, or any more populated area.

In light of several other high-profile train derailments, including those in West Virginia and North Dakota, involving cars carrying crude oil, communities across the country are becoming increasingly concerned about the safe movement of crude oil—and with very good reason.

While I am encouraged that Federal agencies and industry leaders are working together to make transportation of hazardous material safer, Congress must also do its job and step up and provide adequate resources to keep our energy transport system safe and secure.

That is why I ask today for your support for my effort to ensure this appropriations bill includes additional funding for the agency that helps ensure the safe transportation of energy products, including the shipment of crude oil by pipeline and rail.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chairman, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Florida for his indulgence and working with me on this amendment.

We have benefited here across the United States in recent times with a boom in energy and moving towards energy self-sufficiency. Much of this has been due to the ability to take advantage of our natural resources, including crude oil, which is increasingly being developed from the Western parts of our country. In fact, more than 33 million barrels of crude oil are shipped by rail each month in the United States, and that is a fifty-fold increase from more than 5 years ago.

Shipments from the Bakken region have brightened the future of oil workers and refineries in my own Seventh District of Pennsylvania, and indeed the entire Philadelphia area, and in fact they have created energy opportunities throughout our Nation.

But now, despite the fact that nearly all of the shipments reach their destinations safely, accidents, sadly, are on the rise. Recent incidents in Ontario, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania call to mind the need for improved safety measures.

Madam Chairman, my amendment seeks to transfer funding from the Office of the Secretary salaries and expense account and puts $3.5 million into the Federal Railroad Administration to fund additional cars to inspect the more than 14,000 miles of crude oil rail routes nationwide.

This funding would also expedite the use of remote automated track inspection capability, which will increase inspection mileage while reducing costs.

For more than 30 years, the FRA's automated track inspection program, called ATIP, has provided accurate track geometry and performance data to assess compliance with the Federal Track Safety Standards.

Collected data is used by the FRA, railroad inspectors, and railroads to ensure that track safety is being maintained. Immediately following ATIP track surveys, the railroads use the data to help locate and correct problems. Often railroads use the ATIP data as a quality assurance check on their own track inspection and maintenance programs.

Madam Chairman, America's energy boom has brightened communities across the country, and as crude oil by rail grows, I want to help protect those communities. My amendment would enable the FRA to increase its ATIP capability to meet this challenge.

Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman and Ranking Member PRICE for their willingness to work with me on this issue. I urge the amendment's adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert ''($4,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $250,000)''.

Page 2, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 3, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $250,000)''.

Page 40, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,000,000)''.

Mr. BURGESS (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, this is an amendment to add an additional $4 million to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's operations and research.

Madam Chair, at the beginning of this Congress, I took the gavel of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade. This was the gavel previously held by our good friend, Chairman Lee Terry.

There was some unfinished business as this Congress started, and one of the biggest issues left over from the previous Congress was the issue of airbag energetic deployments and ruptures, and the subsequent recall of those airbags.

There was a hearing done in December right at the end of the last Congress, and it seemed like there was no activity from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. But just 2 weeks ago, they announced a recall of 34 million vehicles. The recall massively expanded. And the manufacturer of the airbags, Takata, finally admitted that six of their manufacturing designs were indeed defective. Takata has identified 11 auto manufacturers that use the defective air bag inflators.

Again, 34 million vehicles have been subject to this recall. And this may not be the end.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and Takata have not identified what is the cause of these energetic disruptions of the air bag inflators.

Yesterday, the Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee held a hearing to receive an update on the situation. Among the witnesses was the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Dr. Mark Rosekind. Dr. Rosekind took over the Administration just weeks after the subcommittee's Takata hearing in December.

During yesterday's hearing, one of the themes we heard repeatedly from Administrator Rosekind was that NHTSA would have been better able to identify and mandate recalls had they had more resources. It is a refrain we are used to hearing here in Congress. His argument was that with more money, the agency could save more lives. I will take him at his word on that.

For fiscal year 2016, Congress is proposing funding the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration operations and research, the account responsible for the policing of the safety of auto manufacturers' products, at $150 million. This indeed is an increase of $20 million from fiscal year 2015, and for that I am extremely grateful.

In the interest of good faith, however, from the new chairman of the subcommittee to the new Administrator of NHTSA, I want to take one more step and offer an additional $4 million to this account to provide NHTSA with the resources it needs to ensure that more lives are not disrupted by these defects.

□ 2015

It is my hope that NHTSA can use this additional funding to find a permanent solution to the problem.

The Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee is closely watching and awaiting the release of a report by NHTSA's inspector general on their Office of Defects Investigation. We hope it will be released soon.

The offset comes from the Department of Transportation Office of the Secretary for salaries and expenses. This seems like an extremely worthwhile investment, and I urge the subcommittee's adoption of my amendment.

Again, I want to thank the subcommittee for hearing my amendment. I certainly want to congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee. I think they have done good work on this. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses related to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, $11,386,000, of which $8,218,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training: *Provided further*, That any reference in law, regulation, judicial proceedings, or elsewhere to the Research and Innovative Technology Administration shall continue to be deemed to be a reference to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology of the Department of Transportation.

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For capital investments in surface transportation infrastructure, $100,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute funds provided under this heading as discretionary grants to be awarded to a State, local government, transit agency, or a collaboration among such entities on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area, or a region: *Provided further*, That projects eligible for funding provided under this heading shall include, but not be limited to, highway or bridge projects eligible under title 23, United States Code; public transportation projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code; passenger and freight rail transportation projects; and port infrastructure investments (including inland port infrastructure and land ports of entry): *Provided further*, That the Secretary may use up to 20 percent of the funds made available under this heading for the purpose of paying the subsidy and administrative costs of projects eligible for Federal credit assistance under chapter 6 of title 23, United States Code, if the Secretary finds that such use of the funds would advance the purposes of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That in distributing funds provided under this heading, the Secretary shall take such measures so as to ensure an equitable geographic distribution of funds, an appropriate balance in addressing the needs of urban and rural areas, and the investment in a variety of transportation modes: *Provided further*, That a grant funded under this heading shall be not less than $2,000,000 and not greater than $15,000,000: *Provided further*, That not more than 20 percent of the funds made available under this heading may be awarded to projects in a single State: *Provided further*, That the Federal share of the costs for which an expenditure is made under this heading shall be, at the option of the recipient, up to 50 percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall give priority to projects that require a contribution of Federal funds in order to complete an overall financing package: *Provided further*, That not less than 10 percent of the funds provided under this heading shall be for projects located in rural areas: *Provided further*, That for projects located in rural areas, the minimum grant size shall be $1,000,000 and the Secretary may increase the Federal share of costs above 80 percent: *Provided further*, That projects conducted using funds provided under this heading must comply with the requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall conduct a new competition to select the grants and credit assistance awarded under this heading: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain up to $5,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading, and may transfer portions of those funds to the Administrators of the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration and the Maritime Administration, to fund the award and oversight of grants and credit assistance made under the National Infrastructure Investments program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,150,000,000)''.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to invest in transportation infrastructure for the 21st century.

The transportation funding in this bill is woefully insufficient to meet our country's infrastructure needs. The cuts to the TIGER program are particularly egregious.

TIGER, formally known as Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery, is a competitive grant program that creates jobs by funding investments in transportation infrastructure. This bill cuts TIGER from the 2015 level of $500 million down to a mere $100 million in 2016.

America needs new infrastructure for the 21st century. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave the public infrastructure of the United States a grade of D-plus in 2013 and estimated that we will need to invest $3.6 trillion by 2020 in order to improve the conditions of our infrastructure.

Indeed, TIGER needs to be expanded, not cut. The President requested $1.25 billion for TIGER in the coming fiscal year, as part of an expanded TIGER program that will create jobs, encourage innovation, and modernize transportation infrastructure for the 21st century.

Earlier this year, I sent a letter to the Appropriations Committee urging support for the President's request, and 144 Members of Congress signed my letter.

Our economy is still struggling to recover from the recession. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, our Nation's unemployment rate stands at 5.4 percent. Furthermore, unemployment among Hispanics is 6.9 percent. Among African Americans, it is 9.6 percent, and among teenagers, it is 17.1 percent.

An expanded TIGER program will create meaningful employment building safe roads, bridges, and public transit systems in communities throughout the United States.

My amendment increases TIGER funding to $1.25 billion in order to fully fund the President's request for this critical program.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I want to commend my colleague, who does such distinguished work in housing and financial services on her committee, for coming in to this debate today and calling attention to the importance of the TIGER program, and I would just like to ask her to respond.

I am looking at the figures for this year. There is a $500 million appropriation for that program in the current year. Is the gentlewoman aware that the Department of Transportation has already received 950 preapplications, totaling $14.5 billion? That is 29 times the amount available.

What does that suggest about the need for this program?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Well, you have accurately and appropriately identified the need for the program, based on those applications. Not only is it a very popular program, it is a program that creates jobs, and our local communities need this very much, and they are strong advocates for it.

I would hope that my colleagues here in the Congress, on both sides of the aisle, who have benefitted from the TIGER program, would see the need and remove all obstacles, support this program, and let us move forward with getting the infrastructure repairs and the building that we need to do.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for offering this amendment. It calls attention to the gross underfunding in this bill, not just of TIGER, but of virtually every HUD and transportation program so that it is very hard, of course, to find offsets. There is very little money in this bill.

We should be breaking out of that mold. We should be going after a budget agreement that will let us write a decent bill and meet this country's needs. Her amendment, better than anything we have heard thus far tonight, underscores that need.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress, which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment does propose a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California violates section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)3 establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $400,000,000)''.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to restore some of the transportation funding that was cut drastically in this bill.

This is my second of two amendments to increase funds for the innovative TIGER transportation grant program. This amendment increases fiscal year 2016 TIGER funding to $500 million, thereby restoring TIGER to the 2015 level.

States, local governments, and transit agencies depend upon the TIGER program to finance projects to repair aging infrastructure and develop new highway and transit systems. A safe, efficient, modern, and accessible transportation system is vital for a growing economy.

Madam Chair, we cannot afford to cut TIGER below the current funding level, and I am here this evening to urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment and invest in infrastructure for the 21st century.

I recognize that a point of order has been raised on this issue, but I also recognize that what I am advocating is vital for this economy and for this country. I would hope that somehow we would be wise enough, creative enough, and caring enough to dispense with the rule, as it has been identified on my first amendment, and move forward in a very creative way to do what is necessary to help our failing infrastructure in this country.

The stories about the failing bridges, the stories about the unsafe highways, the stories about the need for transit system improvements are stories that we hear, day in and day out.

Given the information that has been made available to us about the needs for infrastructure repairs, I would hope that we would not simply treat this in such an ordinary fashion and apply the rule that basically says: Well, if I did not find the money to fund it, then somehow it cannot be in order.

Certainly, this amount of money is not easy to locate; certainly, I do not

have an answer to where this money would necessarily come from, but I would hope that my colleagues would take into consideration again the desperate need of our economy and our communities and not rule this out of order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, this amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California violates section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5.

For the reasons stated in the previous ruling, and as persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 9, strike ''and the Secretary'' and all that follows through ''percent'' on line 10.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to change a provision in the bill relating to TIGER grants.

Put simply, this amendment would put all transportation projects on an even playing field and allow all qualified projects to fairly compete for these grants, regardless of whether they take place in an urban area or a rural area.

□ 2030

Madam Chair, my district is heavily reliant on all forms of transportation. The Chicagoland area is the hub for the Nation's transportation network. Over 925 million tons of freight move in and out of Chicago each and every year, and each workday, tens of thousands of citizens of the 10th Congressional District use commuter rail.

The Chicago Regional Transportation Authority estimates that it needs to find $13.4 billion over the next decade just to maintain the system in its current condition. That is why it is more important than ever to find the funds to pay to maintain and rebuild our Nation's transportation system.

In the Transportation Appropriations funding bill, there is a provision which discriminates against urban districts, like Illinois' 10th Congressional District. TIGER grants, which are competitive grants to fund capital investments in surface transportation projects, can be awarded to projects across the entire Nation.

However, the bill also provides that projects in urban areas receive a Federal match of 50 percent of the project funding, while projects in rural areas can receive up to 80 percent of the project's funding.

Madam Chair, this is unfair and unjust. The TIGER grants are competitive, discretionary grants that should be awarded to the most deserving projects. The bill's language allows rural areas to leverage local dollars at a 4 to 1 ratio, allowing them to put up just $2 out of every $10 needed for a project. Urban areas may only leverage at a 1 to 1 ratio.

This language harms urban areas and makes it more difficult to secure the funding needed to complete these projects. My amendment is a commonsense and just solution to this problem and would place all projects, no matter where they occur, on an even playing field.

Madam Chair, it is time to bring equity back to transportation funding, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and put all qualified projects on an even playing field.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I respectfully oppose the gentleman's well-intentioned amendment.

TIGER is a national program, and we support cities of all sizes having a chance to get a grant, and we work to ensure there is a balance between urban and rural areas. I am afraid that the well-intentioned amendment from the gentleman seeks to undo that delicate balance at this time.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, want to reluctantly express my opposition to this amendment.

Madam Chair, I take second place to no one in this body as the champion of the TIGER program, as I hope was evident in my support for the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) amendments just now; but we are underscoring in this amendment, while it is worthy in its intent—and I would love to be able to add a lot more money than this to the TIGER program—its offset is very worrisome and one that I think should lead us to oppose this amendment.

It comes out of the Federal Aviation Administration's operations account, $100 million out of that account.

Now, the bill provides a slight increase for FAA operations, but it is still $67 million below the President's request. This is the account that provides the funds needed to ensure aviation safety and security, so cutting this account is ill advised.

Mr. DOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. I think the gentleman is talking about a different amendment. My amendment doesn't take anything out of any account. This is talking about simply changing the percentages between urban and rural to allow competitive grants so that it competes at a level playing field.

I just respectfully think you have got a different amendment, which I appreciate, but it is not the one that I think that we are talking about right now.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The gentleman does have an amendment that fits my description; is that true?

Mr. DOLD. Yes, but we have withdrawn that one, but I do appreciate the gentleman talking about that one.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for that clarification. My remarks will await the proper amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, as we talk about transportation and infrastructure, it is so critically important, critically important for our economy, critically important certainly for our urban areas, and if you look at a map of the city of Chicago in the center of our country, we have got six of seven major rail lines that go through there.

It used to be that a third of all the freight in the country would go through Chicago. Now, it is about a quarter, but it is still a tremendous amount, and it really impacts the Nation's economy.

We can get a railcar from Los Angeles to Chicago in 2 days. It takes nearly 2 days to go from one side of Chicago to the other side of Chicago. This does have an impact.

The same rail that we are talking about here also has commuter rails on it, and we are dealing with infrastructure that goes back to the Roosevelt administration. I don't mean FDR; I mean Teddy Roosevelt. We need to make sure that there is some additional funding going here.

This amendment that we are talking about is not talking about moving dollars around. It is talking about trying to provide equity so that urban

projects, which I would argue we desperately need, are on the same level as the rural projects.

If we were to lose mass transit or some of these other projects in the city of Chicago, we are talking about a 50 percent increase in congestion on our roadways.

This is an amendment that I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would embrace—at least let's talk about a level playing field, where we are not giving preference to the rural areas versus the urban areas, urban areas which I would argue use the rail a pretty significant amount in terms of how we are moving people around, not to mention our goods and services.

This is an amendment that I think is a commonsense amendment, and I would hope that I would get some support from my good friend from Florida and maybe we could get him to even reconsider, but I hope I am not tilting at windmills on that one, Madam Chair.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CAPITAL

For necessary expenses for upgrading and enhancing the Department of Transportation's financial systems and re-engineering business processes, $1,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2017.

CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVES

For necessary expenses for cyber security initiatives, including necessary upgrades to wide area network and information technology infrastructure, improvement of network perimeter controls and identity management, testing and assessment of information technology against business, security, and other requirements, implementation of Federal cyber security initiatives and information infrastructure enhancements, implementation of enhanced security controls on network devices, and enhancement of cyber security workforce training tools, $7,000,000 to remain available through September 30, 2017.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, $9,600,000.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, systems development, development activities, and making grants, to remain available until expended, $5,976,000.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Working Capital Fund, not to exceed $181,500,000 shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities within the Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without majority approval of the Working Capital Fund Steering Committee and approval of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $336,000, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $18,367,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, $597,000.

SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION AND OUTREACH

For necessary expenses for small and disadvantaged business utilization and outreach activities, $4,518,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 332, these funds may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

In addition to funds made available from any other source to carry out the essential air service program under 49 U.S.C. 41731 through 41742, $155,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in determining between or among carriers competing to provide service to a community, the Secretary may consider the relative subsidy requirements of the carriers: *Provided further*, That basic essential air service minimum requirements shall not include the 15-passenger capacity requirement under subsection 41732(b)(3) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act or any other Act shall be used to enter into a new contract with a community located less than 40 miles from the nearest small hub airport before the Secretary has negotiated with the community over a local cost share: *Provided further*, That amounts authorized to be distributed for the essential air service program under subsection 41742(b) of title 49, United States Code, shall be made available immediately from amounts otherwise provided to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may reimburse such amounts from fees credited to the account established under section 45303 of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $155,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, this amendment eliminates the $155 million of discretionary spending that is wasted on one of the least essential programs in the entire United States Government, the so-called Essential Air Service. That is the program that subsidizes empty and near-empty planes to fly from small airports to regional hubs just a few hours or less away by car.

This was supposed to be a temporary program to allow local communities and airports to readjust to airline deregulation in 1978. Not only is it still going on today, but it has doubled in cost in the last 4 years, from $130 million in 2011 to roughly $260 million in 2015, and $155 million of that is in our control. This amendment zeros it out and puts it toward deficit reduction.

Now, we are often told: Well, don't worry. We have enacted all of these reforms. We have caps on subsidies.

All those caps, $200 per ticket, are only for flights under 210 miles. It continues unlimited subsidies over that distance. Actual subsidies per passenger can be as high as $980 per ticket, paid by hard-working taxpayers. Year after year, we are promised reform; and year after year, the cost goes up and up.

By the way, Essential Air Service flights are flown out of Merced and Visalia airports, serving my district in the Sierra. Trust me, a tiny number of people actually use it. The alternative is hardly catastrophic; it is typically an extra hour's drive to a regional airport. I guarantee you that everybody who hears about this waste of their money is outraged by it.

It is true there are a few tiny communities in Alaska, like Kake's 700 citizens, that have no highway connections to hub airports, but they have plenty of alternatives. In the case of Kake, they enjoy year-round ferry service to Juneau. In addition, Alaska is well served by a thriving general aviation market and the ubiquitous bush pilot.

Rural life has great advantages. It also has some disadvantages, but it is not the job of hard-working taxpayers who choose to live elsewhere to level out the differences.

Now, apologists for this wasteful spending tell us it is an important economic driver for these small airports and airlines, and I am sure that is so. Whenever you give away money, the folks you are giving it to are always better off, but the folks you are taking it from are always worse off to exactly the same extent. Indeed, it's economic drivers like this that have driven Europe's economy right off a cliff.

Two years ago, one Member rushed to the microphone to suggest that this was essential for emergency medical evacuations. It has nothing to do with that. This program subsidizes regularly scheduled commercial service that practically nobody uses. If it actually had a passenger base, it wouldn't need, in effect, to hand out $100 bills to the few passengers who use it.

An airline so reckless with its funds would quickly bankrupt itself. Well,

the same principle holds true of governments.

The Washington Post is not known as a bastion of fiscal conservatism, but I cannot improve upon an editorial a few years ago when it said, ''Ideally, EAS would be zeroed out, and the $200 million we waste on it devoted to a truly national purpose: perhaps deficit reduction, military readiness, or the social safety net.''

The Washington Post goes on to write, ''Alas, if Congress and the White House were capable of making such choices, we probably never would have had sequestration in the first place.''

Madam Chair, there are many tough calls in setting fiscal priorities, but this isn't one of them. If the House of Representatives—where all appropriations begin, where the Republican majority pledged to stop wasting money—can't even agree to cut this useless program off from the trough, how does it expect to be taken seriously on the much tougher choices that lie ahead?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, this amendment that the gentleman from California has offered is about as indiscriminate as it gets. He apparently has ideas, and those ideas ought to be heard to reform this program, to make it more efficient and more effective and more targeted. The place to do that is in the authorizing committee. We have forums where we can discuss those ideas and act on them.

To come in tonight and offer this indiscriminate amendment which, by the way, not only cuts this overall program by more than half, but also cuts the allocation for this bill, which is already so inadequate, it is not an approach that this body should endorse.

□ 2045

The program we are talking about, Essential Air Services, was created after deregulation. It has remained essential to keep service going to many, many small communities in this country, including Crescent City, El Centro, Merced, and Visalia in California. It is funded through annual appropriations, and also funded through overflight fees that are collected when foreign air carriers traverse through U.S. airspace. If this amendment were adopted, many small communities would lose air service.

Madam Chair, this isn't the way to reform the program, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, this is the kindest cut of all. It is a temporary program that was established 37 years ago and has become a poster child for wasteful Federal spending, and I believe the authorization ran out years ago. Our national debt has doubled in 8 years. American taxpayers pay $230 billion a year just in interest costs on that debt. That means if you are an average family paying average taxes, $2,000 of those taxes did nothing more than rent the money that we have already spent.

Continuing to pay for this obsolete and wasteful program with money we don't have is obscene and makes a mockery of any claim that we have cut spending to the bone, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation to approve assessments or reimbursable agreements pertaining to funds appropriated to the modal administrations in this Act, except for activities underway on the date of enactment of this Act, unless such assessments or agreements have completed the normal reprogramming process for Congressional notification.

SEC. 102. The Secretary or his designee may engage in activities with States and State legislators to consider proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike lines 1 through 3.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. I want to begin by thanking Chairman DIAZ-BALART and his staff for their hard work on this legislation before us.

Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment with Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. RIBBLE of Wisconsin which makes it clear that Federal Government agencies should not be in the business—again, I say should not be—in the business of lobbying State and local legislators with Federal taxpayers' money. Federal law already prohibits Federal agencies from lobbying Congress in support of or against legislation.

Thanks in part to the leadership of Mr. SENSENBRENNER in 1998, Congress passed similar antilobbying language to prohibit the Department of Transportation from lobbying State and local elected officials.

At that time, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration was sending staff to State capitols at taxpayers' expense to lobby in favor of motorcycle helmet laws. At the cost of tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars, these officials traveled across the country to testify before State legislative committees, participate in conferences, and produce videotapes and other printed materials with the goal of advancing mandatory motorcycle helmet laws.

As the co-chairman of the Congressional Motorcycle Caucus and a rider myself who wears a helmet, I believe the most effective way to reduce motorcycle injuries and fatalities is to prevent these crashes from occurring in the first place. Madam Chair, that means putting between the ears as opposed to simply putting on the head.

I believe the NHTSA has an appropriate role in promoting vehicle and highway safety, whether that is focusing on efforts on crash prevention or rider education. Unfortunately, language pushed by the administration has made it into the recent omnibus legislation to reverse the lobby ban, and that provision is carried over into this bill.

Whether you ride or not, I would hope all my colleagues agree that this is an inappropriate use of taxpayer dollars. It violates the rights of States and local communities we represent to make their own decisions on helmet laws.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, we have an amendment before us that would strike a provision that has been carried in every transportation appropriations bill since 2009. The section simply grants the Secretary or his representatives the authority to engage in activities with States and State legislators to consider proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities. This consultation is entirely voluntary.

Madam Chair, in 2013, we had 5,000 motorcycle fatalities in this country. That is the last year for which we have data.

The research and expertise of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration can be extremely helpful—helpful to State highway traffic safety agencies as they consider measures they might want to undertake to improve motorcycle safety. Why wouldn't we want to be in partnership with the States as they address this important safety issue?

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding section 3324 of title 31, United States Code, in addition to authority provided by section 327 of title 49, United States Code, the Department's Working Capital Fund is hereby authorized to provide payments in advance to vendors that are necessary to carry out the Federal transit pass transportation fringe benefit program under Executive Order 13150 and section 3049 of Public Law 109–59: *Provided*, That the Department shall include adequate safeguards in the contract with the vendors to ensure timely and high-quality performance under the contract.

SEC. 104. The Secretary shall post on the Web site of the Department of Transportation a schedule of all meetings of the Credit Council, including the agenda for each meeting, and require the Credit Council to record the decisions and actions of each meeting.

SEC. 105. In addition to authority provided by section 327 of title 49, United States Code, the Department's Working Capital Fund is hereby authorized to provide partial or full payments in advance and accept subsequent reimbursements from all Federal agencies for transit benefit distribution services that are necessary to carry out the Federal transit pass transportation fringe benefit program under Executive Order 13150 and section 3049 of Public Law 109–59: *Provided*, That the Department shall maintain a reasonable operating reserve in the Working Capital Fund, to be expended in advance to provide uninterrupted transit benefits to Government employees, provided that such reserve will not exceed one month of benefits payable: *Provided further*, that such reserve may be used only for the purpose of providing for the continuation of transit benefits, provided that the Working Capital Fund will be fully reimbursed by each customer agency for the actual cost of the transit benefit.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities, the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, subsidizing the cost of aeronautical charts and maps sold to the public, lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, in addition to amounts made available by Public Law 112–95, $9,847,700,000 of which $8,831,250,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which not to exceed $7,505,293,000 shall be available for air traffic organization activities; not to exceed $1,258,411,000 shall be available for aviation safety activities; not to exceed $16,605,000 shall be available for commercial space transportation activities; not to exceed $725,000,000 shall be available for finance and management activities; not to exceed $60,089,000 shall be available for NextGen and operations planning activities; and not to exceed $282,302,000 shall be available for staff offices: *Provided*, That not to exceed 2 percent of any budget activity, except for aviation safety budget activity, may be transferred to any budget activity under this heading: *Provided further*, That no transfer may increase or decrease any appropriation by more than 2 percent: *Provided further*, That any transfer in excess of 2 percent shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 405 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall transmit to Congress an annual update to the report submitted to Congress in December 2004 pursuant to section 221 of Public Law 108–176: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by $100,000 for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a companion report that describes a comprehensive strategy for staffing, hiring, and training flight standards and aircraft certification staff in a format similar to the one utilized for the controller staffing plan, including stated attrition estimates and numerical hiring goals by fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by $100,000 per day for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to Congress: *Provided further*, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a nonprofit standard-setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Federal Aviation Administration to finalize or implement any regulation that would promulgate new aviation user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred in the provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities, and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $154,400,000 shall be for the contract tower program, including the contract tower cost share program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act for aeronautical charting and cartography are available for activities conducted by, or coordinated through, the Working Capital Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO

Mr. LOBIONDO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 16, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 16, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Madam Chair, I would like to start by thanking Chairman DIAZ-BALART for cooperating with this amendment.

Madam Chair, the Federal Aviation Administration is dealing with an increasing threat of cyberattacks against the National Airspace System. This critical threat was recently detailed in a GAO report as well as identified in news reports of a reported attempt to hack into the flight control system of a U.S. airliner through the plane's inflight entertainment system.

The FAA must protect the safety of our citizens and prevent negative impact to the U.S. economy by developing a comprehensive and multilayered approach to mitigating new and emerging cybersecurity threats.

My amendment will transfer $3 million within the FAA to develop an integrated cybersecurity testbed to evaluate and certify all NextGen and National Airspace systems. The FAA currently possesses the capability to establish such a testbed at its existing integrated testing environment at the FAA Tech Center in southern New Jersey. The Tech Center presents a natural host for FAA partnership with industry and academia to leverage the best ideas and technology to continually mitigate evolving cybersecurity threats.

Madam Chair, increasing FAA capability for creating, identifying, defending, and solving cybersecurity-related problems for existing National Airspace System and future NextGen systems is vital to the future safety and proposals of our American airspace.

Once again, Madam Chair, I thank Chairman MARIO DIAZ-BALART. I thank Ranking Member PRICE. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

Ms. ESTY. I have an amendment at the desk, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Connecticut and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, I come to the floor once again to urge this House to invest in rail safety. My amendment adds $3 million to the Federal Railroad Administration for safety and operations to fund vital rail safety education programs, like Operation Lifesaver.

Railroads move the goods that fuel our economy, and thousands of commuters in my district rely on passenger rail lines every day. In fact, over 11½ million Americans took the trains along the Northeast corridor last year, a record high ridership.

Freight rail traffic is also increasing, reflecting a growing economy and a booming energy sector. However, as we have seen in the news almost monthly, there have been a disturbing number of rail accidents in the last few years, many of them preventable train derailments and collisions. We in this House stood in silence a few weeks ago to mourn the loss of the eight passengers killed in last month's Amtrak derailment near Philadelphia. Those deaths were tragic and completely avoidable. We must do more to promote safe and reliable rail travel.

I have worked hard on the Transportation Committee and advocated in this House to implement positive train control and other innovative technologies that can protect passengers against the most dangerous rail accidents. But technologies like positive train control cannot prevent all train-related accidents.

On February 3, 2015, six people died when a northbound Metro-North Railroad commuter train collided with an SUV that was stopped at a highway rail crossing. Aditya Tomar, a resident of Danbury, Connecticut, and one of my constituents, was one of those passengers killed.

□ 2100

According to the Federal Railroad Administration, these sorts of highway-rail grade crossing accidents lead to 270 deaths every year.

Just this morning, media outlets were featuring a viral video from an Amtrak Silver Star train colliding with a car and slicing it in half after the driver drove around the lowered gate at a rail crossing in Jacksonville, Florida. Miraculously, every passenger survived with only minor injuries.

This video demonstrates that even when crossings are equipped with gates and warning lights, human error and miscalculation can have devastating consequences.

That is why we need to educate drivers, passengers, and pedestrians on how to avoid accidents along railroad tracks and at highway-rail grade crossings.

Technological safety advances are essential, make no mistake, but they are not enough. We must educate people about the dangers of walking along railroads or ignoring rail crossing warning signals.

The Operation Lifesaver program is an effective public safety campaign that encourages drivers and pedestrians to ''stop, look, and listen'' at highway-rail grade crossings and increases awareness in all 50 States.

Congress authorized Operation Lifesaver in 2008, but has failed to provide adequate funding.

My amendment to increase funding for the Operation Lifesaver rail safety program is also fiscally responsible and does not increase spending. Instead, this investment is offset by a very small reduction in Federal Government staff offices for the Federal Aviation Administration, an account that will still receive $75 million above the administration's request.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, just moments ago we increased the FRA safety and operations by $3.5 million.

This amendment, however, would result in, really, an unsustainable cut to FAA's operations account. Air traffic control facilities would have to close and communities would lose service. Frankly, critical operational support staff would have to be furloughed or even laid off. Safety could be compromised for flights, and flights could be potentially canceled.

Therefore, I cannot support this well-intentioned offset and, therefore, I cannot support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, I urge passage of this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

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

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $290,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $81,203,000)''.

Page 13, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $208,797,000)''.

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $290,000,000)''.

Mr. DOLD (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment to increase funding for Amtrak's capital account. The bill as is cuts $290 million from Amtrak's capital account, which is used to upgrade or replace the infrastructure that Amtrak owns, along with the acquisition and maintenance of Amtrak's fleet of locomotives, passenger cars, and other equipment.

Madam Chair, the Chicago area, which I represent, is the hub of our Nation's transportation network. Over 30 million people ride Amtrak every year nationwide, and many of those passengers ride through the city of Chicago. However, in the Chicago area, Amtrak trains are running on infrastructure that has not been updated in decades, including switches that date back to the administration of Teddy Roosevelt.

As we have seen in recent months, safety concerns on Amtrak are at a premium. Now is not the time to reduce the amount of money that we have made available for Amtrak and for our needed infrastructure upgrades. We need to make investments in our tracks, our trains, our stations, and the rest of our transportation system.

My amendment would take a step towards addressing that problem. All it does is restore capital investment grants to the level at which they were appropriated last year. This is a small step but one that will help rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and will help improve the mass transit systems that so many of our citizens use each and every day.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, this amendment would result in a deep and, frankly, unsustainable reduction to FAA's operations account. FAA would have to suspend contracts that run the information technology systems that keep our air traffic control flowing.

Air traffic control facilities would have to be closed and communities, frankly, would lose service. Critical operational support staff would be furloughed or, again, laid off. Safety could be compromised. Flights, again, would be canceled.

Therefore, I cannot support this offset and, respectfully, cannot support the gentleman's amendment.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, reluctantly oppose this amendment. The discussion we had earlier about this offset certainly pertains here. We really cannot afford to make this kind of cut—safety-related cut, I might say—to the Federal Aviation Administration's funding.

The amendment is worthy in purpose. Again, funding for Amtrak's capital accounts is woefully inadequate in this bill. But this is simply not the way to make it up. In fact, there is no way to make it up within the confines of this bill. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. This is what is wrong with this bill—an inadequate allocation. That means there is no way to get adequate funding for things we care about without doing equivalent damage somewhere else. It is an impossible dilemma.

What we need to do is do the responsible thing: get a budget agreement, get numbers we can work with, and write a decent bill. In the meantime, this amendment, while well-intentioned, really is not acceptable, and I urge rejection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, as we look at our transportation and infrastructure system, we know that investment is needed.

I urge adoption of 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 Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, what I am trying to do in this amendment is to really address a wider problem in my congressional district. My district surrounds the Logan International Airport in Boston.

What this amendment would do is remove $25 million from the FAA budget and transfer it to rail. The reason for that is because the FAA has steadfastly refused to do part of their job in my district. I have tried to get them to come to the town of Milton, Massachusetts, to address the overflights in that area. The new NextGen RNAV system concentrates flight after flight, thousands of flights a month, over the town of Milton, Massachusetts.

I requested the FAA to come out and meet with my neighbors—the people that I represent—just like everybody else represents people in their districts, and the FAA has flatly refused. So since they have refused to do part of the job that we fund them for, I figured I would take $25 million out of their budget because they are not doing their job.

All I am looking for is a meeting with the FAA in my district, and I've got to resort to this. It is shameful. I would say that their attitude towards my constituents—the people I work for—has been utter contempt and disrespectful. So here I am trying to cut their budget to get their attention. It is a sad statement of the way the FAA operates.

But my real issue is getting the FAA to respond to my constituents, not about cutting their budgets. I know the chair and the ranking member have worked wonderfully, and I give you great credit for the work you have done.

What I am wondering is, would the chair and the ranking member help me just get the FAA to respond by having a meeting in my district in the town of Milton? I would withdraw my amendment and leave the money that you have wisely appropriated where it is. I am just looking to get this agency, this bureaucracy, to respond to the people I represent. It is as simple as that, Mr. Chairman.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will tell the gentleman that one of the responsibilities that we have is to make sure that we hold government accountable. I don't think it is acceptable to not get answers. So I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure that we move to address those concerns of your community. I don't want to speak for the ranking member, but I know that I look forward to working with you to make sure that we get answers that you need to get.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I appreciate the chairman's response.

I, too, will work with you. This isn't acceptable. We will do our best to help you get the kind of response you need.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I want to thank the chairman, and I want to thank the ranking member for the courtesy, not only to me, but to my constituents as well.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 52, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment to increase funding for capital investment grants to help our Nation's mass transit rail systems. The bill as is cuts $200 million from the account, and my amendment would restore that funding.

While I recognize, and as we have heard from the chairman and the ranking member, there is not really a good spot to be able to take some of these additional funds from, I do think it is important though, Madam Chair, that we talk about our infrastructure system, especially our rail system. And as we look specifically in the greater Chicago area, the Chicago Transit Authority's rail system, the El, serves around 725,000 riders each and every day, and the Metra, which serves the suburban areas like the 10th District in Illinois, serves over 300,000 riders each and every day. Over a million people are using these rail systems.

□ 2115

Again, as we talked about before, Metra estimates that it needs to find roughly $13.4 billion over the next decade just to maintain the system in its current condition. That is why it is more important than ever before to find the funds to pay to maintain and rebuild our Nation's transportation infrastructure system.

Madam Chair, we hear all the time from our constituents that we need good, high-paying jobs. Frankly, a transportation infrastructure system for manufacturers—how do we get raw material and a finished product out? How do we get people around?—is absolutely critical to our economy.

I saw an estimate from UPS that read that every additional 5 minutes of idling time costs them $100 million. We have switches in the Chicago area that delay rail up to 15 minutes one way. That is 30 minutes a day; and, if you are a regular commuter, that is 10½ hours in a given month, 10½ hours that you could be more productive or could be spending time with your family or spending time doing homework with your children.

If we as a country want to be more productive, if we want to encourage more good, high-paying jobs, we have to find a way to make sure that we invest in our transportation infrastructure system.

When we use this transportation infrastructure system and if it goes away, we are talking about an increase in congestion—at least I can tell you in the Chicago area—of an additional 50 percent. In talking to the rail, we would need an additional 29 lanes of traffic.

What is the cost of that? We just don't have it. If we don't have this type of funding, the car in front of you could have been somebody who was sitting on the rail, who could have been using mass transit.

Madam Chair, this bill is a step backward for our Nation's mass transit systems, not a step forward. Instead of providing funds to maintain and improve world-class mass transit systems, we are, instead, taking money away and making it harder and harder for the public to find the funds needed to keep their systems operational, much less to improve them. A reliable and consistent stream of capital funding is essential for these systems, but this bill does not meet that need.

My amendment would take a step toward addressing that problem. I recognize it is just a step, but I am anxious to work with the chairman and the ranking member, and I am anxious to work with those on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to make sure that we are coming up with outside-the-box thinking in how we can improve our mass transit systems.

It is vitally important for our urban areas, and it is certainly important for the Nation's transportation hub, which, I would argue, is in the heartland, in the Chicago area.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, one has to frankly respect and admire Mr. DOLD's knowledge and passion in these amendments that he is doing. I am sensitive to that, and I look forward to working with him. I know that he will make sure that we work with him on these issues that he brings up and that he is very passionate about, which I think are very important.

Respectfully, I have to oppose this amendment. This amendment would result in deep reductions to the FAA's operations account and would result in breaches of contract for air traffic control information technology systems. In addition, it would result in staff layoffs, which would again compromise safety.

I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman. He brings up, obviously, some very important points; but again, respectfully, I must object to this amendment at this time.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I appreciate the chairman's yielding.

I want to echo his opposition to this amendment, and I want to echo his praise for the reality check that the gentleman from Illinois has provided us tonight. At various times in the course of the evening, we have talked about TIGER grants; we have talked about Amtrak; we have talked about transit investments—all of which are underfunded in this bill.

I am also pleased that the chairman has expressed the willingness to cooperate in going forward. I want to echo that on my part, too, because we do believe a better day will come and, hopefully, not only at the end of the fiscal year but soon, where we get a budget agreement, where we get better numbers, and where we are able to address each of these accounts that the gentleman has highlighted.

He is exactly right about the need in all of these areas. The offset is not acceptable. It is even dangerous.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment, but the larger message is we have got to get a better budget number, and we have got to revisit many of the accounts in this bill.

Mr. DOLD. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DOLD. I certainly want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their thoughts.

Madam Chair, there is no question as we look at the debt that we have—we have an $18 trillion debt in our country—that it is jeopardizing our children's opportunity for the American Dream. One of the things that I talk about in terms of how we get out of it is by talking about: How do we grow, Madam Chair?

We grow, I think, by creating this opportunity and environment so people want to come and put their businesses here, becoming globally competitive. When entrepreneurs look at where to go to place their businesses, one of the things they are going to look at is our transportation infrastructure system. We need to know how we are going to get our raw materials in and our finished product out if we want to be globally competitive and if we want to manufacture. I would argue that we do.

I recognize where the committee is. I also appreciate the chairman's and the ranking member's willingness to work with us in going forward, but we have to, each and every one of us, come together and put our differences aside and invest in our infrastructure system so that we can grow our economy and have greater dollars coming into the Federal Treasury so that we can have these resources.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $250,000)''.

Page 13, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $250,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Chair, the Bridenstine-Rohrabacher-Posey amendment, which is supported by the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, transfers $250,000 from the FAA's finance and management activities to the Office of Commercial Space Transportation. This is a small amount, but it is extremely important if we are to support the booming commercial spaceflight industry.

The FAA Office of Commercial Space Transportation's mission is as follows: ''to ensure protection of the public, property, and the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States during commercial launch or reentry activities and to encourage, facilitate, and promote commercial space transportation.''

To carry out this mission, AST, as the office is known, is tasked with overseeing commercially licensed launches, test launches under experimental permits, licenses and permits for new vehicle designs, supporting NASA and the Commercial Crew contractors, taking the lead role in coordinating space traffic at the White House's request, and many other duties.

Over the past few years, the number of activities AST oversees has grown significantly; yet funding and staffing levels have remained absolutely flat.

Just last month, the House of Representatives passed the SPACE Act on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. That bill establishes a statutory and regulatory regime that provides stability and encourages private sector investment in order to facilitate the growth of commercial space activities. If we are passing legislation to encourage growth, we need to provide this office with increased resources to keep up.

We rely on the commercial space sector for many things: reliable, frequent, and inexpensive launches; communications, navigation, and imaging satellites; and services such as the Internet, telephone, television, and radio, which are staples of modern life.

Going forward, there are companies whose goal is to provide space tourism services. There are also ventures planning missions to harvest precious resources from celestial bodies. This is just the tip of the iceberg for this growth industry.

This is an industry that is constantly innovating. It is also an industry we have come to increasingly rely on. If AST does not get the additional resources, it could lead to slips of planned launch dates for some companies as the office is unable to process inspections, permits, and licenses in a timely manner. On top of being a hindrance to this growth industry, it could also reduce the functionality and capabilities we take for granted in our everyday lives.

This funding will give AST additional resources to accomplish its mission. As its workload continues to grow, I encourage the Office of Commercial Space Transportation to continue to work alongside industry in developing and supporting consensus safety standards that can streamline the inspection process.

I appreciate Chairman DIAZ-BALART's leadership and his recognition of the importance of this office. I thank him for working with me on this amendment, particularly given the constraints he is under while crafting this appropriations bill.

I understand we are in tough fiscal times; however, we need to ensure we do not strangle the unlimited potential of the commercial spaceflight industry. An important piece of this is ensuring that the Office of Commercial Space Transportation can keep up with the growth of this burgeoning industry.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, technical support services, improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of national airspace systems and experimental facilities and equipment, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing, including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease, or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this heading, including aircraft for aviation regulation and certification; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, $2,500,000,000, of which $460,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, and $2,040,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment, improvement, and modernization of national airspace systems: *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2017 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the Federal Aviation Administration which includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2017 through 2021, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by $100,000 per day for each day after the initial submission of the fiscal year 2017 President's budget that such report has not been submitted to Congress.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering, and development, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, $156,750,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, which shall be available for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs as authorized under subchapter I of chapter 471 and subchapter I of chapter 475 of title 49, United States Code, and under other law authorizing such obligations; for procurement, installation, and commissioning of runway incursion prevention devices and systems at airports of such title; for grants authorized under section 41743 of title 49, United States Code; and for inspection activities and administration of airport safety programs, including those related to airport operating certificates under section 44706 of title 49, United States Code, $3,600,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $3,350,000,000 in fiscal year 2016, notwithstanding section 47117(g) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the replacement of baggage conveyor systems, reconfiguration of terminal baggage areas, or other airport improvements that are necessary to install bulk explosive detection systems: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of funds limited under this heading, not more than $107,100,000 shall be obligated for administration, not less than $15,000,000 shall be available for the Airport Cooperative Research Program, and not less than $31,000,000 shall be available for Airport Technology Research.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 110. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate in excess of 600 technical staff-years under the federally funded research and development center contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development during fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 111. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pursue or adopt guidelines or regulations requiring airport sponsors to provide to the Federal Aviation Administration without cost building construction, maintenance, utilities and expenses, or space in airport sponsor-owned buildings for services relating to air traffic control, air navigation, or weather reporting: *Provided*, That the prohibition of funds in this section does not apply to negotiations between the agency and airport sponsors to achieve agreement on below-market rates for these items or to grant assurances that require airport sponsors to provide land without cost to the FAA for air traffic control facilities.

SEC. 112. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may reimburse amounts made available to satisfy 49 U.S.C. 41742(a)(1) from fees credited under 49 U.S.C. 45303 and any amount remaining in such account at the close of that fiscal year may be made available to satisfy section 41742(a)(1) for the subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 113. Amounts collected under section 40113(e) of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to the appropriation current at the time of collection, to be merged with and available for the same purposes of such appropriation.

SEC. 114. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for paying premium pay under subsection 5546(a) of title 5, United States Code, to any Federal Aviation Administration employee unless such employee actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay.

SEC. 115. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for an employee of the Federal Aviation Administration to purchase a store gift card or gift certificate through use of a Government-issued credit card.

SEC. 116. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for retention bonuses for an employee of the Federal Aviation Administration without the prior written approval of the Assistant Secretary for Administration of the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available under this Act or any prior Act may be used to implement or to continue to implement any limitation on the ability of any owner or operator of a private aircraft to obtain, upon a request to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, a blocking of that owner's or operator's aircraft registration number from any display of the Federal Aviation Administration's Aircraft Situational Display to Industry data that is made available to the public, except data made available to a Government agency, for the noncommercial flights of that owner or operator.

SEC. 118. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 9 political and Presidential appointees in the Federal Aviation Administration.

SEC. 119. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to increase fees pursuant to section 44721 of title 49, United States Code, until the FAA provides to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report that justifies all fees related to aeronautical navigation products and explains how such fees are consistent with Executive Order 13642.

SEC. 119A. None of the funds in this Act may be used to close a regional operations center of the Federal Aviation Administration or reduce its services unless the Administrator notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 90 full business days in advance.

SEC. 119B. None of the funds appropriated or limited by this Act may be used to change weight restrictions or prior permission rules at Teterboro airport in Teterboro, New Jersey.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, not to exceed $426,100,000, together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration, shall be obligated for necessary expenses for administration and operation of the Federal Highway Administration. In addition, not to exceed $3,248,000 shall be transferred to the Appalachian Regional Commission in accordance with section 104 of title 23, United States Code.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, funds available for the implementation or execution of Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs authorized under titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and the provisions of such authorization legislation shall not exceed total obligations of $40,256,000,000 for fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the Secretary may collect and spend fees, as authorized by title 23, United States Code, to cover the costs of services of expert firms, including counsel, in the field of municipal and project finance to assist in the underwriting and servicing of Federal credit instruments and all or a portion of the costs to the Federal Government of servicing such credit instruments: *Provided further*, That such fees are available until expended to pay for such costs: *Provided further*, That such amounts are in addition to administrative expenses that are also available for such purpose, and are not subject to any obligation limitation or the limitation on administrative expenses under section 608 of title 23, United States Code.

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs authorized under title 23, United States Code, $40,995,000,000 derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 120. Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation:

(a) For fiscal year 2016, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) not distribute from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways—

(A) amounts authorized for administrative expenses and programs by section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) amounts authorized for the Bureau of Transportation Statistics;

(2) not distribute an amount from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways that is equal to the unobligated balance of amounts—

(A) made available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for previous fiscal years the funds for which are allocated by the Secretary (or apportioned by the Secretary under sections 202 or 204 of title 23, United States Code); and

(B) for which obligation limitation was provided in a previous fiscal year;

(3) determine the proportion that—

(A) the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate of amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection; bears to

(B) the total of the sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs (other than sums authorized to be appropriated for provisions of law described in paragraphs (1) through (11) of subsection (b) and sums authorized to be appropriated for section 119 of title 23, United States Code, equal to the amount referred to in subsection (b)(12) for such fiscal year), less the aggregate of the amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection;

(4) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2), for each of the programs (other than programs to which paragraph (1) applies) that are allocated by the Secretary under such authorization legislation and title 23, United States Code, or apportioned by the Secretary under sections 202 or 204 of that title, by multiplying—

(A) the proportion determined under paragraph (3); by

(B) the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each such program for such fiscal year; and

(5) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) and the amounts distributed under paragraph (4), for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs that are apportioned by the Secretary under such authorization legislation or title 23, United States Code (other than the amounts apportioned for the National Highway Performance Program in section 119 of title 23, United States Code, that are exempt from the limitation under subsection (b)(12) and the amounts apportioned under sections 202 and 204 of that title) in the proportion that—

(A) amounts authorized to be appropriated for the programs that are apportioned under title 23, United States Code, or such authorization legislation to each State for such fiscal year; bears to

(B) the total of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the programs that are apportioned under title 23, United States Code, or such authorization legislation to all States for such fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTIONS FROM OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—The obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways shall not apply to obligations under or for—

(1) section 125 of title 23, United States Code;

(2) section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (23 U.S.C. 144 note; 92 Stat. 2714);

(3) section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981 (95 Stat. 1701);

(4) subsections (b) and (j) of section 131 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 2119);

(5) subsections (b) and (c) of section 149 of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 (101 Stat. 198);

(6) sections 1103 through 1108 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2027);

(7) section 157 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on June 8, 1998);

(8) section 105 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect for fiscal years 1998 through 2004, but only in an amount equal to $639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years);

(9) Federal-aid highway programs for which obligation authority was made available under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 107) or subsequent Acts for multiple years or to remain available until expended, but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used;

(10) section 105 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect for fiscal years 2005 through 2012, but only in an amount equal to $639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years);

(11) section 1603 of SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 118 note; 119 Stat. 1248), to the extent that funds obligated in accordance with that section were not subject to a limitation on obligations at the time at which the funds were initially made available for obligation; and

(12) section 119 of title 23, United States Code (but, for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2016, only in an amount equal to $639,000,000).

(c) REDISTRIBUTION OF UNUSED OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall, after August 1 of such fiscal year—

(1) revise a distribution of the obligation limitation made available under subsection (a) if an amount distributed cannot be obligated during that fiscal year; and

(2) redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year, giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under sections 144 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112–141) and 104 of title 23, United States Code.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS TO TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways shall apply to contract authority for transportation research programs carried out under—

(A) chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) the transportation research programs sections of such authorization legislation.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Obligation authority made available under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) remain available for a period of 4 fiscal years; and

(B) be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for future fiscal years.

(e) REDISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of distribution of obligation limitation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall distribute to the States any funds (excluding funds authorized for the program under section 202 of title 23, United States Code) that—

(A) are authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for Federal-aid highway programs; and

(B) the Secretary determines will not be allocated to the States (or will not be apportioned to the States under section 204 of title 23, United States Code), and will not be available for obligation, for such fiscal year because of the imposition of any obligation limitation for such fiscal year.

(2) RATIO.—Funds shall be distributed under paragraph (1) in the same proportion as the distribution of obligation authority under subsection (a)(5).

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Funds distributed to each State under paragraph (1) shall be available for any purpose described in section 133(b) of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics from the sale of data products, for necessary expenses incurred pursuant to chapter 63 of title 49, United States Code, may be credited to the Federal-aid highways account for the purpose of reimbursing the Bureau for such expenses: *Provided*, That such funds shall be subject to the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs.

SEC. 122. Not less than 15 days prior to waiving, under his or her statutory authority, any Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highways projects, the Secretary of Transportation shall make an informal public notice and comment opportunity on the intent to issue such waiver and the reasons therefor: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall provide an annual report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on any waivers granted under the Buy America requirements.

SEC. 123. None of the funds in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be used to provide credit assistance unless not less than 3 days before any application approval to provide credit assistance under sections 603 and 604 of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation provides notification in writing to the following committees: the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations; the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That such notification shall include, but not be limited to, the name of the project sponsor; a description of the project; whether credit assistance will be provided as a direct loan, loan guarantee, or line of credit; and the amount of credit assistance.

SEC. 124. Section 127 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) LONGER COMBINATION VEHICLES IN IDAHO.—No limit or other prohibition under this section, except as provided in this subsection, applies to a longer combination vehicle operating on a segment of the Interstate System in the State of Idaho if such vehicle—

''(1) has a gross vehicle weight of 129,000 pounds or less;

''(2) complies with the single axle, tandem axle, and bridge formula limits set forth in subsection (a); and

''(3) is authorized to operate on such segment under Idaho State Law.''.

SEC. 125. Section 31111(b)(1)(A) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or of less than 28 feet on a semitrailer or trailer operating in a truck tractor-semitrailer-trailer combination,'' and inserting ''or, notwithstanding section 31112, of less than 33 feet on a semitrailer or trailer operating in a truck tractor-semitrailer-trailer combination,''.

SEC. 126. EXEMPTION.—

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 31112(c)(5) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''Nebraska may'' and inserting ''Nebraska and Kansas may''; and

(2) by striking ''the State of Nebraska'' and inserting ''the relevant state''.

(b) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 31112(c) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking the subsection designation and heading and inserting the following:

''(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR WYOMING, OHIO, ALASKA, IOWA, NEBRASKA, AND KANSAS.—'';

(2) by striking ''; and'' at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''; and''.

SEC. 127. Section 130(e)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$220,000,000'' and inserting ''$350,000,000''.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in the implementation, execution and administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs pursuant to section 31104(i) of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4127 and 4134 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and as extended by Public Law 113–159, $259,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the sum of which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for implementation, execution or administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs authorized under title 49, United States Code, and sections 4127 and 4134 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and as extended by Public Law 113–159, shall not exceed total obligations of $259,000,000 for ''Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs'' for fiscal year 2016, of which $9,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, is for the research and technology program, and of which $34,545,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, is for information management: *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 shall be made available for commercial motor vehicle operator grants to carry out section 4134 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and as extended by Public Law 113–159.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out sections 31102, 31104(a), 31106, 31107, 31109, 31309, 31313 of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4126 and 4128 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141, as extended by Public Law 113–159, $313,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of motor carrier safety programs shall not exceed total obligations of $313,000,000 in fiscal year 2016 for ''Motor Carrier Safety Grants''; of which $218,000,000 shall be available for the motor carrier safety assistance program, $30,000,000 shall be available for commercial driver's license program improvement grants, $32,000,000 shall be available for border enforcement grants, $5,000,000 shall be available for performance and registration information system management grants, $25,000,000 shall be available for the commercial vehicle information systems and networks deployment program, and $3,000,000 shall be available for safety data improvement grants: *Provided further*, That, of the funds made available herein for the motor carrier safety assistance program, $32,000,000 shall be available for audits of new entrant motor carriers.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 130. Funds appropriated or limited in this Act shall be subject to the terms and conditions stipulated in section 350 of Public Law 107–87 and section 6901 of Public Law 110–28.

SEC. 131. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration shall send notice of 49 CFR section 385.308 violations by certified mail, registered mail, or another manner of delivery, which records the receipt of the notice by the persons responsible for the violations.

SEC. 132. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce sections 395.3(c) and 395.3(d) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, and such section shall have no force or effect on submission of the final report issued by the Secretary, as required by section 133 of Division K of Public Law 113–235, unless the Secretary and the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation each review and determine that the final report—

(1) meets the statutory requirements set forth in such section; and

(2) establishes that commercial motor vehicle drivers who operated under the restart provisions in effect between July 1, 2013, and the day before the date of enactment of such Public Law demonstrated statistically significant improvement in all outcomes related to safety, operator fatigue, driver health and longevity, and work schedules, in comparison to commercial motor vehicle drivers who operated under the restart provisions in effect on June 30, 2013.

SEC. 133. None of the funds limited or otherwise made available under the heading ''Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs'' may be used to deny an application to renew a Hazardous Materials Safety Program permit for a motor carrier based on that carrier's Hazardous Materials Out-of-Service rate, unless the carrier has the opportunity to submit a written description of corrective actions taken, and other documentation the carrier wishes the Secretary to consider, including submitting a corrective action plan, and the Secretary determines the actions or plan is insufficient to address the safety concerns that resulted in that Hazardous Materials Out-of-Service rate.

SEC. 134. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, issue, or implement any regulation that increases levels of minimum financial responsibility for transporting passengers or property as in effect on January 1, 2014, under regulations issued pursuant to sections 31138 and 31139 of title 49, United States Code.

□ 2130

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 134.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, tonight I urge the adoption of my amendment, which would allow the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to continue its congressionally mandated ongoing work to improve

safety and accountability in the trucking and bus industry. I do so out of a concern that we need to exhibit common sense in what we do. We need to be fiscally prudent, we need to promote safe highways in our Nation, and we need to recognize the importance of promoting personal responsibility and accountability.

My amendment would strike a section of this bill that would halt the FMCSA's work toward issuing a rule that would make our highways safer for everyone by creating an incentive for motor carriers to make safety a greater priority. We have to allow the FMCSA to proceed with the development of a rule to increase insurance minimums for motor carriers, which have not been updated in, fully, 35 years in this Nation and, thus, have become outdated to the point of uselessness.

The first point I make is that it is simply common sense that we adjust for inflation. Not adjusting for inflation for 35 years is not prudent, and it makes no sense. It allows carriers to travel on our Nation's highways in a financially irresponsible manner, in a manner that would allow them not to be accountable for whatever harm they might cause.

Adjusting for inflation is common sense. It is also fiscally prudent, because what happens? Right now in this Nation, tractor-trailers are allowed to travel around with $750,000 of liability insurance. The FMCSA is studying that number to see what it should be updated to after 35 years. $750,000 is not enough money.

Just this morning in my district in northeastern Pennsylvania, there was a horrendous truck and bus accident in which three people were killed and a dozen others were seriously injured. When three people are killed, asking their families to share $750,000 is not fiscally responsible. Look who pays the difference.

If somebody is killed or if somebody is rendered, for example, a paraplegic, they are going to incur incredible amounts of medical bills; they are not going to be able to work. Who picks up the difference when that happens? It is the Social Security system, it is the Medicare system, it is John Q. Taxpayer that ends up paying the bill when the trucking company doesn't have enough insurance to pay the damages.

That is why it is fiscally prudent that we allow the FMCSA to continue its important work, and it is important work that was mandated by the MAP–21 bill that required the FMCSA to do this work.

It also promotes safe highways, because if we raise insurance minimums up to modern and responsible levels, that means insurance companies will have to engage in actual real underwriting. They will have to go out from the home office and visit the headquarters of trucking companies to make sure they are acting properly and safely and responsibly. If they do that, if you want to buy insurance at reasonable levels, you have to act safely.

Finally, Madam Chair, this is about personal responsibility. If you don't have enough insurance, you get away without being personally responsible when these horrendous crashes happen.

Madam Chair, I yield to Mr. PRICE for a colloquy.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend him for offering this amendment.

Madam Chair, as he has stressed very effectively, this is simply irrational to freeze these claims where they were in the early 1980s, and it also defies our own body's directions to the DOT to look at this and to think about what kind of future changes might be in order. This simply preempts that whole process; is that right?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. That is correct. For that very reason, I urge everyone to support my amendment to allow the FMCSA to finish its important work of examining and developing a rule that is critical to preventing devastating trucking accidents and keeping our highways safe and secure for everyone.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment. As is frequently the case in Washington, D.C., the proposed rules requiring truckers to increase their liability insurance is a solution in search of a problem. The provision currently included in the bill must remain. It must remain because it protects job creators so they can stay in business. When you consider that 99.9 percent of crashes are already covered by existing insurance requirements, you can see that increasing insurance and, thus, costs at the expense of jobs is just not a credible solution.

Safety is important. We all know that. We all want to make sure that our roadways are safe. But the Department of Transportation readily admits that raising the cost does not necessarily improve safety. The DOT's own study expresses a crippling revelation to proponents of a cost increase on our job creators. There may be more effective ways that reduce crashes at a lower cost.

Bottom line, we need to strike a balance. If the proposed regulations went into effect, our smaller trucking companies in Iowa and other rural areas in States around the country would be unable to absorb the increased costs, and it could threaten their ability to stay in business. Too frequently in this town we are working to fix the mistakes that were made by so-called Washington solutions. I strongly encourage the rejection of this amendment tonight.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, on the one point about 99.9 percent of crashes settling within existing insurance minimums, there we have the opponents of my amendment speaking really out of both sides of their mouth, because if they say it is so rare that a crash will cost more than the minimum insurance, then what that means is that the expense of insuring against that minimal risk has to be minimal itself, but these are the same people saying that it will be a crippling additional insurance premium. It doesn't make sense.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Chair, I, too, oppose this amendment. Increasing insurance requirements will not improve highway safety. I mean, what incentive does it create? How does increasing the insurance requirement improve safety? It is not backed by any sound data.

The agency's own data shows that current requirements cover damages in more—more—than 99 percent of all crashes. Think about that, more than 99 percent of all crashes. But to the gentleman's point, my friend from Pennsylvania, the agency is planning on tying these requirements to medical inflation, and that results in increases of 500 percent or more. Think about that, medical inflation, this administration. I mean, isn't that the height of irony? I thought they were driving the cost of medical inflation down. That is another whole story.

The fact is the industry has a remarkable safety record compared to all commercial motor vehicles. As a matter of fact, motor coaches average only 20 fatalities per year and schoolbuses only 5. Now, that is not meant to minimize those losses because every life is precious, but in a highway environment that produces 35,000 fatalities per year, the DOT study did not even consider accident data, claims data, or talk to insurance carriers about the impacts of increasing insurance or whether there is even a need for it.

Indeed, this is a solution that is looking for a problem, a problem that does not exist. I urge the Members to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 135. None of the funds made available by this Act or previous appropriations Acts under the heading ''Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs'' shall be used to pay for costs associated with design, development, testing, or implementation of a wireless roadside inspection program until 180 days after the Secretary of Transportation certifies to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that such program does not conflict with existing non-Federal electronic screening systems, create capabilities already available, or require additional statutory authority to incorporate generated inspection data into safety determinations or databases, and has restrictions to specifically address privacy concerns of affected motor carriers and operators: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the Department's ongoing research efforts in this area.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary, with respect to traffic and highway safety authorized under chapter 301 and part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, $150,000,000, of which $20,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2017.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 12, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $1,200,000)''.

Page 142, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 2145

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which seeks to bolster funds for the inspector general of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, or Amtrak.

I am a strong proponent of government oversight, and I believe the revelatory work of the inspector general should be staunchly supported within each agency of the Federal Government.

Today, given the dismal financial record of Amtrak through its history, compounded with recent safety failures, it is clear that the scrupulous, objective oversight of the inspector general is needed for this agency now more than ever.

This amendment redirects $500,000 to the Amtrak Office of the Inspector General salaries and expenses account to bring it up to the budget request level.

Since the Inspector General Act was passed into law, the IG community has saved taxpayers billions of dollars and has uncovered countless examples of wrongdoing in the Federal Government. The inspector general community does good work. Let's give them the resources they need.

The committee has noted the good work of the Amtrak OIG in the committee report, stating: ''The OIG's efforts have resulted in valuable studies and recommendations for this committee and for the Corporation that have yielded cost savings and management improvements. These studies have been in a number of areas, including food and beverage service, capital planning, overtime, and fraud.''

I commend the committee for the work they have done to support efficient and effective government.

This amendment is directly in line with the high value the committee places on the thorough work of the OIG and will ensure additional transparency and accountability within Amtrak.

There is a wide agreement about the need to reform, streamline, and improve Amtrak. A valuable first step in that reform is supporting the objective, rigorous auditing information which the OIG is uniquely qualified to produce.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of government accountability by giving the Amtrak OIG the resources they need to identify the waste, fraud, and abuse within a government agency that is in desperate need of reform.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this bill, 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. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, $125,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2016, are in excess of $125,000,000, of which $120,000,000 shall be for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 403 and $5,000,000 shall be for the National Driver Register authorized under chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That within the $120,000,000 obligation limitation for operations and research, $20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, and shall be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for future years: *Provided further*, That $6,500,000 of the total obligation limitation for operations and research in fiscal year 2016 shall be applied toward unobligated balances of contract authority provided in prior Acts for carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent on the enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112–141, to remain available until expended, $561,500,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account): *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2016, are in excess of $561,500,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112–141, of which $235,000,000 shall be for ''Highway Safety Programs'' under 23 U.S.C. 402; $272,000,000 shall be for ''National Priority Safety Programs'' under 23 U.S.C. 405; $29,000,000 shall be for the ''High Visibility Enforcement Program'' under section 2009 of Public Law 109–59, as amended by Public Law 112–141; $25,500,000 shall be for ''Administrative Expenses'' under section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112–141: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation, or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 of the funds made available for ''National Priority Safety Programs'' under 23 U.S.C. 405 for ''Impaired Driving Countermeasures'' (as described in subsection (d) of that section) shall be available for technical assistance to the States: *Provided further*, That with respect to the ''Transfers'' provision under 23 U.S.C. 405(a)(1)(G), any amounts transferred to increase the amounts made available under section 402 shall include the obligation authority for such amounts: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of any exercise of the authority granted under the previous proviso or under 23 U.S.C. 405(a)(1)(G) within 60 days.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 140. An additional $130,000 shall be made available to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of the amount limited for section 402 of title 23, United States Code, to pay for travel and related expenses for State management reviews and to pay for core competency development training and related expenses for highway safety staff.

SEC. 141. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration set in this Act shall not apply to obligations for which obligation authority was made available in previous public laws but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used.

SEC. 142. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 143. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to obligate or award funds for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's National Roadside Survey.

SEC. 144. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to mandate global positioning system (GPS) tracking in private passenger motor vehicles without providing full and appropriate consideration of privacy concerns under 5 U.S.C. chapter 5, subchapter II.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, $186,870,000, of which $15,400,000 shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $16,930,000)''.

Page 52, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $83,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will bolster our Nation's rail safety and operations.

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for his dedication and important work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the number of train derailments and accidents in our local communities is a growing concern among my constituents and Americans all across the country.

In the first 2 months of 2015, there were 18 Amtrak accidents, as well as recent oil train derailments in West Virginia and in North Dakota. Most recently, Mr. Chairman, an Amtrak train crash in Philadelphia killed eight people and injured dozens more.

In New Jersey alone, there are 2,400 miles of freight lines and over 1,000 passenger rail miles, and we must ensure, Mr. Chairman, that these existing lines are operating safely.

So what do we have here? My amendment fully funds the Federal Railroad Administration's safety and operations account without increasing spending in the underlying bill. The FRA's safety and operations account provides funding for the FRA's safety program activities related to passenger and freight railroads.

So how do we do this? By reallocating a mere 4 percent of funding from capital investment grants, we can fund the safe operation of our Nation's trains at the President's requested levels.

Mr. Chairman, we do not build a new section onto our house if our roof is caving in. So we should not be adding on to these systems if they are caving in or failing.

So why are we funding new projects before we ensure that our current rail lines have enough dollars, enough funding for their safety?

My amendment would simply prioritize safety and maintenance of our existing infrastructure over the ribbon-cutting ceremonies associated with system expansion.

In light of the recent upsurge in deadly rail accidents, now is the time to adequately fund the safety and operations of our trains. Additionally, with our rising national debt, it is very important that we remain fiscally responsible and prioritize how we spend our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars.

That is why, in conclusion, my amendment does not increase spending, but only prioritizes a commonsense directive. And so I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to fund train safety, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, while I know and I am absolutely certain that the gentleman from New Jersey's heart is in the right place, unfortunately, I cannot support the offset.

The committee carefully calculated the New Start numbers to be able to accommodate the signed FFGAs and Small Starts Grant Agreements at the beginning of the fiscal year, and I am a firm believer that once you sign a grant, once you make that commitment, we should honor it. This reduction would impact those signed agreements, so I reluctantly oppose this amendment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to echo his opposition to this amendment, although I do commend Mr. GARRETT for his focus on safety and operations. I, too, would like to raise that appropriation to the request level. That is a good objective.

There are a couple of problems here, though. One, is that because of differences in outlay rates, to pick up $17 million on the safety and operations side you have to cut $83 million from the transit New Starts. That has to do with differences in outlay rates. But the fact is, it is a substantial cut. And these New Starts in the bill, I remind colleagues, are already $1.3 billion below the President's request. They are $198 million below what we have this year.

These are badly underfunded items. So we simply, again, are robbing Peter to pay Paul. But because of the disproportionate impact here, and the fact that New Starts are already so underresourced, I reluctantly oppose this amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, two points. The first is, I understand the gentleman's opposition on procedural grounds as far as the differences in outlays and what have you. But when you go back home and talk to your district and say you are trying to do something for safety, as we are in this case, and you say: Well, the reason we can't do this is the procedural aspect of outlays versus the actual amount of money going in and the amount of money being cut, and so on and so forth, and you go through all the rubric and the matrix that we use around here and all the buzz words on the floor to try to explain things, the eyes of the people back home glaze over, rightfully so, because they say: Those are your rules, not ours. Why don't you just get something done.

What they are asking to get done is rail safety. And that is what this amendment does.

I just want to end with one quote. Back in 2010, the head of the FTA—at that time, the administrator was Peter Rogoff—chastised local transit agencies for promoting rail construction for so many new rail lines. He said on one hand, agencies were unable to maintain the rail lines they already had. The FTA had recently at that point estimated that rail transit systems suffered from close to a $60 billion maintenance backlog—and the backlog was growing even then.

And he said this: ''If you can't afford to operate the systems you have,'' he asked the agencies, ''why does it make sense for us to partner with you in new expansions?''

That is a great question. If they can't fix up what is already out there and all the problems on the rail lines out there on important things like safety, then why on Earth are we spending all these tens of millions of dollars on brand new programs that we know that they are not going to be able to maintain as well? Let's do first things first.

As I said in my little example before, if your roof is collapsing on your house, you don't add a new deck, you don't put in a new pool, you don't put in a paved new driveway, you don't do anything else. You repair the roof, first and foremost, and then everything else comes after that.

And that is really all I am asking. Let's maintain the safety, first and foremost, so that everyone riding on the rails can feel confident that they are operating right. Then, after that, let's come back here to the floor and fix up the other funding mechanism for new programs and what have you, and go forward.

Right now, let's make sure that our constituents back home can feel confident every time they ride on a transit system, be it a bus or train or something else, that they know that it is adequately funded and taken care of and maintained.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, $39,100,000, to remain available until expended.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue direct loans and loan guarantees pursuant to sections 501 through 504 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–210), as amended, such authority to exist as long as any such direct loan or loan guarantee is outstanding. *Provided*, That pursuant to section 502 of such Act, as amended, no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments shall be made using Federal funds for the credit risk premium during fiscal year 2016.

OPERATING GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make quarterly grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, in amounts based on the Secretary's assessment of the Corporation's seasonal cash flow requirements, for the operation of intercity passenger rail, as authorized by section 101 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–432), $288,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amounts available under this paragraph shall be available for the Secretary to approve funding to cover operating losses for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific train route: *Provided further*, That each such grant request shall be accompanied by a detailed financial analysis, revenue projection, and capital expenditure projection justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corporation shall transmit, in electronic format, to the Secretary and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations the annual budget, business plan, the 5-Year Financial Plan for fiscal year 2016 required under section 204 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 and the comprehensive fleet plan for all Amtrak rolling stock: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall include annual information on the maintenance, refurbishment, replacement, and expansion for all Amtrak rolling stock consistent with the comprehensive fleet plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall provide monthly performance reports in an electronic format which shall describe the work completed to date, any changes to the business plan, and the reasons for such changes as well as progress against the milestones and target dates of the 2012 performance improvement plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation's budget, business plan, 5-Year Financial Plan, semiannual reports, monthly reports, comprehensive fleet plan and all supplemental reports or plans comply with requirements in Public Law 112–55: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to support any route on which Amtrak offers a discounted fare of more than 50 percent off the normal peak fare: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso does not apply to routes where the operating loss as a result of the discount is covered by a State and the State participates in the setting of fares.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

□ 2200

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with this very simple amendment. It is one that is meant to shed light on inadequate investments that are being made in our Nation's passenger rail service.

The bill before us appropriates nearly $16 billion for aviation, over $40 billion for our roads, over $10 billion for public transit, but just $1.1 billion for our Nation's passenger rail service.

I represent Las Vegas, where we import everything from tourists to lobsters, so we certainly understand the importance of transportation mobility.

It is interesting, many international and domestic travelers alike are shocked to learn, when they are coming to Las Vegas, that a major metropolitan city, home to more than 2 million residents and playground and boardroom to over 42 million visitors a year, we just don't have access to passenger rail service.

Visitors from Europe or Asia are accustomed to taking trains from one city to another, and they face a sad reality when traveling to Las Vegas from other Southwestern tourist destinations.

From Los Angeles, for example, you would have to take a 7-hour train ride that drops you off in Kingman, Arizona, at 1:30 in the morning. There, you would have to find the bus station, which is 4 miles away, get on a bus at 4 in the morning to travel another 3 hours to downtown Las Vegas. That is just crazy.

The last Amtrak train on the Desert Wind line departed the back of the Plaza Hotel in May of 1997, bound for Los Angeles.

Well, a lot has changed since the late 1990s. Over the last 17 years, southern Nevada's population has grown by a million new residents, and 10 million more visitors travel to southern Nevada annually, putting enormous strain on our area's highways and the airport, which is among the top 10 busiest airports in the country.

More than 42,000 vehicles also cross the I–15 border between California and Nevada daily. If you have traveled along that busy stretch of road, you know the kind of traffic nightmares that you might encounter.

In fact, I recently spoke with an airline pilot who frequently makes the short flight between Los Angeles and Las Vegas, and he remarked that you can't get lost. All you have to do is follow the red brake lights on I–15 all the way to McCarran.

We can and we must do better; but this isn't just about Las Vegas. Cities like Phoenix, Arizona; Nashville, Tennessee; Columbus, Ohio; Louisville, Kentucky; and Boise, Idaho, don't have passenger rail service either.

In addition, there is no direct rail service between major metropolitan areas like Houston and Dallas, Atlanta and Orlando, and Kansas City and Oklahoma City. I believe that expanding rail service to unserved communities like those in southern Nevada should be a priority, but, unfortunately, this legislation before us does not really get us there.

At the end of April, I organized a roundtable back in my district to discuss the need to restore passenger service to Las Vegas, and I was really surprised by the high level of interest from local stakeholders.

We had participants from our State and local transportation authorities, the gaming and hotel industries, the chamber of commerce, labor unions and economic development organizations, all in agreement that southern Nevada should have passenger rail service as part of our long-term economic viability plans. This type of development is a regional and should be a national priority.

Now, a lot of attention has been paid to the Northeast corridor, where travelers frequent Amtrak service along the East Coast, but we should not forget that it was the railroad that built the West and still, today, remains a critical piece of our transportation network.

China is investing $128 million in rail in 2015 alone and India, $137 billion over the next 5 years; yet we are investing only $1.1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, since this amendment really has no monetary impact, I would respectfully ask that you accept it. It is my hope that we recognize this mode of transportation that is so tied to our Nation's history and that we can continue to work together to see that it gets the attention and support that it deserves.

Thank you very much for your time and your consideration. I hope that, together, we can work to be sure that passenger rail service is expanded throughout the country and especially in the Southwest.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, strike line 6 and all that follows through page 47, line 3.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, America recently suffered four straight trillion dollar deficits. In the past few months, America's debt blew through the $18 trillion mark.

America pays over $200 billion per year in debt service, which is more than four times what the Federal Government spends on highways, bridges, and interstates each year. America's Comptroller General warns that America's deficits and debt paths are unsustainable.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office warns that our debt service cost is on a path to increase by another $600 billion within a decade, to more than $800 billion per year. That is more than America spends each year on national defense. The CBO also warns that, within a decade, if current trends continue, America will face yearly trillion dollar deficits in perpetuity.

Per then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen's testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, debt is America's ''greatest threat to our national security.''

As a result of America's debt, in a few short years, America's uniformed military personnel numbers will be our smallest since before World War II, America's Navy will have the smallest number of operational naval vessels since World War I, and America's Air Force will have its smallest number of operational aircraft in its history. Debt, not our enemies, is slowly but surely stripping America of its ability to defend itself.

In sum, Washington's financial irresponsibility, this House of Representatives' financial irresponsibility, is pushing America into a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy that will destroy the American Dream for our children and grandchildren.

It is in this setting that I beseech this House of Representatives to be financially responsible by supporting my amendment that eliminates Federal Government operating subsidies of Amtrak, thus forcing Amtrak to operate in the black.

How bad is the Amtrak subsidy problem? The Congressional Research Service reports that, from 1971 to 2015, Federal Amtrak subsidies totaled $78 billion in constant 2015 dollars. In fiscal year 2014, Amtrak had a net loss of $1.1 billion. Who paid for that loss? America's children and grandchildren, that is who.

How so? It is because America does not have the money and had to borrow every penny of that $1.1 billion, thus burdening Americans for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, a business that relies on subsidies and tax dollars to cover losses has little incentive to operate efficiently or effectively or, for that matter, as safely as it should.

It is appalling that the Federal Government undermines and threatens the future of America's children and grandchildren in order to subsidize Amtrak passenger service that would be self-sufficient if Amtrak riders stopped mooching off of hard-working American taxpayers and, instead, simply paid for the actual cost of their rides.

Amtrak supporters often claim that Amtrak will go out of business if it is not subsidized by American taxpayers. That is bunk unsupported by facts.

This same ''woe is me'' argument was made about freight train subsidies; yet, when freight rail subsidies ended and freight rail was sold to private investors in the 1980s, freight rail did not go out of business and still operates today.

Similarly, the Federal Government does not operate or subsidize national airlines or national bus services; yet airlines and buses operate profitably in the private sector, despite Federal Government subsidies for Amtrak, their competitor.

Just as airlines, bus services, and freight rail operate without government subsidies, Amtrak will do the same if this House of Representatives has the courage to wean Amtrak from the taxpayer nipple.

Mr. Chairman, after more than 40 years, it is time to stop the runaway Amtrak train. It is time to force Amtrak riders to pay their own way by ending their subsidized rides on the backs of American taxpayers.

I urge adoption of my amendment to do just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which, purely and simply, would end intercity passenger rail for our Nation.

I remind colleagues, there is not a single mode of transportation in this country that is not subsidized, contrary to what we have just heard.

To make the case further, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), a distinguished member of the authorizing committee.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, when I was coming up, I used to like this television show, ''Robin Hood.'' My colleagues practice what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the working people and the poor people and the transit people to give tax breaks to the rich.

Just a few weeks ago, the House Republicans passed a bill cutting taxes by $269 billion—I guess that didn't affect the deficit—for their wealthiest friends, but can't find the $2 billion that we need for Amtrak—shameful.

The funding cuts proposed in this amendment would simply force Amtrak to shut down, strand millions of rail passengers, disrupt commuter operations, add to our already congested roads and airports, eliminate over 20,000 jobs nationwide, and jeopardize local economies and businesses that depend on Amtrak's service.

Amtrak provides the majority of all intercity passenger rail service in the United States, with more States and localities across America turning to passenger rail to meet the transportation needs of our citizens.

Amtrak has done an excellent job, based on the fact that 9/11, when we were attacked, Amtrak was the only means that you could move away.

When we had Hurricane Katrina, Amtrak is the only way that we could move people out of harm's way by evacuating and delivering food and water and supplies.

Amtrak has made significant improvement in its system over the last several years, has steady increase in ridership numbers, played a vital role in disaster recovery, and has an ambitious agenda for future growth.

I encourage all Members to vote against this ill-willed and ill-thought-out amendment.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would respond that there is no factual basis for the gentlewoman's comments that have just been made.

Socialism does not work. We need to get Amtrak passengers off the backs of all taxpayers, including those that are poor, that can't afford the taxes that they are already having to pay to benefit those Amtrak riders. Let's set them free.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank the ranking member.

The fact of the matter is, notwithstanding what was offered to the House as the picture of America, we actually live in the greatest country in the world. We have the strongest economy. We are the wealthiest country. There is no country, based on the IMF, that would want to trade our position vis-a-vis debt-to-wealth ratio.

I hear the gentleman saying, Woe is America, and we can't afford to subsidize rail. I think the ranking member makes it clear that there is no form of transportation that is not subsidized.

I heard this utterance that we don't subsidize airplane travel. This is nonsensical. Just the facts of this bill itself outline some of our country's subsidies for our airline industry.

□ 2215

But I want to talk about Amtrak.

When it is said that there is a $1 billion subsidy and that somehow we can't afford that from last year, I want

to remind this House that for each and every month we have been in Afghanistan, we have been spending $2 billion a week for well over a decade, as a Nation. The idea that we can't afford to have a first-rate passenger rail system defies logic. It is just a matter of political will.

We need to make a decision about America's place in the world, and our economy is dependent on our ability to transport not just freight but human beings, and Amtrak is critical to that.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me time.

I hope this House will reconsider this thrust of the majority to move away from passenger rail. I heard some talk from the gentleman that we have got to stop this runaway train, but we tried to stop a train in Philadelphia, and if we had made the investments, there would be people who would be alive today.

We need to make these investments, and we need to move our country forward. It is not about political philosophy. It is about practicality.

Our economic competitors are subsidizing rail. And if we want to make our economy work, we are going to have to make Amtrak work. And we can do that through some of the efforts on this bill today.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for his wise words and join him in wholeheartedly opposing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for capital investments as authorized by sections 101(c), 102, and 219(b) of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–432), $850,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $160,200,000 shall be for debt service obligations as authorized by section 102 of such Act: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, not less than $50,000,000 shall be made available to bring Amtrak-served facilities and stations into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act: *Provided further*, That after an initial distribution of up to $200,000,000, which shall be used by the Corporation as a working capital account, all remaining funds shall be provided to the Corporation only on a reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, up to $20,000,000 may be used by the Secretary to subsidize operating losses of the Corporation should the funds provided under the heading ''Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation'' be insufficient to meet operational costs for fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain up to one-half of 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading to fund the costs of project management and oversight of activities authorized by subsections 101(a) and 101(c) of division B of Public Law 110–432: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve funding for capital expenditures, including advance purchase orders of materials, for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific capital project justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That except as otherwise provided herein, none of the funds under this heading may be used to subsidize operating losses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used for capital projects not approved by the Secretary of Transportation or on the Corporation's fiscal year 2016 business plan: *Provided further*, That in addition to the project management oversight funds authorized under section 101(d) of division B of Public Law 110–432, the Secretary may retain up to an additional $3,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading to fund expenses associated with implementing section 212 of division B of Public Law 110–432, including the amendments made by section 212 to section 24905 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall conduct a business case analysis on capital investments that exceed $10,000,000 in life-cycle costs: *Provided further*, That each contract for a capital acquisition that exceeds $10,000,000 in life cycle costs shall state that funding is subject to the availability of appropriated funds provided by an appropriations Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $861,500,000)''.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases capital grants to Amtrak by $861 million. This will bring the total funding for Amtrak in the bill to $2 billion, equal to Amtrak's fiscal year 2016 budget request to Congress.

This bill, as if it wasn't bad enough, cut $290 million from Amtrak's capital program, which is used to repair and replace aging infrastructure on the Northeast corridor, including 140-year-old bridges and tunnels, and implement positive train control, a system that, according to the National Transportation Safety Board, would have prevented the recent Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia.

According to the April 2015 report to Congress, ''At the current rate of available funding, it would take over 300 years to replace all of the bridges on the Northeast corridor, well beyond the timeframe in which assets would simply be shut down.''

The list of critical needs extends far beyond just bridges and tunnels. Major portions of Amtrak's electrical power supply system date back to 1930.

According to the commission, in total, $21.1 billion is needed to achieve a state of good repair on the corridor, $8.7 billion of which is needed to address critical infrastructure needs over the next 5 years.

We cannot point to the recent Amtrak derailment and say that it was directly caused by a lack of investment. That is true. But we do know from the NTSB that it was preventable had positive train control been installed on that section of track.

Amtrak included $36.4 million in their $2 billion fiscal year 2016 budget request to Congress. Amtrak testified at a hearing in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee yesterday that had they been provided adequate funding from the get-go, they would have been able to implement positive train control sooner.

The impact of this tragic accident could also have been lessened had the Republican-controlled Congress not denied Amtrak's request for funding to replace passenger cars that date back to 1975 with newer cars.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I think it is critically important that we understand that the President requested an increase in capital allotments for Amtrak. Not only was that not honored, but we actually went with the wisdom of the majority: we actually cut last year's number by over $250-plus million.

This is a move in the wrong direction for our country, and I hope that through the gentlewoman's amendment, we can reverse that. So I stand in support of it, and I hope that the majority would allow us to proceed to a vote.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress, which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, just a few short weeks ago, House Republicans passed a bill cutting taxes by $269 billion for their wealthiest friends, yet we can't find $2 billion for Amtrak to make it safe?

My friend from Florida, this is unacceptable; shame.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman needs to confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thought I was speaking to the point of order, sir.

That is my point. We cut $269 billion, and we can't find $2 billion to make Amtrak safe? That is the point.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budgetary authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, strike line 4 and all that follows through page 49, line 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my first amendment, Brooks No. 19, strikes $288.5 million in operating subsidies for Amtrak. This second amendment, which is Brooks No. 21, strikes capital and debt service subsidies that total $850 million per year to get to the point where we can strike all taxpayer subsidies for Amtrak.

I would rely on the arguments previously made with respect to my first amendment to support this second amendment.

I would add, however, that I have heard some comments about the safety associated with Amtrak. I would emphasize at this point that if you want safety with rail service, probably the best thing to do is to put it in the private sector and eliminate Amtrak altogether.

Look at airlines, air carriers; they are private sector and are much safer than Amtrak. Look at buses; they are private sector and are safer than Amtrak. And I would submit that if lives are what concern the opponents to these amendments that they would propose putting Amtrak into private hands in order to have the same kind of safety record that we have with buses, air carriers, and other modes of private transportation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I very strongly oppose this amendment which, like the gentleman's previous amendment, would essentially end passenger rail service in this country. It is just that drastic. It is also targeting passenger rail in a way that obscures the fact that every mode of transportation in this country is subsidized. It is in the public interest to maintain diverse modes of transportation that serve our various transportation needs and our various population centers.

Amtrak provides an invaluable service to this country: 500 destinations in 46 States, connecting small communities that don't have access to air service.

Amtrak is popular with the American people. It is increasingly being taken advantage of. In the last 11 years, 10 consecutive years of record ridership, serving nearly 32 million passengers last year.

Without Amtrak's service in the Northeast corridor, where would we be? There would be virtual gridlock in New York's airports, but it is not just the Northeast corridor. I come from a State that had the insight years ago to invest in State Amtrak service, and now Amtrak is the preferred mode of transportation for thousands of people between Raleigh and Charlotte, with three full routes a day in each direction.

This is an irresponsible amendment. It will eliminate thousands of jobs. It will harm local economies. And it will violate labor agreements. There is so much wrong with this.

I urge its rejection and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the argument that this would end rail service is absolutely false and is not supported by history. Nothing in history supports the gentleman's argument. However well-intentioned, the evidence is clear.

Freight rail, the same kind of argument was made. Subsidies were ended. It went into the private sector. It survives and thrives today.

There is an argument that buses and air carriers are somehow or another subsidized. I would submit that what we are talking about, there are user fees and there are gasoline taxes and diesel taxes that pay for those roads that buses use, and there are air passenger charges that pay for the cost of those airports that air carriers use.

So with that as a backdrop, I would submit that it is time for Amtrak passengers to pay their own way. It is time for Amtrak passengers to quit riding on the backs of other taxpayers. They have the ability to pay their own way. The rest of the country is expected to pay their own way when they travel. As such, I would ask this body to adopt my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 150. The Secretary of Transportation may receive and expend cash, or receive and utilize spare parts and similar items, from non-United States Government sources to repair damages to or replace United States Government owned automated track inspection cars and equipment as a result of third-party liability for such damages, and any amounts collected under this section shall be credited directly to the Safety and Operations account of the Federal Railroad Administration, and shall remain available until expended for the repair, operation and maintenance of automated track inspection cars and equipment in connection with the automated track inspection program.

SEC. 151. None of the funds provided to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation may be used to fund any overtime costs in excess of $35,000 for any individual employee: *Provided*, That the President of Amtrak may waive the cap set in the previous proviso for specific employees when the President of Amtrak determines such a cap poses a risk to the safety and operational efficiency of the system: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations each quarter of the calendar year on waivers granted to employees and amounts paid above the cap for each month within such quarter and delineate the reasons each waiver was granted: *Provided further*, That the President of Amtrak shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by March 1, 2016, a summary of all overtime payments incurred by the Corporation for 2015 and the three prior calendar years: *Provided further*, That such summary shall include the total number of employees that received waivers and the total overtime payments the Corporation paid to those employees receiving waivers for each month for 2015 and for the three prior calendar years.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, $102,933,000, of which not more than $4,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5329 and not less than $750,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5326: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided or limited in this Act may be used to create a permanent office of transit security under this heading: *Provided further*, That upon submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2017 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress the annual report on New Starts, including proposed allocations for fiscal year 2017.

□ 2230

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 52, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today with my good friends Congressmen QUIGLEY and BUTTERFIELD will return funding for FTA Technical Assistance and Training back to its 2014 level. Older adults and individuals with disabilities disproportionately rely on public transit to live, learn, get to work and access recreation in their communities. The Technical Assistance and Training dollars made available by this amendment will help increase mobility for people with disabilities and older adults. By providing this assistance to our transit systems and services, we can ensure that they become more accessible for those who rely on them the most.

Mr. Chairman, FTA has a long history of working with Easter Seals, the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, and others to provide training, technical assistance, and other problem-solving support to the transit industry, people with disabilities, and older adults; and it is imperative that this work continue as more people age and more people with disabilities seek to live as independently as possible.

Now, in order to realize this goal, FTA needs adequate resources to support these technical assistance activities. To that end, my amendment will increase funding by $2 million for FTA Technical Assistance and Training and reduce, by an equivalent amount, funding for FTA administrative expenses.

Mr. Chairman, the House adopted this exact amendment last year to restore FTA Technical Assistance and Training to $5 million. Unfortunately, it was cut to $3 million in this bill. My amendment will simply restore the funds back to the fiscal year '15 House-adopted level of $5 million.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues support this amendment, which will provide a world of benefit to all those that it serves.

I thank my colleagues today for their consideration.

Again, I urge passage of the amendment, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

Clerk read as follows:

TRANSIT FORMULA GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Contingent upon enactment of authorization legislation, for payment of obligations incurred in the Federal Public Transportation Assistance Program in this account, and for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112–141, $9,500,000,000, to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of programs authorized under 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112–141, and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112–141, shall not exceed total obligations of $8,595,000,000 in fiscal year 2016.

TRANSIT RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5312, $26,000,000.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5314 $3,000,000.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5309, $1,921,395,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $230,000,000)''.

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $230,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are very in debt in this country. This budget is on path to balance the budget eventually years down the road, but, really, we should be looking to cut spending right now.

You look at things the Federal Government is paying for that should be done locally, and one of those things is these new capital improvements on mass transit projects. I think normally these things do not get the ridership that justifies these projects, and we would not be doing these projects, local governments would not be applying for these projects or building these projects if they had to pay their money themselves. The only reason these things go ahead is the Federal Government is paying for them, and the Federal Government has no money.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal will bring back down the funding on this line to what the Appropriations Committee wanted only 2 years ago, and for whatever reason, apparently in negotiations, this amount went up last year. But I don't think it is too much to ask that this House not zero out this line—and we could argue that we shouldn't be doing this at all—but at least go back to the levels of 2013, especially given the huge amount of debt that is being piled up at this time.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the committee carefully calculated the New Start number to be able to accommodate the signed FFGAs and Small Starts Grant Agreements at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Again, as I submitted before, I am a firm believer that once you sign a grant agreement, then we should, frankly, honor that. This reduction would impact those signed agreements, and I reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment. I know the passion that he has for this, but I again have to reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's yielding. I would like to echo his opposition to this amendment.

I have just retrieved here a list of New Start projects that, under the present funding levels of the bill, probably aren't going to be able to be addressed. We are talking about the Westside project in Los Angeles. We are talking about San Diego, Denver, Baltimore, the Washington, D.C. area, the Maryland National Capital Purple Line, Minneapolis, Fort Worth. These are ready to go. These are ready to go with strong support in their communities, a strong impact on moving people and providing jobs. It is just unthinkable that we would cut this further.

Transit is an extremely important mode of transportation in many of our cities and suburban areas too, and the bill is inadequate. We need to find ways to make it more adequate going forward.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would move exactly in the wrong direction, so I urge its defeat.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it is all fine and good to move forward, but we are going to borrow about 14 percent of this budget, and we have got to stop saying whenever we see a spending item it is time to move forward. I think what we have to do here is—I can certainly understand if we made commitments today, I can understand how people of goodwill would not want this amendment. But if this amendment doesn't pass, then I think we have to make doubly certain that a year from now we have a dramatic reduction here.

If there are any of these projects that are that important, the local unit of government can fund it. There is no surer way to overspend than have the Federal Government give grants to local units of government that they would never dream of spending themselves.

That is what is going on here, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS TO THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

For grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority as authorized under section 601 of division B of Public Law 110–432, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall approve grants for capital and preventive maintenance expenditures for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority only after receiving and reviewing a request for each specific project: *Provided further*, That prior to approving such grants, the Secretary shall certify that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority is making significant progress in eliminating the material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, and minor control deficiencies identified in the most recent Financial Management Oversight Review: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall determine that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority has placed the highest priority on those investments that will improve the safety of the system before approving such grants: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, in order to ensure safety throughout the rail system, may waive the requirements of section 601(e)(1) of title VI of Public Law 110–432 (112 Stat. 4968).

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

Mr. MICA. 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 53, line 11, strike the colon and all that follows through line 15 and insert a period.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. My colleagues, at this late hour, this is a simple amendment. It strikes a waiver that was granted to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and it is a waiver that has been in place for several years. It waives the requirements for them to complete installation of cellular service in the tunnels of the Metro system in Washington, D.C. That waiver allows them to continue to receive Federal funds but not have made the installation.

It is funny because congressional staffers said: Well, Mr. MICA, why are you doing this? I am doing this because, as the chairman of a subcommittee on transportation oversight, I had to conduct a hearing after the January 12 deadly incident in the Washington area Metro. You may recall at L'Enfant Plaza, on the Yellow Line, there was an incident in which smoke filled the tunnel. A passenger train was left outside of the station.

I might say that, back in 2008, we set up a requirement that we have at the stations, within 1 year, Metro cellular service, and then by 4 years later, the entire system. So they were given from 2008 to 2012 to complete the system. They never completed the system. One individual died, others were injured, and we disrupted service. It was a day from hell in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, they never completed the job. They said they were going to complete the job right after 2012. They did not complete the job. They said it would be done in 2015. The last time I checked, it is 2015. It won't be done in 2015. They will not even sit down with the carriers who will install this equipment, and it is really at no cost to Metro.

I have talked to Mr. CONNOLLY, the gentleman from Virginia; I have talked to Mrs. COMSTOCK, the gentlewoman from Virginia; I have talked to Mr. HOYER, the gentleman from Maryland; and others. We have all had it with Metro not complying with us.

This waiver was put in to give them the opportunity to comply, and they haven't complied. Now it is in here again, and I am offering, in this amendment, to take it out.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the chairman, for comment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Florida is talking about this issue, I think all of us should be very, very concerned. I will tell you I think that the gentleman from Florida has been beyond reasonable, has tried to get folks to do what they were, again, supposed to do, and they have not done it.

So I just want to let the gentleman from Florida know that I am looking forward, and I am committed to making sure that this issue is solved one way or another. I am hoping that it is solved in a nice, positive way. But otherwise, I want to let the gentleman from Florida know that I will be working with him to make sure that we hold folks accountable.

Mr. MICA. Again, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to work with everyone. Again, I have had to conduct oversight over a tragedy that could have and should have been prevented.

Here is the latest headline: ''Can You Hear Me Now? In Metro Tunnels, Answer Is 'Not Yet.' ''

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize deeply with the concerns expressed by my friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. MICA), and I know Metro is committed to working with the wireless carriers to ensure seamless coverage throughout the rail system. I appreciate his willingness ultimately to withdraw the amendment so as not to jeopardize other vital safety improvements underway at Metro by conditioning the Federal commitment, which has already been reduced and which is matched by our State and local partners, on completion of this wireless upgrade.

Without question, the January arcing incident at L'Enfant Plaza underscored the urgent need for having working communications in Metro's underground stations and tunnels. While faulty electrical wiring was to blame for the fire and hazardous smoke, a breakdown in communications, as Mr. MICA has indicated, led to passengers being stranded in dangerous conditions aboard that Yellow Line train for an extended period of time. It wasn't just public safety personnel who experienced problems communicating. Stranded riders also reported having spotty or no cellular service in the tunnel.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), our colleague, so he can complete his statement.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from North Carolina, the distinguished ranking member.

Tragically, one rider—Carol Glover of Virginia, my home State—died as a result of smoke inhalation, and dozens of others required medical treatment and/or hospitalization.

□ 2245

This was, and remains, an unacceptable situation, and I and all of the members of the national capital region delegation are committed to working with the NSTB, FTA, Metro, and our

regional partners to ensure corrective actions are taken to restore public confidence.

I would note for my colleagues, the current Federal law already includes language requiring Metro riders to have underground access to wireless telecommunications services if the service providers work with Metro to install such services. Unfortunately, they have lagged behind again, as my friend from Florida has indicated.

Congress approved that requirement as part of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008. One year later, as required by the law, the wireless providers did successfully establish service in the 20 busiest underground rail stations. However, Congress has granted an extension on the timeline to install wireless service to the tunnels and the rest of the system because Metro and the wireless providers have run into delays with scheduling work while Metro trains are not running, performing higher priority safety improvements as directed by the NTSB, and other factors. However, they continue to work toward meeting this requirement, albeit at a very slow and glacial pace.

Metro is particularly motivated to complete this work as it also involves a parallel upgrade of its own underground radio communications services. Metro is an essential component of this region's transportation network, moving hundreds of thousands of commuters every day, including a significant portion of Federal employees. It also serves as America's subway, transporting 12 million visitors from across the country to the Nation's Capital each year.

It is critical that we maintain this bipartisan commitment to match local and State funding so that Metro can continue working with the NTSB and FTA on its critical safety upgrades.

Mr. MICA is right, and all of us from the national capital region agree with him. I pledge upon withdrawal of this amendment we will work with Mr. MICA to ensure that Metro meets deadlines at a much more expeditious pace than has been the case in the past.

Again, I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding, and I thank Mr. MICA for his leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude. I want to thank Mr. CONNOLLY. I want to thank Mrs. COMSTOCK, and the chairman particularly, for working on this.

I think we have gotten the attention of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. We have an agreement to bring the parties together as a result of this pending amendment. That is set. If it does not go through, I can assure you we will find a way to put this waiver in.

At this time, though, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. I will bring the parties together and hopefully common sense and good faith will prevail.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair.

I rise to offer an amendment with my colleagues in the national capital region that would restore full funding of the Federal commitment for vital rider safety improvements to ''America's Subway,'' the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, or Metro.

Let me remind my colleagues, this is not like the traditional transit or capital funding under the Department of Transportation. The Passenger Rail Investment Improvement Act of 2008 specifically authorized a $150 million annual Federal commitment for 10 years, and Congress has worked in bipartisan fashion the past 6 years to fulfill that. It was a Republican initiative initiated and authored by my predecessor, Republican member Tom Davis of Virginia.

As required by law, the Federal funding is matched dollar for dollar, with $150 million coming from Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

I appreciate the efforts of my fellow Virginian, Mr. RIGELL, and the subcommittee chairman, my friend, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, to try to work with us to restore some of the funding at full committee markup. But reducing any of this funding would renege on the Federal commitment and jeopardize the successful local-State-Federal partnership we have worked so hard to create.

It would also open the door for our partners to pull back on their commitments commensurately, which would only exacerbate Metro's challenge in upgrading its aging infrastructure.

This partnership is funding critical safety improvements throughout the system identified by Metro itself, the National Transportation Safety Board, and the Federal Transit Administration following the tragic 2009 Red Line accident and the recent tragedy on the Yellow Line this past January. The most visible improvement is the purchase of 7000-series new rail cars with advanced crash-resilient technology and extra capacity to replace the oldest and original cars in the fleet.

Congress and the Federal Government have a responsibility in the operation and safety of Metro. Half of all Metro stations are located on Federal property, and approximately 40 percent of rush-hour riders on Metro are, in fact, Federal employees, including many Members of Congress and their staffs.

It is critical we maintain this bipartisan commitment to match local and State funding so that Metro can continue making these safety upgrades.

I want to thank Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BEYER, and my friend Mrs. COMSTOCK for working with us on this regional priority.

I now yield the balance of my time to the distinguished delegate from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding and as a cosponsor of this amendment, which has profound safety implications for America's subway. I think it is so urgent that a member of the Appropriations Committee has already restored $25 million.

This was a partnership, a partnership between the Federal Government and Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. It became real after there was a crash that took the lives of nine District of Columbia residents in 2009.

This is a unique transit agency. This is where staff of this body, this is where visitors from all over the world ride. If this funding is delayed, it will delay the crashworthy 7000-series trains. It is in trains that were not crashworthy that we lost lives. We beg that this funding be restored.

The District, Maryland, and Virginia are each fulfilling their part of the partnership. It is up to the Federal Government to do our part and fulfill our part. Don't break the partnership open now.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and I continue to reserve my point of order.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), who, obviously, is very passionate about this issue.

Ms. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise as a cosponsor of the amendment in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as been pointed out by my colleagues, Congress did make a 10-year statutory commitment as a Federal partner, a 50–50 partner, to provide capital grant money to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. This funding has been used for vital

capital and safety improvements on the Metro system that so many of our constituents and our staff and tourists, people from all over the world, travel on every day.

As part of that agreement, matching grant money from the Commonwealth of Virginia, the District of Columbia, and the State of Maryland have all supplemented this in a full 50–50 match. This is truly a good partnership that has worked well since the bill was passed in 2008, and we should continue to fulfill that commitment.

This amendment would restore the already obligated funding to the bill and keep the promise that we have already made. Metro needs these important funds for capital improvements that will address important safety concerns.

I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues in the national capital area in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I respectfully ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the invocation of the point of order.

This is a provision that has been in law for the past 6 years, and I believe that it ought to be enshrined in law for a 7th. We represent the entire National Capital Region. This is a unique region. This is the Nation's Capital. And we ought not to be reneging on a deal that was worked out with great effort 6 years ago based on a point of order.

With that, I oppose the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 160. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration shall not apply to any authority under 49 U.S.C. 5338, previously made available for obligation, or to any other authority previously made available for obligation.

SEC. 161. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or limited by this Act under the heading Fixed Guideway Capital Investment of the Federal Transit Administration for projects specified in this Act or identified in reports accompanying this Act not obligated by September 30, 2020, and other recoveries, shall be directed to projects eligible to use the funds for the purposes for which they were originally provided.

SEC. 162. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated before October 1, 2015, under any section of chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that remain available for expenditure, may be transferred to and administered under the most recent appropriation heading for any such section.

SEC. 163. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to enter into a full funding grant agreement for a project with a New Starts share greater than 50 percent.

SEC. 164. (a) LOSS OF ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds in this or any other Act may be available to advance in any way a new light or heavy rail project towards a full funding grant agreement as defined by 49 U.S.C. 5309 for the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, Texas if the proposed capital project is constructed on or planned to be constructed on Richmond Avenue west of South Shepherd Drive or on Post Oak Boulevard north of Richmond Avenue in Houston, Texas.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR A NEW ELECTION.—The Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, Texas, may attempt to construct or construct a new fixed guideway capital project, including light rail, in the locations referred to in subsection (a) if—

(1) voters in the jurisdiction that includes such locations approve a ballot proposition that specifies routes on Richmond Avenue west of South Shepherd Drive or on Post Oak Boulevard north of Richmond Avenue in Houston, Texas; and

(2) the proposed construction of such routes is part of a comprehensive, multimodal, service-area wide transportation plan that includes multiple additional segments of fixed guideway capital projects, including light rail for the jurisdiction set forth in the ballot proposition. The ballot language shall include reasonable cost estimates, sources of revenue to be used and the total amount of bonded indebtedness to be incurred as well as a description of each route and the beginning and end point of each proposed transit project.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses to conduct the operations, maintenance, and capital asset renewal activities of those portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway owned, operated, and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, $32,042,000, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99–662.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $186,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses of operations and training activities authorized by law, $164,158,000, of which $22,000,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of training ships at State Maritime Academies, and of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for National Security Multi-Mission Vessel design for State Maritime Academies and National Security, and of which $2,400,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2017, for the Student Incentive Program at State Maritime Academies, and of which $1,200,000 shall remain available until expended for training ship fuel assistance payments, and of which $19,700,000 shall remain available until expended for facilities maintenance and repair, equipment, and capital improvements at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and of which $3,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2017, for Maritime Environment and Technology Assistance grants, contracts, and cooperative agreement: *Provided*, That amounts apportioned for the United States Merchant Marine Academy shall be available only upon allotments made personally by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs: *Provided further*, That the Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent and the Director of the Office of Resource Management of the United States Merchant Marine Academy may not be allotment holders for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and the Administrator of the Maritime Administration shall hold all allotments made by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That 50 percent of the funding made available for the United States Merchant Marine Academy under this heading shall be available only after the Secretary, in consultation with the Superintendent and the Maritime Administrator, completes a plan detailing by program or activity how such funding will be expended at the Academy, and this plan is submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SHIP DISPOSAL

For necessary expenses related to the disposal of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet of the Maritime Administration, $4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the maritime guaranteed loan program, $3,135,000 shall be paid to the appropriations for ''Maritime Administration—Operations and Training''.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 170. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in addition to any existing authority, the Maritime Administration is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Maritime Administration: *Provided*, That payments received therefor shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy for items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 171. None of the funds available or appropriated in this Act shall be used by the United States Department of Transportation or the United States Maritime Administration to negotiate or otherwise execute, enter into, facilitate or perform fee-for-service contracts for vessel disposal, scrapping or recycling, unless there is no qualified domestic ship recycler that will pay any sum of money to purchase and scrap or recycle a vessel owned, operated or managed by the Maritime Administration or that is part of the National Defense Reserve Fleet: *Provided*, That such sales offers must be consistent with the solicitation and provide that the work will be performed in a timely manner at a facility qualified within the meaning of section 3502 of Public Law 106–398: *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall affect the Maritime Administration's authority to award contracts at least cost to the Federal Government and consistent with the requirements of 54 U.S.C. 308704, section 3502, or otherwise authorized under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

For necessary operational expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, $20,725,000.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

For expenses necessary to discharge the hazardous materials safety functions of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, $60,500,000, of which $7,570,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That up to $800,000 in fees collected under 49 U.S.C. 5108(g) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination, and for travel expenses incurred in performance of hazardous materials exemptions and approvals functions.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

For expenses necessary to conduct the functions of the pipeline safety program, for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 60107, and to discharge the pipeline program responsibilities of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $145,870,000, of which $19,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 2018; and of which $124,500,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which $66,309,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That not less than $1,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the One-Call state grant program.

□ 2300

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 22, strike the period at the end insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That not less than $1,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the finalization and implementation of rules required under section 60102(n) of title 49, United States Code, and section 8(b)(3) of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (49 U.S.C. 60108 note; 125 Stat. 1911).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that will take a modest step forward to improve pipeline safety. This issue is of particular importance to me and to my constituents.

Two weeks ago, more than 100,000 gallons of crude oil spilled from the ruptured Plains All American Pipeline along the treasured Gaviota Coast, in my district, just north of Santa Barbara. The oil quickly flowed under the highway, onto the beach, and into the ocean where the oil slick spread south for miles along the coastline, affecting pristine environmental habitats, recreational interests, and commercial fishing operations.

While the exact causes of this spill are still being investigated, it is already clear that woefully inadequate Federal pipeline safety standards played a significant role, but it didn't have to be this way.

In 2011, the House worked in a bipartisan way to pass the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act. This law, which passed the House unanimously, directed the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA, to update and strengthen key pipeline safety standards.

The law called on PHMSA to issue a rule requiring automatic shutoff valves on new pipelines and to strengthen requirements for the inclusion of leak detection technologies on pipelines.

The law required these rules to be finalized by January of last year; yet, here today, we are still waiting. PHMSA has not even issued a proposed rule on these commonsense regulations, which passed the House unanimously. PHMSA continues to drag its feet, and communities like mine continue to pay the price. It is time for PHMSA to follow the law and the bipartisan will of Congress.

My amendment is simple. It would set aside $1 million of PHMSA's own budget for the finalization and implementation of these overdue pipeline safety and spill mitigation rules.

My amendment would simply help ensure that section 4 and section 8 of the bipartisan 2011 pipeline safety law are finally implemented so that our Federal regulations are in line with today's reality.

My amendment does not cost a dime, and it does not authorize any new programs. Section 4 requires new pipelines to install automatic shutoff valves, and section 8 requires pipeline operators to use the latest leak detection technologies. Both of these provisions were enacted unanimously by this House in 2011.

The pipeline that burst in my district did not have an automatic shutoff valve despite the fact that other comparable pipelines in the area do use this technology. An automatic shutoff valve would not have prevented the spill necessarily, but it certainly would have minimized it. It took over 2 hours for the pipeline operator to even identify where the pipeline had ruptured, let alone to actually stop the flow of crude oil.

That is unacceptable. If the standards required under section 4 and section 8 had been required of the Plains pipeline in my district, the spill likely would have been much less severe. My amendment would take a small, yet important step forward to address these troubling issues by pushing PHMSA to get its act together and finalize these rules.

Mr. Chairman, oil and gas development, by its nature, is a dangerous and dirty business. The mere fact that the Plains and other companies have oil spill contingency funds shows that there is no such thing as a safe pipeline. Spills do happen, and they will continue to happen as long as we depend on fossil fuels for our energy needs. We have a responsibility, therefore, to do all we can to make these pipelines as safe as possible.

Congress has repeatedly directed PHMSA to strengthen its standards; yet this agency has done little. My amendment would help hold their feet to the fire and get commonsense safety standards finalized and implemented. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $27,604,000)''.

Page 61, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $27,604,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that Federal pipeline safety standards are in serious need of improvement. Despite repeated bipartisan efforts to strengthen these standards, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, has dragged its feet on implementing the new rules.

Not only has this agency failed to keep up with new statutory requirements, they struggle to even enforce the rules they already have on the books. There are several reasons for this, including rapid growth in the miles of new pipelines to inspect and the need to compete with the private sector for the best talent while using limited resources.

PHMSA's preliminary estimate of serious incidents on pipelines showed an increase in 2014; and, with the miles of pipelines only multiplying, these numbers will surely grow. That is why my amendment would increase funding for PHMSA's pipeline safety program by $27 million, to simply match the President's own fiscal year 2016 budget request. While this would not solve the multitude of problems facing the agency, it would certainly make a big difference in two key areas.

First, it would help PHMSA retain and recruit the best inspectors and staff. Last year, Congress provided funding for 100 additional full-time employees to help PHMSA adjust to the increasing demand; and, as part of its fiscal year 2016 request, PHMSA requested $15 million to fully fund and annualize these employees. The current bill only provides enough funding for 1 year of salaries for these new employees.

How is the agency supposed to attract the best talent when they can't count on paying their new employees for more than a year at a time?

Second, my amendment would also provide requested funding for the national pipeline information exchange. This information exchange would be a comprehensive database of integrated pipeline safety information from PHMSA, from State regulators, industry, and other Federal resources.

Of the 2.6 million miles of pipeline in the United States, PHMSA inspects only 20 percent, while States monitor the remaining 80 percent. However, the information the States gather through inspections is neither shared among the States, nor with PHMSA. That is kind of unbelievable. It makes no sense. We should be doing everything we can to analyze and understand this data.

My amendment would fund this exchange to help regulators be more effective and to better protect communities like mine from future spills. There are currently pilot information exchange programs in 7 States, and the funding provided by my amendment would allow PHMSA to expand these information exchanges to 25 States.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment costs absolutely nothing from the American taxpayers, not one dime. The increased funding would come from a modest increase in user fees paid into the pipeline safety fund. These user fees are paid for by the oil companies that profit enormously from the oil and gas flowing through the pipelines that PHMSA oversees.

Oil companies are seeing record profits from a booming oil and gas development industry. This is leading to more miles of pipeline and more risks for local communities like mine. The least they can do is ensure that the Federal oversight of the industry is keeping pace with the growth because, when pipelines fail, it is our local communities and our constituents, not the oil companies, who suffer the most.

My amendment takes a small step forward to help strengthen the pipeline safety and oversight, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I commend my colleague for offering this amendment, and I want to offer my strong support.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking here about annualizing the funding—in other words, bringing these people on board permanently—for pipeline safety inspectors who were hired in fiscal year 2015. We are also talking about the better coordination of enforcement activities between Federal, State, and local officials.

I would like to remind my colleagues we have 2.6 million miles of pipeline across this country. I think the number is maybe 548 personnel in the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.

This is an enormous task. The gentlewoman's amendment would greatly improve our capacity to address this challenge, and I urge its adoption.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. The authorization for this program expires this year, Mr. Chairman. Frankly, there are many questions, and it is not really clear whether or not the next authorization would accommodate this funding fee level. I understand the gentlewoman's passion, but I must respectfully urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge the adoption of this amendment. I have a classic example of why it is needed, and I ask for your consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS
(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5128(b), $188,000, to be derived from the Emergency Preparedness Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the fiscal year limitation specified in 49 U.S.C. 5116, not more than $28,318,000 shall be made available for obligation in fiscal year 2016 from amounts made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i), and 5128(b) and (c): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 5116(i)(4), not more than 4 percent of the amounts made available from this account shall be available to pay administrative costs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i), 5128(b), or 5128(c) shall be made available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his or her designee.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $86,223,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the Department: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading may be used to investigate, pursuant to section 41712 of title 49, United States Code: (1) unfair or deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition by domestic and foreign air carriers and ticket agents; and (2) the compliance of domestic and foreign air carriers with respect to item (1) of this proviso: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds transferred to the Office of the Inspector General through forfeiture proceedings or from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund or the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund, as a participating agency, as an equitable share from the forfeiture of property in investigations in which the Office of Inspector General participates, or through the granting of a Petition for Remission or Mitigation, shall be deposited to the credit of this account for law enforcement activities authorized under the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, to remain available until expended.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $31,375,000: *Provided*,

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $1,250,000 from fees established by the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and used for necessary and authorized expenses under this heading: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2016, to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at no more than $30,125,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 180. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official department business; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 181. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for an Executive Level IV.

SEC. 182. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 110 political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That none of the personnel covered by this provision may be assigned on temporary detail outside the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 183. (a) No recipient of funds made available in this Act shall disseminate personal information (as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(3)) obtained by a State department of motor vehicles in connection with a motor vehicle record as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(1), except as provided in 18 U.S.C. 2721 for a use permitted under 18 U.S.C. 2721.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall not withhold funds provided in this Act for any grantee if a State is in noncompliance with this provision.

SEC. 184. Funds received by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Railroad Administration from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training may be credited respectively to the Federal Highway Administration's ''Federal-Aid Highways'' account, the Federal Transit Administration's ''Technical Assistance and Training'' account, and to the Federal Railroad Administration's ''Safety and Operations'' account, except for State rail safety inspectors participating in training pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 20105.

SEC. 185. None of the funds in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be used to make a loan, loan guarantee, line of credit, or grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any project competitively selected to receive a discretionary grant award, any discretionary grant award, letter of intent, loan commitment, loan guarantee commitment, line of credit commitment, or full funding grant agreement totaling $750,000 or more is announced by the department or its modal administrations from:

(1) any discretionary grant or federal credit program of the Federal Highway Administration including the emergency relief program;

(2) the airport improvement program of the Federal Aviation Administration;

(3) any program of the Federal Railroad Administration;

(4) any program of the Federal Transit Administration other than the formula grants and fixed guideway modernization programs;

(5) any program of the Maritime Administration; or

(6) any funding provided under the headings ''National Infrastructure Investments'' in this Act:

Provided, That the Secretary gives concurrent notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for any ''quick release'' of funds from the emergency relief program: *Provided further*, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 186. Rebates, refunds, incentive payments, minor fees and other funds received by the Department of Transportation from travel management centers, charge card programs, the subleasing of building space, and miscellaneous sources are to be credited to appropriations of the Department of Transportation and allocated to elements of the Department of Transportation using fair and equitable criteria and such funds shall be available until expended.

SEC. 187. Amounts made available in this or any other Act that the Secretary determines represent improper payments by the Department of Transportation to a third-party contractor under a financial assistance award, which are recovered pursuant to law, shall be available—

(1) to reimburse the actual expenses incurred by the Department of Transportation in recovering improper payments; and

(2) to pay contractors for services provided in recovering improper payments or contractor support in the implementation of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002: *Provided*, That amounts in excess of that required for paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) shall be credited to and merged with the appropriation from which the improper payments were made, and shall be available for the purposes and period for which such appropriations are available: *Provided further*, That where specific project or accounting information associated with the improper payment or payments is not readily available, the Secretary may credit an appropriate account, which shall be available for the purposes and period associated with the account so credited; or

(B) if no such appropriation remains available, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That prior to the transfer of any such recovery to an appropriations account, the Secretary shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of the amount and reasons for such transfer: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section, the term ''improper payments'' has the same meaning as that provided in section 2(d)(2) of Public Law 107–300.

SEC. 188. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if any funds provided in or limited by this Act are subject to a reprogramming action that requires notice to be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, transmission of said reprogramming notice shall be provided solely to the Committees on Appropriations, and said reprogramming action shall be approved or denied solely by the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide notice to other congressional committees of the action of the Committees on Appropriations on such reprogramming but not sooner than 30 days following the date on which the reprogramming action has been approved or denied by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 189. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used by the Surface Transportation Board of the Department of Transportation to charge or collect any filing fee for rate or practice complaints filed with the Board in an amount in excess of the amount authorized for district court civil suit filing fees under section 1914 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 190. Funds appropriated in this Act to the modal administrations may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary for the costs related to assessments or reimbursable agreements only when such amounts are for the costs of goods and services that are purchased to provide a direct benefit to the applicable modal administration or administrations.

SEC. 191. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to carry out a program that establishes uniform standards for developing and supporting agency transit pass and transit benefits authorized under section 7905 of title 5, United States Code, including distribution of transit benefits by various paper and electronic media.

SEC. 192. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Surface Transportation Board to take any actions with respect to the construction of a high speed rail project in California unless the permit is issued by the Board with respect to the project in its entirety.

SEC. 193. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to facilitate new scheduled air transportation originating from the United States if such flights would land on, or pass through, property confiscated by the Cuban Government, including property in which a minority interest was confiscated, as the terms confiscated, Cuban Government, and property are defined in paragraphs (4), (5), and (12)(A), respectively, of section 4 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6023 (4), (5), and (12)(A)): *Provided*, That for this section, new scheduled air transportation shall include any flights not already regularly scheduled prior to March 31, 2015.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2016''.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

For necessary salaries and expenses for Executive Offices, which shall be comprised of the offices of the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Adjudicatory Services, Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Public Affairs, Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, and the Center for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, $14,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,000 of the amount made available under this heading shall be available to the Secretary for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OFFICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary salaries and expenses for Administrative Support Offices, $547,000,000, of which $45,600,000, to remain available until expended, in addition to amounts made available under this heading for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer and the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer, shall be for funding shared service agreements between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of the Treasury; $39,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer; $93,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; $199,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Administration; $40,000,000 shall be

available for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer; $49,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Field Policy and Management; $16,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer; $3,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity; $4,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Strategic Planning and Management; $44,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer; and of which the remaining amount shall be available through September 30, 2017, for transfer to the appropriations for offices specified under this heading or the heading ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' in this title: *Provided*, That funds provided under this heading may be used for necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this heading may be used for advertising and promotional activities that directly support program activities funded in this title: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide the Committees on Appropriations quarterly written notification regarding the status of pending congressional reports: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide in electronic form all signed reports required by Congress.

PROGRAM OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Public and Indian Housing, $203,000,000.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development, $102,000,000.

HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Housing, $372,000,000.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Policy Development and Research, $22,700,000.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, $73,000,000.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND HEALTHY HOMES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes, $6,700,000.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING PROGRAMS

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) (''the Act'' herein), not otherwise provided for, $15,918,643,000 to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be available on October 1, 2015 (in addition to the $4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available on October 1, 2015), and $4,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019, shall be available on October 1, 2016: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) $18,151,000,000 shall be available for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act) and including renewal of other special purpose *or* incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from amounts provided under this paragraph and any carryover, the Secretary for the calendar year 2016 funding cycle shall provide renewal funding for each public housing agency based on validated voucher management system (VMS) leasing and cost data for the prior calendar year and by applying an inflation factor as established by the Secretary, by notice published in the Federal Register, and by making any necessary adjustments for the costs associated with the first-time renewal of vouchers under this paragraph including tenant protection, HOPE VI, and Choice Neighborhoods vouchers: *Provided further*, That in determining calendar year 2016 funding allocations under this heading for public housing agencies, including agencies participating in the Moving To Work (MTW) demonstration, the Secretary may take into account the anticipated impact of changes in targeting and utility allowances, on public housing agencies' contract renewal needs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be used to fund a total number of unit months under lease which exceeds a public housing agency's authorized level of units under contract, except for public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration, which are instead governed by the terms and conditions of their MTW agreements: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the extent necessary to stay within the amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this paragraph), prorate each public housing agency's allocation otherwise established pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That except as provided in the following provisos, the entire amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this paragraph) shall be obligated to the public housing agencies based on the allocation and pro rata method described above, and the Secretary shall notify public housing agencies of their annual budget by the latter of 60 days after enactment of this Act or March 1, 2016: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the notification period with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements and shall be subject to the same pro rata adjustments under the previous provisos: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may offset public housing agencies' calendar year 2016 allocations based on the excess amounts of public housing agencies' net restricted assets accounts, including HUD held programmatic reserves (in accordance with VMS data in calendar year 2015 that is verifiable and complete), as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall also be subject to the offset, as determined by the Secretary, excluding amounts subject to the single fund budget authority provisions of their MTW agreements, from the agencies' calendar year 2016 MTW funding allocation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall use any offset referred to in the previous two provisos throughout the calendar year to prevent the termination of rental assistance for families as the result of insufficient funding, as determined by the Secretary, and to avoid or reduce the proration of renewal funding allocations: *Provided further*, That up to $75,000,000 shall be available only: (1) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies, after application for an adjustment by a public housing agency that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of vouchers resulting from unforeseen circumstances or from portability under section 8(r) of the Act; (2) for vouchers that were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the Act; (3) for adjustments for costs associated with HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD–VASH) vouchers; (4) for adjustments for public housing agencies with voucher leasing rates at the end of the calendar year that exceed the average leasing for the 12-month period used to establish the allocation, and for additional leasing of vouchers that were issued but not leased prior to the end of such calendar year; (5) for public housing agencies that despite taking reasonable cost savings measures, as determined by the Secretary, would otherwise be required to terminate rental assistance for families as a result of insufficient funding; and (6) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs as a result of participation in the Small Area Fair Market Rent demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate amounts under the previous proviso based on need, as determined by the Secretary;

(2) $130,000,000 shall be for section 8 rental assistance for relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to section 18 of the Act, conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8, the family unification program under section 8(x) of the Act, relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency, enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act, HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhood vouchers, mandatory and voluntary conversions, and tenant protection assistance including replacement and relocation assistance or for project-based assistance to prevent the displacement of unassisted elderly tenants currently residing in section 202 properties financed between 1959 and 1974 that are refinanced pursuant to Public Law 106–569, as amended, or under the authority as provided under this Act: *Provided*, That when a public housing development is submitted for demolition or disposition under section 18 of the Act, the Secretary may provide section 8 rental assistance when the units pose an imminent health and safety risk to residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may only provide replacement vouchers for units that were occupied within the previous 24 months that cease to be available as assisted housing, subject only to the availability of funds: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this paragraph, $5,000,000 may be available to provide tenant protection assistance, not otherwise provided under this paragraph, to residents residing in low vacancy areas and who may have to pay rents greater than 30 percent of household income, as the result of (1) the maturity of a HUD-insured, HUD-held or section 202 loan that requires the permission of the Secretary prior to loan prepayment; (2) the expiration of a rental assistance contract for which the tenants are not eligible for enhanced voucher or tenant protection assistance under existing law; or (3) the expiration of affordability restrictions accompanying a mortgage or preservation program administered by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such tenant protection assistance made available under the previous proviso may be provided under the authority of section 8(t) or section 8(o)(13) of the

United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous provisos, including, but not limited to, requirements for defining eligible at-risk households within 120 days of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That any tenant protection voucher made available from amounts under this paragraph shall not be reissued by any public housing agency, except the replacement vouchers as defined by the Secretary by notice, when the initial family that received any such voucher no longer receives such voucher, and the authority for any public housing agency to issue any such voucher shall cease to exist: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, for the purpose under this paragraph, may use unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from amounts appropriated in prior fiscal years under this heading for voucher assistance for nonelderly disabled families and for disaster assistance made available under Public Law 110–329;

(3) $1,530,000,000 shall be for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program, of which up to $10,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to allocate to public housing agencies that need additional funds to administer their section 8 programs, including fees associated with section 8 tenant protection rental assistance, the administration of disaster related vouchers, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, and other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That no less than $1,520,000,000 of the amount provided in this paragraph shall be allocated to public housing agencies for the calendar year 2016 funding cycle based on section 8(q) of the Act (and related Appropriation Act provisions) as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–276): *Provided further*, That if the amounts made available under this paragraph are insufficient to pay the amounts determined under the previous proviso, the Secretary may decrease the amounts allocated to agencies by a uniform percentage applicable to all agencies receiving funding under this paragraph or may, to the extent necessary to provide full payment of amounts determined under the previous proviso, utilize unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading from prior fiscal years, excluding special purpose vouchers, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements, and shall be subject to the same uniform percentage decrease as under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this paragraph shall be only for activities related to the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under section 8, including related development activities;

(4) $107,643,210 for the renewal of tenant-based assistance contracts under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), including necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the special purpose vouchers in this paragraph shall be funded under the same terms and be subject to the same pro rata reduction as the percent decrease for administrative and other expenses to public housing agencies under paragraph (3) of this heading;

(5) The Secretary shall separately track all special purpose vouchers funded under this heading.

□ 2315

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 78, line 9, before the semicolon insert the following: '', except that of the amount made available by this proviso, $75,000,000 shall be used only for the purpose under this clause''.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in support of the people who make it possible for us to be here. Of course, I speak of those persons who go to distant places, those persons who serve us in our military who don't always return the same way they left.

I rise tonight because we have had a successful program. The HUD VASH program has been successful, and it has contributed to the decline in homelessness among those persons who make it possible for us to be here, who make real the great and noble American ideals: liberty and justice for all; government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Mr. Chairman, homelessness has declined 33 percent among our veteran population since 2010, and this is because the President made it a priority. President Obama indicated that he would reduce homelessness among veterans, and he had 2015 as a targeted date.

I am proud to say that in my city of Houston, Texas, our mayor, Annise Parker, had an event just recently with three HUD Secretaries, and it was announced at that event that in Houston, Texas, the resources were available to accommodate a veteran in need of a place to call home.

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that would accord $75 million to the HUD VASH program. This $75 million would be used to make sure that what we have done we will not only continue to do, but we can do even better.

I believe that the people who have served us and who find themselves now living on the streets of life should have a better quality of life. For this reason, I will promote this amendment tonight, understanding that a point of order has been made, but also understanding that it is necessary for us to continue to remind ourselves that we have people who are willing to make the sacrifice and that we should make sacrifices for them.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I want to thank the gentleman, again, for his passion for this issue and for talking to me about this issue, and I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman.

Obviously, all of us know that there is never anything, there is never enough that we could ever do for our veterans. So again, I thank the gentleman, and I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman.

I thank you for yielding your time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and I thank the Congress of the United States of America because Congress has appropriated money for these VASH vouchers, this program. I have always tried to get more because I think our veterans deserve as much as we can give them, but I am appreciative for what Congress has done, and I am appreciative for what the chairman has done.

So tonight I will withdraw my amendment, Mr. Chairman, but I do so with the understanding that as we move forward, knowing that we have done a great job, the President has done well, that the cities and municipalities have worked well with the President, this has been an integrated system, holistic approach to ending homelessness among our veterans, but I still believe that we cannot allow ourselves to relax. We must never assume that we have done enough for those who are willing to do all for us.

With that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $512,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $512,000,000)''.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, that would fully fund the existing Housing Choice Vouchers and replenish the 67,000 vouchers lost to the fiscal year 2013 sequestration.

It is difficult, Mr. Chair, to think of a more urgent issue confronting the American people. Affordable housing has reached zero in many communities of our country. It is estimated that 2.1 million low-income families utilize the Housing Choice Voucher program. These are the most vulnerable among us, including children, senior citizens, veterans, and persons with disabilities who rely on this important program to keep their families from becoming homeless.

Most families must make roughly $18.92 per hour to afford a two-bedroom apartment, which is more than 2½ times the Federal minimum wage. In the District of Columbia, where affordable housing has virtually disappeared, families must make $28.25 per hour to afford a two-bedroom apartment, making the Nation's Capital one of the most expensive housing markets in the Nation.

The District mirrors cities and suburbs throughout the country, however. For over a decade, District residents have faced increasing rents, stagnant incomes, and the disappearance of affordable rental units. As a result, the city has had to close—actually close altogether—its housing waiting list, which includes vouchers, leaving more than 72,000 people waiting to be placed and thousands more waiting for a chance even to get on the list.

My amendment would fund President Obama's budget request to restore 67,000 vouchers lost during the fiscal year 2013 sequestration, bringing urgently needed relief to struggling families across the country. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. What is Congress here for if not to bring some relief to millions of families across the country, those who are most in need?

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida may state his point of order.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5 of the 114th Congress which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, but for sequestration probably most of these housing vouchers would have gone through. They are already cut. These are cuts that were never anticipated. These were sequestration cuts. The Congress cannot ignore forever the neediest people for housing as homelessness increases and as there is no relief whatsoever.

I understand the point of order. I can't agree with it. I think at some point this Congress must face what it must do for people who but for sequestration, something none of us wanted, none of us anticipated, would at least among them have some who would have these housing vouchers.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,204,853,210)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $182,816,000)''.

Page 79, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 81, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $490,037,000)''.

Page 83, after line 10, insert the following:

(5) $277,000,000 shall be for incremental rental voucher assistance under section 8(o) of the Act to be distributed based on relative need, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall make such funding available, notwithstanding section 204 (competition provision) of this title;

(6) $177,500,000 shall be used for incremental rental voucher assistance for use by families, veterans, and tribal families who are experiencing homelessness, as well as victims of domestic and dating violence: *Provided*, That eligibility for veterans is made without regard to discharge status: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make such funding available through a competitive process to public housing agencies that partner with eligible Continuums of Care, as identified by the Secretary and to recipients eligible to receive block grants under the Native American Housing Assistance and Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That assistance provided to recipients eligible under NAHASDA shall be subject to requirements of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for any provision or statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this paragraph upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective delivery and administration of such voucher assistance: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous proviso;

(7) $37,500,000 shall be made available to provide incremental rental voucher assistance for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, as defined by the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4), who require an emergency transfer: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement this paragraph;

(8) $20,000,000 shall be made available for new incremental voucher assistance through the Family Unification Program: *Provided*, That the assistance made available under this paragraph shall continue to remain available for family unification upon turnover: *Provided further*, That the amounts made available under this paragraph shall be used only in connection with tenant-based assistance on behalf of—

(A) any family—

(i) who is otherwise eligible for such assistance; and

(ii) who the public child welfare agency for the jurisdiction has certified is a family for whom the lack of adequate housing is a primary factor in the imminent placement of the family's child or children in out-of-home care; and

(B) for a period not to exceed 60 months, otherwise eligible youths who have attained at least 18 years of age and not more than 21 years of age and who have left foster care at age 16 or older.

Page 83, line 11, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(9)''

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, the funding levels provided in this bill are unrealistic and unsustainable and clearly demonstrate that our current budget process has failed. This bill reveals where the majority's priorities lie, and they clearly do not lie in serving the most basic function of government: to provide for the safety and well-being of its citizens.

This bill makes major cuts to critical HUD programs. The public housing

capital fund is slashed by $200 million, barely reaching its 1989 level, almost 30 years ago. This will cover less than half of the basic maintenance needs and does nothing to address the $25 billion in deferred projects.

For the first time since 2007, this body will provide no new funding to provide housing and support to homeless veterans. The Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control program is cut by 32 percent, even as The Washington Post reported 2 months ago that in low-income West Baltimore neighborhoods, more than 3 percent of children under the age of 6 had dangerously high levels of lead in their blood, which we know leads to learning disabilities and can lead to lifelong dependency, not to mention lifelong dependency on the taxpayers.

But perhaps most startling is the bill's failure to provide low-income seniors and hard-working families adequate access to affordable housing through HUD's Section 8 program. Rental assistance helps 2.1 million very-low-income households to rent modest homes in the private market at affordable costs. Households that use vouchers have an average income of $13,000 per year, well below the Federal poverty line, and nearly all include children, seniors, or people with disabilities. Only about one in four eligible low-income families receives Federal rental assistance. Long waiting lists remain in nearly every community, and these long waits are exacerbated by a lack of administrative funding for public housing agencies.

Sequestration has only made this situation worse. As of June of last year, an estimated 100,000 fewer families were receiving assistance from Section 8 due to the sequestration cuts; 100,000 families cut off. These cuts have had a severe impact on communities at a time when the number of very-low-income renters with worst case housing needs remains 30 percent higher than it was before the Great Recession.

Through the fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015 appropriations bills, Congress began the work of reversing the deep cuts in assistance caused by sequestration, but nearly 67,000 vouchers have yet to be restored. My amendment would finally restore those lost vouchers by providing an additional $512 million to the voucher renewal account. This amendment mirrors the President's request and targets 30,000 vouchers to those families and individuals most in need of housing assistance: homeless families; veterans, including those not covered by the VASH program; victims of domestic violence; and Native Americans.

□ 2330

The bill does include important and helpful language directing HUD to target vouchers to the vulnerable populations as they become available but provides no funds for HUD to do so.

My amendment sets aside specific funding for these targeted vouchers to make sure the most vulnerable populations have access to safe, affordable housing.

This additional funding will go a long way toward ensuring that every family that qualifies for rental assistance finds a home. However, at the funding levels for administrative fees in this legislation, it would be impossible for public housing agencies to hire and maintain enough staff to process and renew vouchers.

We cannot continue to undermine our hard-working public housing agencies by failing to provide them enough money to function. My amendment would finally address the undercutting of public housing agencies by providing an additional $490 million to match the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, this is the minimum we can do to meet the vital needs of our lowest-income citizens and of our veterans. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, which states:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we can all agree that this amendment is necessary. We are talking about denying tens of thousands of families and seniors access to an efficient, cost-effective program that keeps families together and lowers the government's costs over the long term. Without this amendment, we will see a spike in homelessness, a spike in medical costs, and a spike in hungry children.

I understand the point of order. I understand that the rules demand an offset for any funding increase in the bill. I also appreciate the chairman's efforts to support Section 8 and public housing. However, when funding levels are as restrictive as this bill provides across the board, it is impossible to offset such drastic underfunding without hurting other people in need.

When faced with a funding bill——

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from New York wish to speak to the point of order?

The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. NADLER. When faced with a funding bill that fails to provide any new funding to support homeless veterans and is leaving victims of domestic violence and homeless families with no access to secure housing, we need to take action to support the most vulnerable among us.

I hope that as we go forward, we can find a way to provide these funds so that kids, working families, and seniors are not out on the street.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that this moment not pass without us expressing appreciation to Mr. NADLER and to Ms. NORTON for these amendments they have offered, because they are addressing a critical issue, a critical deficiency in this bill. And believe me, Mr. Chairman, this is just the tip of the iceberg.

The President proposed in his budget to provide additional rental vouchers to compensate for those lost earlier to sequestration. He also proposed funding for 30,000 new targeted vouchers, as Mr. NADLER was indicating: homeless families, veterans, Native Americans, victims of domestic violence and stalking, reuniting families.

Because of this budget policy that has us so hamstrung, we are simply not addressing in this bill any of these desperate needs. I invite colleagues to talk to their local housing authorities, if they haven't already. Ask how many are on the waiting list. Ask how many people are desperate for decent housing. There is nothing more basic to our communities' well-being than decent housing.

I don't know of a single housing program that isn't underresourced, and all this because of a budget policy that really isn't working as fiscal policy. That is what it is supposed to be doing, but it is decimating these investments that our country needs to be making.

I said the tip of the iceberg. Here is what I mean. The Choice Neighborhoods initiative is the successor to HOPE VI. That has been an enormously successful program in my area of Raleigh-Durham in North Carolina. That is $20 million. That is a token amount. I hope we will revisit that amount later.

Public housing capital fund, $1.68 billion. That is $194 million cut from last year. That goes back to where we were 26 years ago. And then we have a $25 billion backlog—not even beginning to address that.

Mr. Chairman, my district displays rental housing for the elderly, housing for the disabled. Local congregations have taken on these projects. We have group homes for the disabled that have done a wonderful job. This budget simply turns them into rental renewal programs. No capital funding, no increase in the supply. And so it goes.

So Mr. NADLER and Ms. NORTON have done us a great service tonight in pressing the case for tenant-based rental assistance—for these vouchers—and for addressing some of these very needy categories of our fellow citizens. But it is the tip of the iceberg. It is only one of an array of programs that we very much need to address.

I am hopeful that the inadequacy of this bill tonight, and the kind of debate we are having tonight, the kind of sharp relief that these needs are being put into, will motivate us very strongly sooner rather than later.

Let's not wait for a Presidential veto. Let's not wait for some kind of governmental shutdown. Let's show that we can govern. Let's show that we can take hold of our situation, invest the way a great country should invest, and do a budget agreement that secures our fiscal future but also makes room for the kind of investments that we should make.

So I thank my colleagues for bringing up these critical housing needs. We simply must address them in the weeks ahead.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $614,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $434,000,000)''.

Page 81, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $180,000,000)''.

Page 81, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $180,000,000)''.

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $614,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be here. It shows different people look at this budget and see different things.

I look at this budget and see a $614 million increase in Section 8 housing, and I look at the huge debt we have, and I say: Why are we spending more? Other people apparently look at the $614 million increase and say: Why, that is just a pittance.

Obviously, a 3 percent increase in any program at a time we are in the huge debt we are should be viewed skeptically. I have an amendment here to get rid of the $614 million increase.

Now, as I understand, the reason there is an increase is because we are getting in less receipts on the Section 8 housing and, therefore, we feel that the citizens of this country have to make up the difference.

My opinion is they have done nothing that we have to take more out of their pocket, either in taxes or by way of inflation, and we should not be increasing this funding by $614 million.

In the debate over the last amendment it was said that there is a waiting list on a lot of these programs. That doesn't mean we have to spend more money on the programs. If we are giving away something for free, there is always going to be a waiting list. If you go out in society, if a store says, we are going to give away something for free, you have a waiting list, right?

This is a flawed program for a couple of reasons. I don't object to using it for disabled people. I don't object to using it for elderly people. But like many welfare-related programs, two things help you in eligibility for this program.

First of all, you are required not to work very hard. And the gentleman made a point that the income level of a lot of these people in the projects isn't that high. That is because if they made more money, they wouldn't be eligible for the generous subsidies. So, of course they are not making a lot of money. It is wrong to set up a program that discourages industry.

The second thing wrong with this program is it discourages marriage. A lot of these housing things are set up such that if somebody marries the mother or father of their children who is working harder, you lose the subsidy. I can't imagine anything more foolish than setting up a program that says we will give you an apartment if you raise a child out of wedlock, but if you get married, we will take away your apartment.

The last time we really looked at this program was 1994. It is time we look at it again. And the idea of pouring another $614 million into this program is out of line.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition with considerable enthusiasm.

It is as though what I said 5 minutes ago about the deficiencies of this bill—this whole budget strategy that has left us so unable to address our needs—it is as though the gentleman took that and went in exactly the opposite direction.

His amendment reduced an allocation that is already far too low, and it takes these rental assistance programs and reduces them further. Not only does it not meet the need that we are seeing but actually reduces what we are already doing. This means evictions. I promise you, it means large-scale evictions. It means a cutting back in communities across this country of the housing alternatives that people have.

I have always thought, Mr. Chairman, that rental assistance—Section 8—should be a housing program that conservatives should love because it is market-based. It is not, contrary to what the gentleman says, a total free ride. As a matter of fact, people pay a third of their income in rent. What Section 8 provides is a modest boost so that these housing developments and these apartment buildings can work. People can live there. They put their own money in, and they get a boost. They are able to move toward self-sufficiency.

So it is not public housing. It is housing for people who are able to do more for themselves and who are receiving support as they do that. This would be unconscionable to cut this program further.

With great conviction I believe this would be a mistaken amendment, a hard-hearted amendment, and one that this body should reject.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading ''Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing'' and the heading ''Project-Based Rental Assistance'', for fiscal year 2016 and prior years may be used for renewal of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts and for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That amounts heretofore recaptured, or recaptured during the current fiscal year, from section 8 project-based contracts from source years fiscal year 1975 through fiscal year 1987 are hereby rescinded, and an amount of additional new budget authority, equivalent to the amount rescinded is hereby appropriated, to remain available until expended, for the purposes set forth under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise available.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (''the Act''), $1,681,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2016 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian

Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term ''obligate'' means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That up to $3,000,000 shall be to support ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs including safety and security measures necessary to address crime and drug-related activity as well as needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters excluding Presidentially declared emergencies and natural disasters under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) occurring in fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading $30,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service coordinator and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437z-6) and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, up to $15,000,000 may be used for a Jobs-Plus initiative modeled after the Jobs-Plus demonstration: *Provided further*, That the funding provided under the previous proviso shall provide competitive grants to partnerships between public housing authorities, local workforce investment boards established under section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, and other agencies and organizations that provide support to help public housing residents obtain employment and increase earnings: *Provided further*, That applicants must demonstrate the ability to provide services to residents, partner with workforce investment boards, and leverage service dollars: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may set aside a portion of the funds provided for the Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency program to support the services element of the Jobs-Plus Pilot initiative: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may allow PHAs to request exemptions from rent and income limitation requirements under sections 3 and 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 as necessary to implement the Jobs-Plus program, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may approve upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective implementation of the Jobs-Plus initiative as a voluntary program for residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register any waivers or alternative requirements pursuant to the preceding proviso no later than 10 days before the effective date of such notice: *Provided further*, That for funds provided under this heading, the limitation in section 9(g)(1) of the Act shall be 25 percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the limitation in the previous proviso to allow public housing agencies to fund activities authorized under section 9(e)(1)(C) of the Act: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary shall provide bonus awards in fiscal year 2016 to public housing agencies that are designated high performers: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify public housing agencies of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2016 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), $4,440,000,000.

CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS INITIATIVE

For competitive grants under the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (subject to section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v), unless otherwise specified under this heading), for transformation, rehabilitation, and replacement housing needs of both public and HUD-assisted housing and to transform neighborhoods of poverty into functioning, sustainable mixed income neighborhoods with appropriate services, schools, public assets, transportation and access to jobs, $20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That grant funds may be used for resident and community services, community development, and affordable housing needs in the community, and for conversion of vacant or foreclosed properties to affordable housing: *Provided further*, That the use of funds made available under this heading shall not be deemed to be public housing notwithstanding section 3(b)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That grantees shall commit to an additional period of affordability determined by the Secretary of not fewer than 20 years: *Provided further*, That grantees shall undertake comprehensive local planning with input from residents and the community, and that grantees shall provide a match in State, local, other Federal or private funds: *Provided further*, That grantees may include local governments, tribal entities, public housing authorities, and nonprofits: *Provided further*, That for-profit developers may apply jointly with a public entity: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, a grantee shall be treated as a public housing agency under section 26 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437x), and grants under this heading shall be subject to the regulations issued by the Secretary to implement such section: *Provided further*, That such grantees shall create partnerships with other local organizations including assisted housing owners, service agencies, and resident organizations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall consult with the Secretaries of Education, Labor, Transportation, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, and Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to coordinate and leverage other appropriate Federal resources: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures, remaining from funds appropriated under the heading ''Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)'' in fiscal year 2011 and prior fiscal years may be used for purposes under this heading, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY

For the Family Self-Sufficiency program to support family self-sufficiency coordinators under section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate the use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of such Act with public and private resources, and enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, $75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, by Federal Register notice, waive or specify alternative requirements under sections b(3), b(4), b(5), or c(1) of section 23 of such Act in order to facilitate the operation of a unified self-sufficiency program for individuals receiving assistance under different provisions of the Act, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That owners of multifamily properties with project-based subsidy contracts under section 8 may compete for funding under this heading and/or voluntarily make a Family Self-Sufficiency program available to the assisted tenants of such property in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such procedures established pursuant to the previous proviso shall permit participating tenants to accrue escrow funds in accordance with section 23(d)(2) and shall allow owners to use funding from residual receipt accounts to hire coordinators for their own Family Self-Sufficiency program.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), $650,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act with the need component based on single-race census data and with the need component based on multi-race census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, $3,500,000 shall be contracted for assistance for national or regional organizations representing Native American housing interests for providing training and technical assistance to Indian housing authorities and tribally designated housing entities as authorized under NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under the previous proviso, not less than $2,000,000 shall be made available for a national organization as authorized under section 703 of NAHASDA (25 U.S.C. 4212): *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, $2,000,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of such Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to $300,000 for related travel: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $2,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $17,452,007: *Provided further*, That the Department will notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, notwithstanding section 302(d) of NAHASDA, if on January 1, 2016, a recipient's total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department's line of credit control system is greater than three times the formula allocation it would otherwise receive under this heading, the Secretary shall adjust that recipient's formula allocation down by the difference between its total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department's line of credit control system on January 1, 2016, and three times the formula allocation it would otherwise receive: *Provided further*, That grant amounts not allocated to a recipient pursuant to the previous proviso shall be allocated under the need component of the formula proportionately among all other Indian tribes not subject to an adjustment: *Provided further*, That the two previous

provisos shall not apply to any Indian tribe that would otherwise receive a formula allocation of less than $5,000,000: *Provided further*, That to take effect, the three previous provisos do not require the issuance of any regulation.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), $8,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to $1,269,841,270, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That up to $750,000 of this amount may be for administrative contract expenses including management processes and systems to carry out the loan guarantee program.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), $332,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that initially were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act from funds made available under this heading in fiscal year 2010 and prior fiscal years that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts under such section: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

□ 2345

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 116, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, since 1992, the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS has provided a vital safety net. In the United States, 50,000 people become infected with HIV every year, and 1.2 million people are living with HIV/AIDS. More than 500,000 of these individuals will need some form of housing assistance during the course of their illness, but 145,000 individuals have unmet housing needs.

HOPWA combines housing support with additional services to help people living with HIV/AIDS and their families stay in stable, safe housing; manage their illness; and remain active in their communities. Housing interventions are critical in our continued fight against HIV/AIDS, and research clearly shows that stable housing leads to better health outcomes.

Providing stable housing to people living with HIV/AIDS reduces the risk of transmission to a partner by 96 percent; it reduces emergency room visits and expense to the public by 36 percent and hospitalizations by 57 percent. In other words, investing a modest amount in HOPWA today saves us millions, if not billions of Federal taxpayer dollars in the future.

HOPWA is the only Federal housing program to provide cities and States with dedicated resources to address the housing crisis facing people living with HIV/AIDS, and the program traditionally enjoys strong bipartisan support.

Congressional support for HOPWA is clear in this legislation. While nearly every other program in the bill has been slashed by millions of dollars and often funded at levels below the point of actually functioning, HOPWA saw a slight increase in funding during the committee's consideration of the bill.

Some hail the bill's slim $332 million for HOPWA as a victory. I also applaud any additional funding for HOPWA, but I cannot call it a victory to fund this program below its 2010 funding level when wait lists for HOPWA services continue to grow and thousands of Americans die on the streets and in shelters because we refuse to provide a few extra million dollars to provide them with the care they need.

I will not claim that my amendment completely solves that problem. The National AIDS Housing Coalition estimates that, in FY16, they will need $364 million to provide HOPWA services to those who need them and to fund vital administrative support to improve the program.

To reach that goal, we would need to find $32 million somewhere in this bill to transfer to HOPWA, but the funding levels we are considering today are so abysmally low, it is nearly impossible to move that much money without gutting other important programs.

What we do, at the very least, is pass my amendment to restore HOPWA to its FY10 funding level of $335 million, a scant $3 million increase. That funding level makes only a small dent in HOPWA's real need, but it will give hundreds more people and families access to lifesaving services. It is a very small step, but it is in the right direction, and I believe if we have the chance to save even one life, let alone hundreds, we have a duty to act.

To protect those living with HIV/AIDS and to stay within the House rules, my amendment offsets this additional funding to cuts to HUD's information technology fund.

I recognize the importance of providing HUD with phones and computers and understand the chairman and ranking member's concerns about additional cuts to this account, but nothing is more important than, quite simply, saving lives.

We must pass this amendment and give those families battling HIV/AIDS a fighting chance. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, let me inquire of the chairman, does he plan to claim the time in opposition?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I will not be claiming the time in opposition.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, although, as a formality, I will then claim that time, although I am not opposed; I am enthusiastically in support of Mr. NADLER's amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do want to take a little extra time to mention some things connected to this that I think need to come to our colleagues' attention.

First of all, this is not an ideal offset that Mr. NADLER has chosen. This is simply an example of the problem we have had all evening. Any funding amendment will fill only one hole by digging another, and so that is just the reality we are dealing with.

I do support this amendment. It runs the risk of further delaying HUD's acquisition of improved IT systems. We are going to need to attend to that. In this bill, HUD's IT account is already $150 million below the fiscal year '15 level and $234 million below the President's request. This is not an account that has a lot to spare, so I hope we can revisit that.

It may be relatively easy to target this funding line. We have got to provide HUD with the tools it needs to properly administer HOPWA and other programs.

We need, of course, eventually, a bipartisan budget agreement that will allow for a more credible bill that will adequately fund HOPWA and HUD's IT account both, both of those.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, I, in addition, hope that the chairman and other longtime supporters of HOPWA are

going to be able to work—we are all going to be able to work together moving forward to get this HOPWA formula updated once and for all.

The formula hasn't been updated for the distribution of funds, the allocation of funds, that formula hasn't been updated since the inception of program in the early nineties. Without an update, many Americans who are living with HIV in areas of the country with the fastest growing infection rates—namely, the South and rural America—are not getting the housing support they desperately need.

As a Member from a State with an AIDS death rate higher than the national average, this issue, getting this formula right, is a matter of life and death for many of my constituents.

As we work on this bill in the months to come, try to get the funding levels where they need to be, we also very much need to address that formula issue, and I pledge my readiness to work with colleagues to have an equitable funding formula.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I won't use it.

I simply want to express my appreciation first to the ranking member for supporting the amendment, despite the very painful offset which he will have to deal with, which I won't have to deal with, except as a single Member of the House.

I want to thank the chairman for not opposing this amendment. This amendment is a matter of life or death for a large number of people, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, $3,060,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided, $3,000,000,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (''the Act'' herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That a metropolitan city, urban county, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe, or insular area that directly or indirectly receives funds under this heading may not sell, trade, or otherwise transfer all or any portion of such funds to another such entity in exchange for any other funds, credits or non-Federal considerations, but must use such funds for activities eligible under title I of the Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 105(e)(1) of the Act, no funds provided under this heading may be provided to a for-profit entity for an economic development project under section 105(a)(17) unless such project has been evaluated and selected in accordance with guidelines required under subparagraph (e)(2): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (''EDI'') or Neighborhood Initiatives activities, Rural Innovation Fund, or for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307): *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading $60,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 204 of this Act), up to $3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2016, commitments to guarantee loans under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5308), any part of which is guaranteed, shall not exceed a total principal amount of $300,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in subsection (k) of such section 108: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall collect fees from borrowers, notwithstanding subsection (m) of such section 108, to result in a credit subsidy cost of zero for guaranteeing such loans, and any such fees shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That all unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading are hereby permanently rescinded.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, $767,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the amount made available under this heading, the threshold reduction requirements in sections 216(10) and 217(b)(4) of such Act shall not apply to allocations of such amount: *Provided further*, That the requirements under provisos 2 through 6 under this heading for fiscal year 2012 and such requirements applicable pursuant to the ''Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013'', shall not apply to any project to which funds were committed on or after August 23, 2013, but such projects shall instead be governed by the Final Rule titled ''Home Investment Partnerships Program; Improving Performance and Accountability; Updating Property Standards'' which became effective on such date: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B)(i) or (2)(B)(i) of section 1337(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4567(a)), amounts allocated under such paragraphs shall be credited to, made available, and merged with this account: *Provided further*, That no amounts made available by any provision of law may be transferred, reprogrammed, or credited to the Housing Trust Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the ''Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—HOME Investment Partnerships Program'' account, after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(increased by $293,000,000)''.

In the ''Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—HOME Investment Partnerships Program'' account, strike the last two provisos.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me please start by acknowledging the Honorable MAXINE WATERS. What I present tonight is an amendment that she actually authored, and I would like to present it. In so doing, I want to remind us that this amendment deals with two programs that are near and dear to my heart, the affordable housing trust fund and the HOME program.

These programs are near and dear to my heart because the greatness of a nation will not be measured by how we treat people who live in the suites of life, how we treat the well off, the well heeled, and the well to do.

The greatness of a nation is often measured by how we treat people who live in the streets of life, those who are too often among the least, the last, and the lost.

This amendment seeks to provide aid and comfort for those who, but for the grace of God, could be you or me, but those who find themselves living in the streets of life. This amendment, in dealing with the affordable housing trust fund, will restore it.

The current bill would actually eliminate the affordable housing trust fund. This amendment provides some degree of aid and comfort for those who are living at 30 percent of the area median income, wherever they happen to live.

In Ms. MAXINE WATERS' district, this would mean an annual income of $20,200 for a family of four. I would dare say that there are few among us who

would dare attempt to live off of $20,200 as an individual. This helps a family of four with $20,200. This is what the affordable housing trust fund does. It helps people who are extremely low of income.

My hope is that we will be able to prevent this elimination of the affordable housing trust fund, and this amendment does it.

This amendment also will help those who can benefit from the HOME program. The HOME program can serve a family of four that earns up to $53,900 per year. This program is a partnership, if you will, between State, municipal, and Federal Government.

It has been a program that has been of great benefit across the length and breadth of this country. There is not a State in the country, I would dare say, that has not benefited from the HOME program.

It is my hope that we can meet the President's request for the HOME program. Right now, it is about $293 million short of the President's request. This amendment would add that $293 million that the President has requested.

I started by indicating that these are two programs that are near and dear to me. Mr. Chairman, I believe that Ruth Meltzer was right when she indicated that some measure their lives by days and years, others by heartthrobs, passions, and tears; but the surest measure under God's sun is what for others in your lifetime have you done.

These programs afford us an opportunity to do for others, to be a blessing to those that have not been as blessed as we. My hope is that we will find a way to salvage both of these programs, restore the HOME program to what the President has requested, and prevent the affordable housing trust fund from finding its way to the ash heap of history.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill.

The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)3 of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, which states the following:

''It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.''

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. If I may, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, understanding the rules, I still would beseech us, Mr. Chairman, to give some consideration to the salvation of these programs.

Perhaps I will be able to work with the chairman and in some way help those who are not in a position to help themselves.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Florida, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

□ 0000

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program, as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended, $50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be made available to the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $35,000,000 shall be made available for the second, third, and fourth capacity building activities authorized under section 4(a) of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), of which not less than $5,000,000 shall be made available for rural capacity building activities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building by national rural housing organizations with experience assessing national rural conditions and providing financing, training, technical assistance, information, and research to local nonprofits, local governments and Indian Tribes serving high need rural communities.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency solutions grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; the continuum of care program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; and the rural housing stability assistance program as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of such Act, $2,185,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That any rental assistance amounts that are recaptured under such continuum of care program shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That not less than $250,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such emergency solutions grants program: *Provided further*, That not less than $1,905,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such continuum of care and rural housing stability assistance programs: *Provided further*, That up to $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for supportive services under the continuum of care program and the rural housing stability assistance program shall be matched by not less than 25 percent in cash or in kind by each grantee: *Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may use (or could have used) as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies unless there is (or was) a specific statutory prohibition on any such use of any such funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall establish minimum project performance thresholds for each grantee under the continuum of care program based on program performance data: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be available to renew any expiring contract or amendment to a contract funded under the continuum of care program unless the Secretary determines that the expiring contract or amendment to a contract is needed under the applicable continuum of care and meets appropriate program requirements, financial standards, and performance measures, including the minimum performance thresholds established in the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall prioritize funding under the continuum of care program to grant applications that demonstrate a capacity to reallocate funding from lower performing projects to higher performing projects: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible: *Provided further*, That with respect to funds provided under this heading for the continuum of care program for fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 provision of permanent housing rental assistance may be administered by private nonprofit organizations: *Provided further*, That any unobligated amounts remaining from funds appropriated under this heading in fiscal year 2012 and prior years for project-based rental assistance for rehabilitation projects with 10-year grant terms may be used for purposes under this heading, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all balances for Shelter Plus Care renewals previously funded from the Shelter Plus Care Renewal account and transferred to this account shall be available, if recaptured, for continuum of care renewals in fiscal year 2016: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation from amounts allocated (which may represent initial or final amounts allocated) for the emergency solutions grant program within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) (''the Act''), not otherwise provided for, $10,254,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2015 (in addition to the

$400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2015), and $400,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2016: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading shall be available for expiring or terminating section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the total amounts provided under this heading, not to exceed $150,000,000 shall be available for performance-based contract administrators for section 8 project-based assistance, for carrying out 42 U.S.C. 1437(f): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may also use such amounts in the previous proviso for performance-based contract administrators for the administration of: interest reduction payments pursuant to section 236(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(a)); rent supplement payments pursuant to section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s); section 236(f)(2) rental assistance payments (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)(2)); project rental assistance contracts for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q); project rental assistance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)); project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667); and loans under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667): *Provided further*, That amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading ''Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing'', or the heading ''Housing Certificate Fund'', may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts or for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 8 project-based Housing Assistance Payments contract that authorizes HUD or a Housing Finance Agency to require that surplus project funds be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and that are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amount otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

For amendments to capital advance contracts for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for senior preservation rental assistance contracts, including renewals, as authorized by section 811(e) of the American Housing and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000, as amended, and for supportive services associated with the housing, $414,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, up to $77,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 202 projects: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That upon request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 202 project rental assistance contract, and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until September 30, 2019, for purposes under this heading, and shall be in addition to the amounts otherwise provided under this heading for such purposes: *Provided further*, That in addition, of the prior year unobligated balances of funds, including recaptures and carryover, made available under this heading, $47,000,000 shall be used for an additional amount for the purposes provided under this heading, notwithstanding any purpose for which originally appropriated.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 105, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 113, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to increase the housing for the elderly account in this bill by $2.5 million and decrease the policy development and research account within the Department of Housing and Urban Development by an equal amount.

I hope my good friend from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) across the aisle agrees with me on this one. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

For amendments to capital advance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act and for project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–372; 73 Stat. 667), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, for project rental assistance to State housing finance agencies and other appropriate entities as authorized under section 811(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Housing Act, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, $152,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 811 projects: *Provided further*, That, in this fiscal year, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 811 project rental assistance contract and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until September 30, 2019: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading for the purposes authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds transferred to or appropriated under this heading may be used for the current purposes authorized under this heading notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds originally were appropriated.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance excluding loans, as authorized under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, $47,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, including up to $4,500,000 for administrative contract services: *Provided*, That grants made available from amounts provided under this heading shall be awarded within 180 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be used for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners, both current and prospective, with respect to property maintenance, financial management/literacy, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions, meeting their financial needs, and fulfilling the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership; for program administration; and for housing counselor training: *Provided further*, That for purposes of providing such grants from amounts provided under this heading, the Secretary may enter into multiyear agreements as is appropriate, subject to the availability of annual appropriations.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

For amendments to contracts under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s) and section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) in State-aided, noninsured rental housing projects, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount, together with unobligated balances from recaptured amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 2006 from terminated contracts under such sections of law, and any unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated

under this heading after fiscal year 2005, shall also be available for extensions of up to one year for expiring contracts under such sections of law.

PAYMENT TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to $11,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $11,000,000 is to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at zero, and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation: *Provided further*, That for the dispute resolution and installation programs, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees from any program participant: *Provided further*, That such collections shall be deposited into the Fund, and the Secretary, as provided herein, may use such collections, as well as fees collected under section 620, for necessary expenses of such Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the requirements of section 620 of such Act, the Secretary may carry out responsibilities of the Secretary under such Act through the use of approved service providers that are paid directly by the recipients of their services.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee single family loans insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund shall not exceed $400,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2016, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed $5,000,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amount in the previous proviso shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund: *Provided Further*, That for administrative contract expenses of the Federal Housing Administration, $130,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee loans insured under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), shall not exceed $30,000,000,000 in total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2016, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed $5,000,000, which shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed $500,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That $23,000,000 shall be available for necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Government National Mortgage Association: *Provided further*, That receipts from Commitment and Multiclass fees collected pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, $52,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project: *Provided further*, That for non-competitive agreements entered into in accordance with the previous two provisos, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall comply with section 2(b) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–282, 31 U.S.C. note) in lieu of compliance with section 102(a)(4)(C) with respect to documentation of award decisions: *Provided further*, That prior to obligation of technical assistance funding, the Secretary shall submit a plan, for approval, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on how it will allocate funding for this activity.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, $65,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary may assess and collect fees to cover the costs of the Fair Housing Training Academy, and may use such funds to provide such training: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant, or loan: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $300,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the creation and promotion of translated materials and other programs that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency in utilizing the services provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 114, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $28,375,000) (increased by $28,375,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman DIAZ-BALART as well as Ranking Member PRICE for their hard work on this bill and for preparing a bill that is the best we can do.

I do rise in support of an amendment that seeks to curb lawsuit abuse and help fund our local governments. This creates congressional intent to redirect funds away from the private enforcement account to the administrative enforcement account.

My amendment would decrease by $28.375 million the Private Enforcement Initiative and redirect those resources to the Administrative Enforcement Initiative in the Fair Housing Initiatives Program.

I believe that the most efficient and effective way to protect Fair Housing is through the Administrative Enforcement Initiative of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program, which helps State and local governments who administer laws that include rights and remedies every day. They act to help Fair Housing. They know their communities, and they can enforce in their communities best.

My amendment would help protect more consumers. In fact, I believe administrative enforcement is less expensive to taxpayers. It is more certain. It has faster resolution. It has less conflicts of interest than some of these nonprofit proxy agencies that use the Private Enforcement Initiative.

In fact, there is a 1997 GAO study, Mr. Chairman, that revealed that more than half of the Private Enforcement Initiative dollars were concentrated in just 6 of the 27 awardees. I have asked the GAO to update that study and to look at private enforcement as far as its effectiveness because, as I said, it is slower and more expensive than administrative enforcement.

Therefore, I would ask my colleagues to support my congressional intent amendment to redirect these resources to our State and local governments who can more effectively administer justice. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have only recently received it, and I haven't fully analyzed

it; but, on the face of it, it does appear to be shifting the support among private enforcement and public enforcement, the kind of private enforcement that involves community-based groups, that involves often more flexible ways of resolving conflicts and issues.

I simply think it is ill advised here tonight to undertake that kind of internal shifting of funds and would suggest that we reject this, understanding that we can return to it and examine this more fully to see exactly what is implied by this kind of internal shifting of funds within Fair Housing accounts.

I suggest that we reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to my colleague from North Carolina that administrative enforcement is more effective, it is more efficient. That is why we should redirect these resources internally inside Fair Housing. It doesn't change Fair Housing dollars one penny.

It redirects the resources to more efficient and effective means of enforcement, from folks who enforce these laws every day and can do it faster and more effectively, to make sure the people that might be discriminated against get their redress sooner.

I am excited about this amendment. I think it will lead to much more effective enforcement. It does so without the conflict of interest of these private organizations that can have conflicts of interest, and that has been another issue that I have asked the GAO to look at in my letter to them today.

I apologize that the minority is just seeing this for the first time. I did talk about it at the Rules Committee the other day. It is something I have been working on just for a couple of days since that Rules Committee meeting when it came up. I apologized for not giving the gentleman from North Carolina more notice.

I would urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 114, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $150,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to raise the cap on funding for the Limited English Proficiency Initiative under the Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity section of the bill by 50 percent.

I want to highlight that we are not taking away anything from other programs. We are simply lifting the cap on this particular initiative. This amendment has passed by voice vote for the last 2 years, and it is my hope that it will do so again.

There are more than 40 million Americans who do not speak English as their first language. This tiny, but vital program demonstrates to the American people that we have equal protection under the law, regardless of what language we speak.

I hope to once again have the support of my friend from Florida and from the House as a whole.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND HEALTHY HOMES

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, $75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That up to $15,000,000 of that amount shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other provisions of the law that further the purposes of such Act, a grant under the Healthy Homes Initiative, or the Lead Technical Studies program under this heading or under prior appropriations Acts for such purposes under this heading, shall be considered to be funds for a special project for purposes of section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading in this or prior appropriations Acts, and that still remain available, may be used for any purpose under this heading notwithstanding the purpose for which such amounts were appropriated if a program competition is undersubscribed and there are other program competitions under this heading that are oversubscribed.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUND

For the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems, for the continuing operation and maintenance of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, and for program-related maintenance activities, $100,000,000: *Provided*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund from amounts appropriated by previously enacted appropriations Acts may be used for the purposes specified under this Fund, in addition to any other information technology purposes for which such amounts were appropriated.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $126,000,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 201. Eighty five percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 85 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate. Any amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded, returned to the Treasury, or otherwise awarded by September 30, 2016 shall be rescinded or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2016 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a nonfrivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. Sections 203 and 209 of division C of Public Law 112–55 (125 Stat. 693–694) shall apply during fiscal year 2016 as if such sections were included in this title, except that during such fiscal year such sections shall be applied by substituting ''fiscal year 2016'' for ''fiscal year 2011'' and for ''fiscal year 2012'' each place such terms appear, and shall be amended to reflect revised delineations of statistical areas established by the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3504(e)(3), 31 U.S.C. 1104(d), and Executive Order No. 10253.

SEC. 204. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545).

SEC. 205. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for the services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-11).

SEC. 206. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 207. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the

limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2016 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

SEC. 209. The President's formal budget request for fiscal year 2017, as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development's congressional budget justifications to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall use the identical account and sub-account structure provided under this Act.

SEC. 210. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California, and the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California and the States of Alaska, Iowa and Mississippi that chooses not to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of section 8 assistance on the board of directors or a similar governing board shall establish an advisory board of not less than six residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 211. No funds provided under this title may be used for an audit of the Government National Mortgage Association that makes applicable requirements under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

SEC. 212. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the conditions listed under this section, for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may authorize the transfer of some or all project-based assistance, debt held or insured by the Secretary and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions if any, associated with one or more multifamily housing project or projects to another multifamily housing project or projects.

(b) Transfers of project-based assistance under this section may be done in phases to accommodate the financing and other requirements related to rehabilitating or constructing the project or projects to which the assistance is transferred, to ensure that such project or projects meet the standards under subsection (c).

(c) The transfer authorized in subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Number and bedroom size of units.—

(A) For occupied units in the transferring project: the number of low-income and very low-income units and the configuration (i.e., bedroom size) provided by the transferring project shall be no less than when transferred to the receiving project or projects and the net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided to the transferring project shall remain the same in the receiving project or projects.

(B) For unoccupied units in the transferring project: the Secretary may authorize a reduction in the number of dwelling units in the receiving project or projects to allow for a reconfiguration of bedroom sizes to meet current market demands, as determined by the Secretary and provided there is no increase in the project-based assistance budget authority.

(2) The transferring project shall, as determined by the Secretary, be either physically obsolete or economically nonviable.

(3) The receiving project or projects shall meet or exceed applicable physical standards established by the Secretary.

(4) The owner or mortgagor of the transferring project shall notify and consult with the tenants residing in the transferring project and provide a certification of approval by all appropriate local governmental officials.

(5) The tenants of the transferring project who remain eligible for assistance to be provided by the receiving project or projects shall not be required to vacate their units in the transferring project or projects until new units in the receiving project are available for occupancy.

(6) The Secretary determines that this transfer is in the best interest of the tenants.

(7) If either the transferring project or the receiving project or projects meets the condition specified in subsection (d)(2)(A), any lien on the receiving project resulting from additional financing obtained by the owner shall be subordinate to any FHA-insured mortgage lien transferred to, or placed on, such project by the Secretary, except that the Secretary may waive this requirement upon determination that such a waiver is necessary to facilitate the financing of acquisition, construction, and/or rehabilitation of the receiving project or projects.

(8) If the transferring project meets the requirements of subsection (d)(2), the owner or mortgagor of the receiving project or projects shall execute and record either a continuation of the existing use agreement or a new use agreement for the project where, in either case, any use restrictions in such agreement are of no lesser duration than the existing use restrictions.

(9) The transfer does not increase the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended) of any FHA-insured mortgage, except to the extent that appropriations are provided in advance for the amount of any such increased cost.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms ''low-income'' and ''very low-income'' shall have the meanings provided by the statute and/or regulations governing the program under which the project is insured or assisted;

(2) the term ''multifamily housing project'' means housing that meets one of the following conditions—

(A) housing that is subject to a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act;

(B) housing that has project-based assistance attached to the structure including projects undergoing mark to market debt restructuring under the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Housing Act;

(C) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(D) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(E) housing that is assisted under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act; or

(F) housing or vacant land that is subject to a use agreement;

(3) the term ''project-based assistance'' means—

(A) assistance provided under section 8(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(B) assistance for housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of such Act (as such section existed immediately before October 1, 1983);

(C) rent supplement payments under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(D) interest reduction payments under section 236 and/or additional assistance payments under section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act;

(E) assistance payments made under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959; and

(F) assistance payments made under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act;

(4) the term ''receiving project or projects'' means the multifamily housing project or projects to which some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions are to be transferred;

(5) the term ''transferring project'' means the multifamily housing project which is transferring some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and the statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions to the receiving project or projects; and

(6) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) PUBLIC NOTICE AND RESEARCH REPORT.—

(1) The Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register the terms and conditions, including criteria for HUD approval, of transfers pursuant to this section no later than 30 days before the effective date of such notice.

(2) The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the transfer authority under this section, including the effect of such transfers on the operational efficiency, contract rents, physical and financial conditions, and long-term preservation of the affected properties.

SEC. 213. (a) No assistance shall be provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to any individual who—

(1) is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education (as defined under section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002));

(2) is under 24 years of age;

(3) is not a veteran;

(4) is unmarried;

(5) does not have a dependent child;

(6) is not a person with disabilities, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(3)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(3)(E)) and was not receiving assistance under such section 8 as of November 30, 2005; and

(7) is not otherwise individually eligible, or has parents who, individually or jointly, are

not eligible, to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(b) For purposes of determining the eligibility of a person to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), any financial assistance (in excess of amounts received for tuition and any other required fees and charges) that an individual receives under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), from private sources, or an institution of higher education (as defined under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall be considered income to that individual, except for a person over the age of 23 with dependent children.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 156, line 8 be considered read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 156, line 8, is as follows:

SEC. 214. The funds made available for Native Alaskans under the heading ''Native American Housing Block Grants'' in title II of this Act shall be allocated to the same Native Alaskan housing block grant recipients that received funds in fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 215. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20(g)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until September 30, 2016, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under such section 255.

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2016, in managing and disposing of any multifamily property that is owned or has a mortgage held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and during the process of foreclosure on any property with a contract for rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or other Federal programs, the Secretary shall maintain any rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and other programs that are attached to any dwelling units in the property. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that such a multifamily property owned or held by the Secretary is not feasible for continued rental assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (''MAHRAA'') and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect prior to foreclosure, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other available remedies, such as partial abatements or receivership. After disposition of any multifamily property described under this section, the contract and allowable rent levels on such properties shall be subject to the requirements under section 524 of MAHRAA.

SEC. 217. The commitment authority funded by fees as provided under the heading ''Community Development Loan Guarantees Program Account'' may be used to guarantee, or make commitments to guarantee, notes or other obligations issued by any State on behalf of non-entitlement communities in the State in accordance with the requirements of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided*, That any State receiving such a guarantee or commitment shall distribute all funds subject to such guarantee to the units of general local government in non-entitlement areas that received the commitment.

SEC. 218. Public housing agencies that own and operate 400 or fewer public housing units may elect to be exempt from any asset management requirement imposed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the operating fund rule: *Provided*, That an agency seeking a discontinuance of a reduction of subsidy under the operating fund formula shall not be exempt from asset management requirements.

SEC. 219. With respect to the use of amounts provided in this Act and in future Acts for the operation, capital improvement and management of public housing as authorized by sections 9(d) and 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(d) and (e)), the Secretary shall not impose any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits in any way the use of capital funds for central office costs pursuant to section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(g)(1), (2)): *Provided*, That a public housing agency may not use capital funds authorized under section 9(d) for activities that are eligible under section 9(e) for assistance with amounts from the operating fund in excess of the amounts permitted under section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2).

SEC. 220. No official or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives. The Chief Financial Officer shall ensure that there is a trained allotment holder for each HUD sub-office under the accounts ''Executive Offices'' and ''Administrative Support Offices'', as well as each account receiving appropriations for ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'', ''Government National Mortgage Association—Guarantees of Mortgage-Backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account'', and ''Office of Inspector General'' within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 221. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall, for fiscal year 2016, notify the public through the Federal Register and other means, as determined appropriate, of the issuance of a notice of the availability of assistance or notice of funding availability (NOFA) for any program or discretionary fund administered by the Secretary that is to be competitively awarded. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2016, the Secretary may make the NOFA available only on the Internet at the appropriate Government web site or through other electronic media, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 222. Payment of attorney fees in program-related litigation must be paid from the individual program office and Office of General Counsel personnel funding. The annual budget submissions for program offices and Office of General Counsel personnel funding must include program-related litigation costs for attorney fees as a separate line item request.

SEC. 223. The Disaster Housing Assistance Programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be considered a ''program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development'' under section 904 of the McKinney Act for the purpose of income verifications and matching.

SEC. 224. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall take the required actions under subsection (b) when a multifamily housing project with a section 8 contract or contract for similar project-based assistance:

(1) receives a Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC) score of 30 or less; or

(2) receives a REAC score between 31 and 59 and:

(A) fails to certify in writing to HUD within 60 days that all deficiencies have been corrected; or

(B) receives consecutive scores of less than 60 on REAC inspections.

Such requirements shall apply to insured and noninsured projects with assistance attached to the units under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), but do not apply to such units assisted under section 8(o)(13) (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13)) or to public housing units assisted with capital or operating funds under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g).

(b) The Secretary shall take the following required actions as authorized under subsection (a)—

(1) The Secretary shall notify the owner and provide an opportunity for response within 30 days. If the violations remain, the Secretary shall develop a Compliance, Disposition and Enforcement Plan within 60 days, with a specified timetable for correcting all deficiencies. The Secretary shall provide notice of the Plan to the owner, tenants, the local government, any mortgagees, and any contract administrator.

(2) At the end of the term of the Compliance, Disposition and Enforcement Plan, if the owner fails to fully comply with such plan, the Secretary may require immediate replacement of project management with a management agent approved by the Secretary, and shall take one or more of the following actions, and provide additional notice of those actions to the owner and the parties specified above:

(A) impose civil money penalties;

(B) abate the section 8 contract, including partial abatement, as determined by the Secretary, until all deficiencies have been corrected;

(C) pursue transfer of the project to an owner, approved by the Secretary under established procedures, which will be obligated to promptly make all required repairs and to accept renewal of the assistance contract as long as such renewal is offered; or

(D) seek judicial appointment of a receiver to manage the property and cure all project deficiencies or seek a judicial order of specific performance requiring the owner to cure all project deficiencies.

(c) The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other remedies set forth above. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that the property is not feasible for continued rental

assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (''MAHRAA'') and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall report semi-annually on all properties covered by this section that are assessed through the Real Estate Assessment Center and have physical inspection scores of less than 30 or have consecutive physical inspection scores of less than 60. The report shall include:

(1) The enforcement actions being taken to address such conditions, including imposition of civil money penalties and termination of subsidies, and identify properties that have such conditions multiple times; and

(2) Actions that the Department of Housing and Urban Development is taking to protect tenants of such identified properties.

SEC. 225. None of the funds made available by this Act, or any other Act, for purposes authorized under section 8 (only with respect to the tenant-based rental assistance program) and section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.), may be used by any public housing agency for any amount of salary, including bonuses, for the chief executive officer of which, or any other official or employee of which, that exceeds the annual rate of basic pay payable for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule at any time during any public housing agency fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 226. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the doctoral dissertation research grant program at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 227. None of the funds in this Act provided to the Department of Housing and Urban Development may be used to make a grant award unless the Secretary notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any project, State, locality, housing authority, tribe, nonprofit organization, or other entity selected to receive a grant award is announced by the Department or its offices.

SEC. 228. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require or enforce the Physical Needs Assessment (PNA).

SEC. 229. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used by the Federal Housing Administration, the Government National Mortgage Administration, or the Department of Housing and Urban Development to insure, securitize, or establish a Federal guarantee of any mortgage or mortgage backed security that refinances or otherwise replaces a mortgage that has been subject to eminent domain condemnation or seizure, by a state, municipality, or any other political subdivision of a state.

SEC. 230. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to terminate the status of a unit of general local government as a metropolitan city (as defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302)) with respect to grants under section 106 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 5306).

SEC. 231. Amounts made available under this Act which are either appropriated, allocated, advanced on a reimbursable basis, or transferred to the Office of Policy Development and Research in the Department of Housing and Urban Development and functions thereof, for research, evaluation, or statistical purposes, and which are unexpended at the time of completion of a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, may be deobligated and shall immediately become available and may be reobligated in that fiscal year or the subsequent fiscal year for the research, evaluation, or statistical purposes for which the amounts are made available to that Office subject to reprogramming requirements in Section 405 of this Act.

SEC. 232. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to require a recipient or sub-recipient of funding for the purpose of land acquisition, affordable housing construction, or affordable housing rehabilitation to meet Energy Star standards or any other energy efficiency standards that exceed the requirements of applicable State and local building codes.

SEC. 233. Of the unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated in section 1497(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note) and section 2301(a) of title III of division B of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–289; 42 U.S.C. 5301 note), $7,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

SEC. 234. (a) All unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the heading ''Rural Housing and Economic Development'' are hereby rescinded.

(b) Effective October 1, 2015, all unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for accounts under the headings ''Management and Administration'' and ''Program Office Salaries and Expenses'' in division K of Public Law 113–235 are rescinded.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2016''.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Access Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, $7,548,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 307), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902, $25,660,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $23,999,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern the obtaining of such services within the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Office of Inspector General, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern such selections, appointments, and employment within Amtrak: *Provided further*, That concurrent with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2017, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2017 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS–15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902), $103,981,000, of which not to exceed $2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses. The amounts made available to the National Transportation Safety Board in this Act include amounts necessary to make lease payments on an obligation incurred in fiscal year 2001 for a capital lease.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), $135,000,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be for a multi-family rental housing program: *Provided*, That in addition, $42,000,000 shall be made available until expended to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for mortgage foreclosure mitigation activities, under the following terms and conditions:

(1) The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC) shall make grants to counseling intermediaries approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (with match to be determined by NRC based on affordability and the economic conditions of an area; a match also may be waived by NRC based on the aforementioned conditions) to provide mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance primarily to States and areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures to help eliminate the default and foreclosure of mortgages of owner-occupied single-family homes that are at risk of such foreclosure. Other than areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures, grants may also be provided to approved counseling intermediaries based on a geographic analysis of the Nation by NRC which determines where there is a prevalence of mortgages that are risky and likely to fail, including any trends for mortgages that are likely to default and face foreclosure. A State Housing Finance Agency may also be eligible where the State Housing Finance Agency meets all the requirements under this paragraph. A

HUD-approved counseling intermediary shall meet certain mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance counseling requirements, as determined by NRC, and shall be approved by HUD or NRC as meeting these requirements.

(2) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance shall only be made available to homeowners of owner-occupied homes with mortgages in default or in danger of default. These mortgages shall likely be subject to a foreclosure action and homeowners will be provided such assistance that shall consist of activities that are likely to prevent foreclosures and result in the long-term affordability of the mortgage retained pursuant to such activity or another positive outcome for the homeowner. No funds made available under this paragraph may be provided directly to lenders or homeowners to discharge outstanding mortgage balances or for any other direct debt reduction payments.

(3) The use of mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance by approved counseling intermediaries and State Housing Finance Agencies shall involve a reasonable analysis of the borrower's financial situation, an evaluation of the current value of the property that is subject to the mortgage, counseling regarding the assumption of the mortgage by another non-Federal party, counseling regarding the possible purchase of the mortgage by a non-Federal third party, counseling and advice of all likely restructuring and refinancing strategies or the approval of a work-out strategy by all interested parties.

(4) NRC may provide up to 15 percent of the total funds under this paragraph to its own charter members with expertise in foreclosure prevention counseling, subject to a certification by NRC that the procedures for selection do not consist of any procedures or activities that could be construed as a conflict of interest or have the appearance of impropriety.

(5) HUD-approved counseling entities and State Housing Finance Agencies receiving funds under this paragraph shall have demonstrated experience in successfully working with financial institutions as well as borrowers facing default, delinquency and foreclosure as well as documented counseling capacity, outreach capacity, past successful performance and positive outcomes with documented counseling plans (including post mortgage foreclosure mitigation counseling), loan workout agreements and loan modification agreements. NRC may use other criteria to demonstrate capacity in underserved areas.

(6) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to $2,000,000 may be made available to build the mortgage foreclosure and default mitigation counseling capacity of counseling intermediaries through NRC training courses with HUD-approved counseling intermediaries and their partners, except that private financial institutions that participate in NRC training shall pay market rates for such training.

(7) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to 5 percent may be used for associated administrative expenses for NRC to carry out activities provided under this section.

(8) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance grants may include a budget for outreach and advertising, and training, as determined by NRC.

(9) NRC shall continue to report bi-annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as well as the Senate Banking Committee and House Financial Services Committee on its efforts to mitigate mortgage default.

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, $3,530,000.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 401. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 402. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 403. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through a procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 404. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or ''new age'' belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N–915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2016, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

(1) creates a new program;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose;

(5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less;

(6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures a branch, division, office, bureau, board, commission, agency, administration, or department different from the budget justifications submitted to the Committees on Appropriations or the table accompanying the explanatory statement accompanying this Act, whichever is more detailed, unless prior approval is received from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the report shall include:

(A) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the prior year enacted level, the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(B) a delineation in the table for each appropriation and its respective prior year enacted level by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and

(C) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

SEC. 406. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2016 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2016 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2017, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines under section 405 of this Act.

SEC. 407. No funds in this Act may be used to support any Federal, State, or local projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities: *Provided further*, That any use of funds for mass transit, railroad, airport, seaport or highway projects, as well as utility projects which benefit or serve the general public (including energy-related, communication-related, water-related and wastewater-related infrastructure), other structures designated for use by the general public or which have other common-carrier or public-utility functions that serve the general public and are subject to regulation and oversight by the government, and projects for the removal of an immediate threat to public health and safety or brownfields as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Public Law 107–118) shall be considered a public use for purposes of eminent domain.

SEC. 408. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly

held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his or her period of active military or naval service, and has within 90 days after his or her release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his or her former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his or her former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 410. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 411. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

SEC. 412. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class airline accommodations in contravention of sections 301–10.122 and 301–10.123 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 413. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to approve a new foreign air carrier permit under sections 41301 through 41305 of title 49, United States Code, or exemption application under section 40109 of that title of an air carrier already holding an air operators certificate issued by a country that is party to the U.S.-E.U.-Iceland-Norway Air Transport Agreement where such approval would contravene United States law or Article 17 bis of the U.S.-E.U.-Iceland-Norway Air Transport Agreement.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict or otherwise preclude the Secretary of Transportation from granting a foreign air carrier permit or an exemption to such an air carrier where such authorization is consistent with the U.S.-E.U.-Iceland-Norway Air Transport Agreement and United States law.

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Maritime Commission or the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to issue a license or certificate for a commercial vessel that docked or anchored within the previous 180 days within 7 miles of a port on property that was confiscated, in whole or in part, by the Cuban Government, as the terms confiscated, Cuban Government, and property are defined in paragraphs (4), (5), and (12)(A), respectively, of section 4 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6023).

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that portion of the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 415. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under Section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Private Enforcement Initiative of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program under section 561(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3616a(b)) and section 125.401 of the regulations of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (24 C.F.R. 125.401).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I will be fairly brief.

This is a followup amendment. We have already accepted the congressional intent that we will have a preference toward administrative enforcement. This is a followup limitation amendment that basically says we will not, for this calendar year, use the Private Enforcement Initiative.

As the gentleman from North Carolina said, we can always come back; but I think we need to have time for this GAO study that I have requested to come back because I would assert that administrative enforcement is less expensive to taxpayers than private enforcement.

It creates more certainty. It happens faster. It has less conflict of interest than the Private Enforcement Initiative. I would ask that my colleagues support this limitation amendment on the Private Enforcement Initiative for this year period.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0015

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Again, Mr. Chairman, let me say how unfortunate I believe it is that we are dealing with this kind of amendment in this setting here tonight without really having much notice, much ability to understand the full implications.

I do think that we need to appreciate the role of what the gentleman calls private organizations. We are really talking here about nonprofits, about mediators, about the kind of working out of complaints, working out of problems, informal work with landlords, the kind of thing that actually helps avoid legal action and avoid litigation. There is a lot that can be mediated, a lot of things can be worked out in the fair housing arena. There are many nonprofit groups that do a good job of doing that.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman apparently has lots of complaints about this, and there have been a couple of prominent cases. I am aware of that. But the notion that we would come in here tonight and make a change of this magnitude, of this importance, I simply don't think is responsible.

So I will speak for myself. I am perfectly willing to look at this matter down the road. I understand there may be some issues here, but this is a pretty drastic amendment, and you are taking a whole area here of mediation and informal conciliation, things that actually keep things out of the courts, keep things out of the legal system and out of litigation. I don't know why we would want to do that. It seems reckless to me.

I recommend that we reject this amendment and, at the same time, pledge to look at this carefully and work on it later.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Chair, does recognize that there are problems in the private enforcement initiative. He just admitted that. There is a lot of lawsuit abuse. In fact, many of these organizations sue first and ask questions later. They don't do their due diligence. They send interns in to actually look at these places and file lawsuits before they get the facts.

The gentleman asserted that we shouldn't make these kind of changes. That is why the people sent us here, to make things better. We are supposed to do it every day, and when we see problems, we need to fix them. This is a temporary, 1-year halt of the private enforcement initiative with the GAO study that is not directed in this bill, but I asked for by letter through the GAO, and they are always good about doing those when you ask them to. They haven't looked at this program since 1997.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to look at this program in detail. I would assert that our local and State governments can also do the mediation that the gentleman from North Carolina talked about, Mr. Chairman, and they can do it better, more efficiently, and without the conflicts of interest that some of these private organizations have done.

So I think we ought to give it a try. That is the great thing about an annual appropriations bill. Guess what; we get to do it again next year. I am certainly willing to admit if I am wrong and we find out through a GAO study that the private enforcement has worked well. But there have been articles in the paper about some of the lawsuit abuse that we have seen all across the country, and I think we should just take a strategic pause here and give the money to our State and local governments who can better enforce our laws. They do it every day, and they can do it through the mediation and things that the gentleman asserts that these private enforcement initiatives can do so well.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I think it will help make our fair housing laws better, and it will protect more consumers.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule during the 113th and 114th Congresses.

My amendment would expand the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of that contractor. It is my hope that this amendment will be noncontroversial, as it always has been, and again passed unanimously by the House.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 121.584 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will ensure that the FAA is doing everything that it can to certify that our aircraft are protected during a moment that pilots, flight attendants, and Federal law enforcement officers have all said that the aircraft is vulnerable to terror hijackings. Despite the effort to safeguard the cockpit after the 9/11 terror attacks, today, operational experience has highlighted that a critical vulnerability remains when a pilot must open the hardened, reinforced cockpit doors to eat, rest, or use the bathroom during long flights. Even the FAA recognizes that, ''During this door transition, the flight deck is vulnerable.''

Current FAA regulations require that the area outside the flight deck be secure before the reinforced cockpit door is opened. Currently, some airlines are using human shields or, in some cases, drink carts to try to block entry to the cockpit and claim it ''secure.'' But only one method has been thoroughly studied and proven to beat the threat of a trained hijacker exploiting this particular vulnerability, and that is an installed physical secondary barrier door. These barriers are light, inexpensive wire gates that are able to protect the flight deck long enough for the pilot to shut the reinforced door.

This double door security procedure is something that Israeli airlines have been using for over a decade. They understand the risk and how to mitigate it. A Cato study has shown these secondary barrier doors to be the most cost-effective way to protect the cockpit door when the reinforced door is opened.

This is not some hypothetical threat. We know for a fact that terrorists maintain their desire to exploit vulnerabilities in our aircraft safety protocols to bring down an airliner just like they did on September 11, 2001. A recent USA Today headline read, ''ISIS' Next Test Could Be a 9/11–Style Attack.'' In 2013, outgoing FBI Director Robert Mueller said that the terror scenario he fears most remains an attack with the use of an aircraft.

Perhaps no one knows the consequences of terrorists hijacking our aircraft more so than my constituent, Ellen Saracini. The terror hijackings of September 11 took the life of her husband, Victor Saracini, Captain of United Flight 175, which was hijacked and flown into the South Tower of the World Trade Center by al Qaeda terrorists.

Inspired by Ellen and the pilots and flight attendants that stand with her, I have been working with a bipartisan, bicameral group of lawmakers to have these commonsense, cost-effective security features installed on every single large passenger aircraft in the United States through my bill, H.R. 911, the Saracini Aviation Safety Act.

Some have pointed to the ''layered security'' approach to aircraft security as proof that we don't need secondary barriers, but one only need to read current headlines to see the huge gaps in our layered security. As we recently learned, undercover agents, we saw, this week, were able to get weapons past the TSA 95 percent of the time.

Mr. Chairman, a recent Advisory Circular issued by the FAA highlights the risk to the cockpit during door transition and calls for the use of effective protection measures. Support for this amendment today would build on this positive step used by the FAA by showing that Congress is serious about this issue and that installed physical secondary barriers are the only way that we can guarantee, as FAA regulations do require, that the flight deck be secure prior to that reinforced door being opened.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make incentive payments pursuant to 48 CFR 16.4 to contractors for contracts that are behind schedule under the terms of the contract as prescribed by 48 CFR 52.211 or over the contract amount indicated in Standard Form 33, box 20.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a good government amendment the House passed by voice vote last year. It simply states that bonus payments should not be paid to contractors whose projects are behind schedule or over budget.

I urge support for this amendment that combats waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TODAY

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

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

There was no objection.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 2, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

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, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, June 4, 2015, at 9 a.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. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2623. A bill to reduce prescription drug costs by allowing the importation and reimportation of certain drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 2624. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow for fair application of the exceptions process for drugs in tiers in formularies in prescription drug plans under Medicare part D, 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. GARRETT (for himself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 2625. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to reform the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit Indian tribal governments to be shareholders of S corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2627. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to expand the use of salad bars in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2628. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2629. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the approval of certain antibacterial and antifungal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOLLY (for himself and Ms. GRAHAM):

H.R. 2630. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to extend the moratorium on oil and gas leasing and related activities in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2631. A bill to require notice and comment for certain interpretive rules; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2632. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and update the National Child Traumatic Stress Initiative for grants to address the problems of individuals who experience trauma and violence related stress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2633. A bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2634. A bill to provide for temporary emergency impact aid for local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 2635. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, 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. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2636. A bill to require a study on the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use of petroleum coke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 2637. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the regulation of emissions of carbon dioxide from new or existing power plants under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2638. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reform and modernize the Universal Service Fund Lifeline Assistance Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GIBSON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2639. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for additional qualification requirements for individuals appointed to marriage and family therapist positions in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2640. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for discharge of consumer indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2641. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 2642. A bill to provide sensible relief to community financial institutions, to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. FINCHER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 2643. A bill to direct the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers

required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. ZINKE:

H.R. 2644. A bill to expedite certain forest management activities on National Forest System lands derived from the public domain when the activities are developed through a collaborative process of interested parties. to require the posting of a bond in initiating a legal challenge to certain forest management activities, to modify the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, to authorize additional funding sources for forest management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 292. A resolution permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Res. 293. A resolution expressing concern over anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement within the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself and Mr. POCAN):

H. Res. 294. A resolution expressing support for the continuation of the Perkins Loan Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. YODER):

H. Res. 295. A resolution supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 296. A resolution calling for Sickle Cell Trait research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LEE, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Res. 297. A resolution expressing support for designation of the first full week of May as ''National Mental Health No Stigma Week''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. ELLISON:

H.R. 2623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 2624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which sets forth the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 2625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes); Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 (To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures); Article I, Section 8, Clause 6 (To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department thereof).

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 2626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2627.

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. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 2630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 provides Congress the power to ''make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.'' This legislation provides for appropriate execution of rulemaking authority by agencies throughout the federal government.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 2635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 1 (''The Congress shall have Power To . . . [enact legislation that] provide[s] for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States[.]'') (this bill would require several federal agencies, in consultation with other issue area experts, to conduct a study on the public and ecological health consequences of the storage and transportation of petroleum coke, and promulgate rules based off of the study's findings—improving public and ecological health, and in turn, improving the nation's ''general Welfare.'').

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution:

[The Congress shall have Power] To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 2638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, . . .

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I—Section 8—Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes'')

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 2644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 136: Mr. PETERS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HAHN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 223: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 235: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 266: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 282: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 314: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 356: Ms. TITUS and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 363: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 378: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 379: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 387: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 425: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 499: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 510: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 511: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 540: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 542: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 546: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 556: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 572: Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 602: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 605: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 628: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 653: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 662: Ms. TITUS and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 702: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 707: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 766: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 767: Mr. BEYER, Mr. TROTT, Mr. VELA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 784: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 812: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 815: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 838: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 845: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 850: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 868: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 911: Mr. GRAYSON and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 920: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 980: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 985: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1089: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1095: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1114: Mr. HARDY and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1117: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1141: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1190: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 1197: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1211: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1221: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1233: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1301: Mr. REED and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1309: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 1310: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1312: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1321: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1338: Mr. WALZ, Mr. LATTA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1344: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1369: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1371: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1387: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1388: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1401: Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESTY, Ms. ADAMS, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1413: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1415: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1427: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1439: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1462: Mr. LEVIN and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1475: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1552: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1574: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1598: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1599: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BARR, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1603: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1608: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1610: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1655: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1660: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1664: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1665: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1671: Mr. HILL and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1674: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1684: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1692: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1695: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1718: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1725: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1734: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1769: Ms. SINEMA, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1801: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1830: Mr. BABIN and Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 1843: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1848: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1854: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1856: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1857: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1861: Mrs. NOEM and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1886: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1902: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1908: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 1919: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1964: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1986: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1988: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1994: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 2005: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2016: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2017: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2032: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2044: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2061: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2076: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2126: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 2150: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2156: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 2170: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2207: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2215: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 2216: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2218: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2228: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2233: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2247: Mr. BABIN and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 2248: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2255: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2300: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 2302: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2315: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 2355: Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2400: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2404: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2405: Mr. RENACCI and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2406: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2410: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2412: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2431: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 2459: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2490: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2497: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2509: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 2510: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2516: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2521: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2522: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2523: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2526: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2531: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2540: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2545: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2570: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2579: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2612: Mr. HIMES, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.J. Res. 30: Mr. TAKANO.
H.J. Res. 32: Mr. NUGENT.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. REED.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. LABRADOR.
H. Res. 12: Mr. KIND and Mr. DOGGETT.
H. Res. 54: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H. Res. 207: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Res. 209: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. MESSER.
H. Res. 233: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H. Res. 240: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 259: Mr. YODER, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 281: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H. Res. 284: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. COLLINS OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 4, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000,000)''

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide financial assistance in violation of section 214(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 1436a(d)).

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 75, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 78, line 9, before the semicolon insert the following: '', except that of the amount made available by this proviso, $75,000,000 shall be used only for the purpose under this clause''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. DENT

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $9,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 56, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 114, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $150,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

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

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

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

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

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make incentive payments pursuant to 48 CFR 16.4 to contractors for contracts that are behind schedule under the terms of the contract as prescribed by 48 CFR 52.211 or over the contract amount indicated in Standard Form 33, box 20.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 9, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $155,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 113, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 115, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 20: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 108, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)'',

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 114, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 22: Page 72, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)'',

Page 77, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 23: Beginning on page 54, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 55, line 21.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 105, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 113, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 2015 No. 88

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father God, in the fret and fever of these challenging times when we know not what a day may bring forth, we thank You for this quiet moment when all else is shut out and our hearts are uplifted to You. Lord, we cannot make better laws or a better world except as we are better people.

Inspire our lawmakers to make and keep their inner lives pure and kind and just. Show them what You desire for this Nation and world, and help them to be faithful agents for bringing Your will to pass.

Correct our mistakes, redeem our failures, and confirm our right actions. Lord, crown this day with the benediction of Your peace.

We pray in Your wonderful 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 MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The Democratic leader is recognized.

THE REPUBLICAN-LED SENATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, over the past several years, we have seen a very disturbing practice which is becoming commonplace in the Republican-dominated U.S. Congress. Governing by brinkmanship, manufactured crisis, flirting with deadlines, a game of chicken—we can call it whatever we want, but Republicans are doing it. Governing by crisis is a modus operandi of the modern Republican Party. We saw it in 2011, as the newly elected Republican majority in the House pushed the U.S. Government to the threshold of shutdown and default, and again with the so-called fiscal cliff in 2012—financial brinkmanship for our whole country—and then, of course, the infamous government shutdown that actually did occur in 2013, and it occurred over a period of several weeks and was devastating to our economy.

But since the Republicans assumed control of the Senate earlier this year, the brinkmanship in the Halls of the Capitol has become unbearable. Recall what happened this past February. ISIS had just burned a man alive in a cage. We saw that. The world saw that. The tragic Charlie Hebdo shooting had just occurred a month earlier in France, and that spilled over into Belgium, where more people were killed. Belgium authorities were making sweeping arrests of terror cells, and ISIS was threatening us in our homeland. Three Brooklyn men were arrested for trying to join ISIS here in our homeland. Yet, in this tumultuous environment, Senate Republicans brought the American Government within hours of a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. This is a Cabinet-level office that was created during the Bush administration, the Agency responsible for the safety of each American in our homeland. It was stunning.

But even more stunning is the fact that they keep doing it over and over again. This past week, it happened with the expiration of the important PATRIOT Act provisions. A few Senators wanted to offer some amendments on that legislation. That is all it was—amendments. In fact, on the Friday night of the debate, one Senator said: I will take two amendments. We on this side agreed—two amendments. Nope. Can't do that. And so, again, brinkmanship. The PATRIOT Act is a law that helps keep terrorists from attacking America. Would it have been asking too much to have a little bit of time to debate this issue? We were not given that time.

The Republican leadership knew for years that these programs were scheduled to expire on June 1, 2015. People who didn't like this act—and there were a number of them—gave speeches all over the country talking about the act. It was no secret that the act was not that popular in some people's minds.

Last year, Senator MCCONNELL knew this deadline was looming when he prevented the Senate from debating another version of the USA FREEDOM Act by conducting one of their hundreds of filibusters stopping President Obama's efforts. And the majority leader knew a month ago that the deadline was coming and chose to prioritize other legislation over these critical programs. So what happened? The authority for these sensitive programs expired.

Yesterday, we passed the USA FREEDOM Act, reestablishing these important terror-fighting provisions with some improvements in them. But for 2 days, America had its guard down. Every minute that passed from that lapse to passage of the USA FREEDOM Act was an unnecessary gamble with our national security. And for what? What did the Republicans achieve by letting these provisions lapse?

This is no way to govern—using legislative deadlines as some kind of ransom, staggering from one catastrophe to another.

Now on the horizon are two more important deadlines for legislation that is important to the American people—the Export-Import Bank and the Federal highway program. And what are we

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

doing? We are not doing these measures; we are on a bill that the President said he is going to veto. The Export-Import Bank expires at the end of this month, which is just a few weeks from now.

The Bank creates jobs by providing loans and loan guarantees to foreign customers who purchase American exports. This year alone, the Export-Import Bank supported 165,000 American jobs—165,000 jobs. What does it cost the American taxpayer? Zero. Nothing. In fact, it makes money for our country. Over the last 10 years, the Bank has returned more than $7 billion to the Treasury.

The majority leader should bring the Bank's reauthorization to the Senate floor for a vote before the charter expires at the end of this month, but it appears that is not going to happen. The senior Senator from Texas is already saying the Republicans have no intention of meeting that deadline. Instead, the American people will have to endure another manufactured crisis at the hands of Senate Republicans. Should we also assume the majority leader will do the same with the Federal highway program, which expires at the end of July? The Senate also faces a looming deadline for that program. It is critical that we craft a long-term solution to America's crumbling roads, highways, bridges, and rail systems.

Just a few miles from here, we have the Memorial Bridge. It is a beautiful bridge. It was built in the 1930s. The Memorial Bridge connects the Arlington National Cemetery to the Lincoln Memorial and the Mall. It is one of the busiest bridges in the whole DC area. Each day, 68,000 cars and buses cross that bridge, along with countless pedestrians and bicyclists.

Last week, Federal officials announced they will be shutting down two lanes of the bridge to repair the bridge, which is structurally deficient, which was caused by a number of problems, not the least of which is corrosion due to all of the moisture we have here. That is a problem we have with everything. And the problems, just minutes from the Capitol, are a daily reality for millions of Americans.

The Memorial Bridge is just one of the 64,000 structurally deficient bridges throughout our country. The people in Minnesota understand what this means. They had a bridge collapse, and 30-some people died as a result of that. That happened recently.

How long will we wait to fix these problems? What will it take before Republicans get serious about a solution to our crumbling highways, railroads, and bridges?

We understand. Democrats understand the urgency of the crisis facing our country, and we are ready to work with Republicans to rebuild our bridges, roads, and railway systems. We understand that investing in our surface transportation, including rail, can be a job creator and economy booster. For every $1 billion we spend on these roads, bridges, and rail systems, we employ 47,500 high-paying jobs and many other lesser paying jobs.

Before we left for recess a couple of weeks ago, we passed a short-term extension for the surface transportation programs. That is the 33rd time we have done that. Now that we are back in session, there appears to be no urgency from the Senate Republicans to schedule committee hearings, mark up the bill or to make the highway trust fund solvent.

Once again it seems the majority leader is content to let another vital program lapse, regardless of the harm it does or the American jobs he puts at risk.

How many more of these manufactured crises must the American people endure? How many more times would the majority leader let another vital program lapse regardless of the harm it does? It is imperative that Republicans not continue their assault on job creation in America. We should not let the Export-Import Bank or the Federal highway program expire, losing the millions of American jobs they create and sustain. It is beyond belief that on these two important legislative matters, Republicans will not help the American people with instant job creation. In the past, these two issues were never handled this way. The Export-Import Bank had three of its biggest cheerleaders: Reagan, Bush, and Bush. That is not the way it is anymore. The highway bill used to pass every 5 or 6 years, and it would be extended for 5 or 6 years. Until the Republicans changed the way the Senate operates, we used to pass these bills easily—but not now. We are having to address multiple short-term extensions each year and it seems every few months. This will be, as I indicated earlier, the 33rd short-term extension for the Federal highway program. This is not legislating. This is Republican procrastination.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know my good friend, the Democratic leader, is frustrated that he is no longer setting the schedule in the Senate. He seems to differ with the order of priorities that we deal with things here. Yesterday, he said debating the Defense authorization bill was ''a waste of time''—a waste of time to debate the Defense authorization bill in a time of high crisis for our country.

Nevertheless, a new majority sets the agenda of the schedule these days. Today, the Senate turns to the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2016—in June, not in December, at the end of the year, in a situation in which no amendments are allowed.

This legislation, which authorizes funds and sets out policy for our military annually, is always important, but it is especially important now, given the multitude of threats that challenge us as a nation; for instance, the aggressive rise of ISIL, Iran's ambitions for regional hegemony and its accompanying quest for nuclear weapons, and both Chinese and Russian efforts to erode American influence and assert domination over their neighbors. It is also important, given the need to start thinking about preparing our armed services for the many global threats the next President will confront the day he or she takes office.

The reality is we have left behind the era of when Americans could withdraw from conflict overseas and escape to the comfort and security provided by vast oceans and isolation. We have lost the luxury of building our forces years after a war has begun. Most important, the simple tradeoff of guns versus butter, drawing down our conventional forces, hollowing them out, and standing behind our nuclear arsenal does not suit the strategic challenges we now face. We can no longer ignore ungoverned spaces. We have left the Cold War long behind. Tradeoffs have become more difficult to accomplish, and they require greater strategic thought than the President has provided, and we have seen the resilience of the terrorist threat.

Senator MCCAIN, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is a man with the depth of experience to understand the need to modernize, refit, and prepare our military for the threats and operations in the coming years. Thankfully, for the Senate, he is also a man with vision to craft a bill that could put us on a path to address those challenges—legislation that could help equip the next President with adequate capabilities to address threats from adversaries like Russia, China, ISIL, and Al Qaeda, not to mention the unforeseen challenges that inevitably arise. That is just the course this Defense authorization bill proposes to put us on—the correct course. I would like to commend Senator MCCAIN, not just for crafting this bill but for working closely with Members of both parties to steer it through committee with overwhelming bipartisan support.

This legislation proposes to do a lot of things, but fundamentally it is premised on a commonsense idea that we should cut waste and redirect that authorized funding to where it is actually needed—such as meeting the needs of the men and women who put everything on the line—everything—to keep us safe.

In a time when missions are in imbalance with resources for a military that has already had to endure too many cuts in recent years, it just makes sense to do things such as taking on a growing bureaucracy in the Pentagon to make it more efficient and effective,

working toward reforming the way our military purchases weapons and equipment, and improving and modernizing the military retirement system in order to secure greater value and choice for servicemembers.

Overall, this bill authorizes about $10 billion in savings for actual military needs. These authorities will allow for improvements in the training and capability of our forces, and they will help us develop new technologies to maintain superiority on the battlefield. Our constituents stand to benefit from many of the provisions in this bill as well.

For instance, Kentuckians will be glad to know this legislation would authorize a new Special Forces facility at Fort Campbell. They will also be glad to hear it will authorize construction projects and an important new medical clinic at Fort Knox—an initiative I have championed literally for years.

It is no wonder why so many Democrats joined Republicans to support this bill on the floor of the House of Representatives or why they joined Republicans in the Armed Services Committee to pass this bill on an overwhelming bipartisan basis, too, which of course is the tradition, both of that committee and of the Senate as a whole.

Now we need to keep the momentum going because this defense policy bill cannot fall hostage to partisan politics. Too much is at stake.

We just heard more partisan saber rattling from the White House yesterday, which is now threatening to block a pay raise for our troops unless Congress first agrees to spend billions more pumping up bloated bureaucracies like the IRS. That is despite the fact that the funding level in this bill is exactly—exactly—the same as what President Obama requested in his budget. Let me say that again. The funding level in this bill is exactly what President Obama requested in his budget—$612 billion.

As I said earlier, the Democratic leader appeared to go even further, essentially saying that voting to support the men and women who protect us is now ''just a waste of time.'' It is just a waste of time, according to the Democratic leader, to be debating the bill about the men and women who protect us. The assumption, I guess, is his party isn't getting its way on other partisan demands completely unrelated to the bill, so they want to punish the men and women of our military.

Look, we understand that some of our Democratic friends might be so determined to increase spending for Washington's bureaucracies that to achieve it they would even risk support for our men and women in uniform in the face of so many global threats. I certainly don't love every aspect of the Budget Control Act, especially the effects we have seen on the defense side in hindering our ability to modernize the force and meet the demand of current operations. But to deny brave servicemembers the benefits they have earned putting everything on the line for each one of us, for these partisan reasons, would be profoundly unfair to our troops.

Blocking this bill is not in the national interest. So let's skip the partisan games and start working toward commonsense reforms, as this bill proposes. Let's work together to pass the best Defense authorization bill possible.

I urge Members of both parties who want to offer amendments to go ahead and do so and then work with the bill managers to get them moving. We have that opportunity this year because we returned to the regular order and because we are considering the NDAA at the appropriate time in the session, rather than at the very last minute with little time for thoughtful consideration of amendments, as had become the unfortunate norm under the previous majority. This positive turn is another credit to Senator MCCAIN's leadership.

Of course, no Defense authorization bill will ever be perfect, but this legislation reflects a good-faith effort to authorize programs in the political reality in which we live today. It is bipartisan reform legislation that proposes to root out waste, improve our military capabilities, support the brave Americans who protect us, and make preparations for challenges, both foreseeable and unforeseeable, in the years ahead.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein, with the time equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

The Senator from Wyoming.

FEDERAL WATER QUALITY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last week, our Nation observed Memorial Day. We paid tribute to the sacrifices so many Americans have made to preserve our freedom. Also, last week, while Members were back home, the Obama administration snuck out a new rule that takes away freedom from Americans all across the country.

The Environmental Protection Agency released the final version of a new rule that will dramatically increase the agency's power and will devastate Americans' ability to use their own property and their own water. With this rule, President Obama's Environmental Protection Agency overreaches and ignores the American public. The rule is an attempt to change the definition of what the Clean Water Act calls waters of the United States.

There is bipartisan agreement that Washington bureaucrats have gone way beyond their authority with this new regulation. They have written this rule so broadly and with so much uncertainty that it is not clear if there are any limits on this Agency's power.

I agree with what the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee has to say. He wrote it in an op-ed that appeared yesterday. Senator INHOFE, chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, said:

> Not only does this final rule break promises EPA has made, but it claims federal powers even beyond what EPA originally proposed a year ago. This will drastically affect—for the worse—the ability of many Americans to use and enjoy their property.

This rule gives the Agency broad control over things such as any area within 4,000 feet of a navigable water or a tributary. Then, it defines tributaries to include any place where you can see an ''ordinary high water mark'' on what looks like—on what looks like—it was once the bank of a creek body of water—what looks like, not what is but what looks like.

Under the rule, the Environmental Protection Agency can regulate something as waters of the United States if it falls in a 100-year floodplain of a navigable water—not a navigable water but anything within a 100-year floodplain of a navigable water. The rule says the Agency has to find a ''significant nexus'' to navigable water.

What is a significant nexus to the EPA? Well, the Agency gets to make up its own definition. They say it includes something as simple as finding that the water provides—get this—''life cycle dependent aquatic habitat'' for a species that spends part of its time in a navigable water.

All of these terms are things that Washington bureaucrats are defining for themselves. They decide for themselves that they have the authority.

Let's say your property is within 4,000 feet of anything the Environmental Protection Agency decides is a tributary and your property has a natural pond or some standing water after heavy rain, and let's say a bird that spends part of its life on the Colorado River decides to hang out near that natural pond or some standing water after a heavy rain that occurred on your property, under this new regulation, the Environmental Protection Agency now has the power to regulate what you do on that land.

It is bad enough that this administration has taken this extraordinary step. It is bad enough that it has tried to sneak out its rule, hoping that nobody was paying attention over the Memorial Day time at home. There are now reports that the Obama administration may have broken the law. Here

is what the New York Times reported on May 18 under the headline on the front page: ''Critics Hear E.P.A.'s Voice in 'Public Comments.' ''

This is an article on the front page of the New York Times about the public comments that government agencies have to collect. They have to collect these comments from the public when they propose new regulations such as this one that they have done with the waters of the United States. The comment period is supposed to be an opportunity for people who might be harmed by the rules to have their say.

Well, according to this front-page article in the New York Times, the Environmental Protection Agency has twisted the public comment requirements into its own private government-funded spin machine. The article says: ''In a campaign that tests the limits of federal lobbying law, the agency has orchestrated a drive to counter political opposition from Republicans and enlist public support in concert with liberal environmental groups and a grass-roots organization aligned with President Obama.''

This tests the limits of Federal lobbying law. This government agency ignored the negative comments by Americans who were concerned about the law, who were hurt by the law. Then it used taxpayer dollars to lobby liberal groups to flood the Agency with positive comments. That is not me; that is what is written in the New York Times. These were the same phony, ginned-up comments it used to justify the dramatic overreach of its new regulations.

It is incredible. It is unacceptable. I believe it is illegal. The Environmental Protection Agency would rather skew public comments in its favor than acknowledge the real concerns that Americans and Members of Congress have with this destructive rule. These are the concerns of farmers, of ranchers, of hard-working families, and of small businesses all across the country.

There was an interesting column in U.S. News & World Report last Friday. The headline says: ''Stop Terrorizing Main Street.'' The column talked about the damage that all this redtape can do to small businesses. It says:

> When the EPA jumps up and yells 'boo', entrepreneurs cringe. They withdraw. They feel anxious and reconsider plans to start or expand a business. This is bad for our economy.

This is hurting our country. Well, I believe they are exactly right. That is what Washington does with the uncertainty and the overreach of rules such as this one. It is bad for the economy. It does nothing to improve the quality of our water or the quality of life.

There is universal agreement in this country that we should protect America's navigable waters. There is also bipartisan agreement on the best ways for Washington to help to do that. This is not just Republicans against President Obama. This is Republicans and Democrats working to protect America's waterways and President Obama working, instead, to expand the power of unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats.

Here is how the newspaper The Hill reported it last Thursday with an article with this headline: ''Democrats buck Obama on water rule.'' The article says: ''Dozens of Congressional Democrats are joining Republicans to back legislation blocking the Obama administration's new rule to redefine its jurisdiction over the nation's waterways.''

Now, it is talking about my bill, a bill called the Federal Water Quality Protection Act. The bill has 30 cosponsors in the Senate—Democrats and Republicans alike. A similar bill in the House actually passed with the support of 24 Democrats and every Republican. So what does the administration have to say to the dozens of Democrats in Congress, to the 24 Democrats who voted against the administration, to the millions of Americans who are concerned about this new regulation?

Well, according to the article in The Hill, President Obama's top environmental adviser said of the Democrats who voted for this: ''The only people with reason to oppose the rule are polluters.'' So the President believes that the 24 Democrats who voted to support it and the Democrats in the Senate who cosponsored my legislation are polluters who want to threaten our clean water. That is what the White House thinks of these Democrats in Congress. That is what the White House thinks of anyone who dares to suggest that this rule is bureaucratic overreach. That is such arrogance.

Well, there are a lot of Americans—Democrats and Republicans—who are not going to be intimidated by the Obama administration's power grab or its name-calling. The Obama administration has ignored the strong bipartisan consensus against this rule. It has once again taken its own radical approach. Instead of moving forward with a rule that fails to represent the interests of many Americans, we should act immediately to pass this bipartisan Federal Water Quality Protection Act. This legislation says yes to clean water and no to extreme bureaucracy.

It will protect America's waterways, while keeping Washington's hands off of the things that it really has no business regulating. The Environmental Protection Agency would have to consult with the States to make sure that we have the approach that works best everywhere—not just the approach that Washington likes best. They would not be able to just listen to the echo chamber of phony comments concocted by their own lobbying campaign.

Now, this bill gives certainty and clarity to farmers, to hard-working ranchers, to small business owners and their families. It makes sure that people can continue to enjoy the beautiful rivers and the lakes. They should be preserved and protected. This bipartisan bill protects Americans from runaway bureaucracy—unaccountable, unelected. It restores Washington's attention to the traditional waters that were always the focus before.

The American people do not need more bureaucratic overreach. We do not need more redtape. Congress should act immediately to stop this outrageous regulation before it goes into effect. The Senate should take up and pass this bipartisan Federal Water Quality Protection Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Montana.

(The remarks of Mr. DAINES pertaining to the introduction of S. 1487 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. DAINES. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it was 3 years ago this month in June of 2012 that President Obama established the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, known as DACA, that provides temporary—underline the word ''temporary''—legal status to immigrant students who arrived in the United States as children.

DACA is based on the DREAM Act, a bill I introduced 14 years ago, to give undocumented students who grow up in this country a chance to earn their citizenship. These young people have come to be known as DREAMers, and this has become a term of art that is used now across the United States to capsulize the immigration dilemma we face.

While this DACA Program by President Obama has been an amazing success, more than 600,000 of these DREAMers have come forward, paid the filing fee, submitted themselves for background checks, and are now temporarily living in America, going to school and working. DACA has allowed these DREAMers to become part of our country as they strive for education in engineering, education in business—just about every profession you can think of.

This policy of giving people a chance to be part of America's future unfortunately infuriates my Republican colleagues. They have tried over and over and over again to stop the DREAMers,

to deport the DREAMers. I don't understand it.

President Obama established this new program called DAPA to build on DACA's success, which allows their parents, under certain circumstances, to stay in the United States on a temporary basis. Under the President's second program, DAPA, undocumented immigrants who have lived in the United States at least 5 years and have American children are required to come forward, pay a filing fee, register with the government, pass a criminal and national security background check, and then pay their fair share of taxes. Those are the conditions. If they violate any of them, they are subject to deportation.

If the government determines that these parents have not committed any serious crimes, do not pose any threat to our safety, this new Executive order says, on a temporary basis, they will not be targeted for deportation.

I have seen this in Chicago, and I have seen it around Illinois. Many people think the undocumented live in a household full of undocumented people. That is almost never the case.

What I found over and over again is that perhaps one parent, usually the mother, is undocumented—the father, a citizen; kids born in America, citizens; the mother, undocumented. Are we really safer as a nation to break up that family and deport the mother if she is no threat to this country? I don't think so.

DAPA was scheduled to go into effect last month. That is what President Obama had hoped for—and I joined him—but it didn't. Why? Because some Republican Governors and attorneys general have filed a lawsuit to block this new program.

The Supreme Court has been clear that Presidents have the authority to set Federal immigration enforcement priorities. I am confident all of the President's decisions in this matter will be upheld. It is hard for me to understand or explain why the Republicans are so determined to stop any reform of our broken immigration system. For years, Republicans in Congress have refused to even consider legislation to fix our broken immigration system.

I spent a good part of my life, 6 months or more, working in a bipartisan group to write an immigration reform bill for Democrats, for Republicans. We brought it to the floor of the Senate. It passed with 68 votes. Fourteen Republicans, virtually all of the Democrats voted for it. It really addressed every aspect of immigration. Parts of it I didn't like, but overall it was a very good and balanced bill.

When it came to the floor, the Republicans said: Wait a minute. No immigration reform until you get tough at the border.

Well, the record says and shows we are already pretty tough at the border. Illegal immigration is down dramatically. But in an effort to make this bipartisan, we agreed to even more enforcement at the border. Think about this for a second. Today, there are more Federal law enforcement agents on our border with Mexico than the combined total of all Federal law enforcement agents in every other agency, and we increased it in this comprehensive immigration bill. So the argument that we are not getting tough at the border is kind of hard to make. We passed the bill with 68 votes. We sent it to the House 2 years ago. What did the House do? Absolutely nothing—they refused to call the bill. They refused to call any version of the bill. They refused to call their own bill. They refused to even debate the issue of immigration.

Everyone acknowledges our immigration system needs to be improved and changed. They wouldn't even take up the issue. And now, when the President tries, on a temporary basis, to say: I am not going to deport the mother in a family where everyone else is an American citizen or I am not going to deport children who were brought here at the age of 2, who have grown up in America and simply want to be part of our future, the Republicans have said: We will fight you to the death. We will challenge you in every court in the land. We want to deport these people.

What I have found is that it is best for Members of Congress, the Senate, and the American public to meet some of the individuals who are the target of these high emotions and negative feelings on the Republican side. I want to introduce one of them today.

This is Jean-Yannick Diouf. When he was 8 years old, his father, a diplomat from the African country of Senegal, brought his family to the United States. Unfortunately, Yannick's parents separated and Yannick's father returned to Senegal, leaving him and the rest of his family behind. Yannick was too young to even realize it at the time—he was just a little kid—but when his father left the United States, he lost his legal status to live in this country.

Yannick grew up in Montgomery County, MD. In high school, he was a member of the National Honor Society. He volunteered weekly at a homeless shelter. He organized soccer tournaments for 3 years to raise money for the Red Cross for Haiti earthquake relief.

After high school, Yannick wanted to continue his education. But remember, if you are undocumented in this country, you don't qualify for a penny when it comes to Federal assistance—no Pell grants, no Federal Government loans. So he went to Montgomery College, a junior college, and earned an associate's degree in business. He was on the dean's list.

Yannick then transferred to the University of Maryland, College Park. Again, he had to pay for it all. There was no government assistance since he is undocumented. He is working now on a bachelor's degree in business management. He runs the Achievers Mentoring Program. It is an after-school program to advise middle and high school students on how to get into college.

Yannick is also a volunteer for United We Dream, the largest organization of undocumented young people such as himself in this country. He was a leader of the campaign to pass the Maryland DREAM Act, which allows Maryland residents who are undocumented to pay in-State tuition. That is the only break he can get, and it comes from the State.

Keep in mind that Yannick is undocumented. So he doesn't qualify for any financial aid from the Federal Government. Yet he is trying to make a life. Here is what he said in a letter:

> DACA means dignity. More than making money, having a job gives you dignity and self-respect. I want to work for what I have. I don't look to anyone for pity. People should judge me based on what I do and what I stand for, not based on status. I want to be given a chance to prove that not only am I a functioning member of society, I am here to serve and share my talents with those in my community.

Earlier this year, Yannick was one of six DREAMers who met with the President of the United States in the Oval Office. Here is what the President said after he met with Yannick and the other five. He said:

> I don't think there's anybody in America who's had a chance to talk to these six young people who wouldn't find it in their heart to say these kids are Americans just like us, and they belong here, and we want to do right by them.

Well, I think President Obama is right. Yannick and the other DREAMers have so much to contribute to our country. But sadly, Republicans in Congress have a different agenda. They want to shut down DACA, which allows this young man to go to school in the only country he has ever known, and they want to shut down the DAPA Program, which the President has instituted to try to protect the parents of those who have been here at least 5 years.

If they have their way, this young man will be deported to Senegal, a country where he hasn't lived since he was a little boy. Will America be better, if we get rid of folks such as him? Will it be a better country if we tear families apart? I don't think so.

Instead of trying to deport DREAMers and moms and dads, congressional Republicans should work with us to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill to fix our broken immigration system. The estimates are wide-ranging as to how many young people there are in America like Yannick. Some say 1.5 million. Some say 2.5 million. I have met so many of them.

It wasn't that long ago that we had a bill on the floor of the Senate, and that entire Gallery was filled with young DREAMers. They came wearing caps and gowns—that was their decision—to make the point that they are students—students who are learning and trying to improve their lives to be better and to be a better part of America.

That bill was defeated that day. It broke my heart. I went to meet with them afterwards, and I said to them: Don't give up. Don't give up on me, because I am not giving up on you.

I got started on this battle 15 years ago—15 years ago—when I met a young Korean girl in Chicago who was brought here at the age of 2 and who was a musical prodigy. She had been accepted at the Juilliard School of music, the Manhattan conservatory of music, but she was afraid she couldn't go. She was undocumented. Her mom and dad brought her here to this country at the age of 2, and they never filed the papers.

She grew up in a very poor family, but she went into the Merit Music Program in Chicago and became an accomplished musician. It was because of her that I started and introduced the DREAM Act.

There is good news. She went on to the Manhattan conservatory of music. A generous family in Chicago paid for it because she couldn't get any assistance.

She married a young man, became an American citizen, and played in Carnegie Hall. She is now pursuing her Ph.D. in music. Is America better because of that? Yes, it is. I have no doubt that it is.

Those who don't see the promise in the eyes of these young people and don't see what they can bring to America have forgotten who we are. We are a nation of immigrants. We are a nation that has allowed young people such as these a chance to succeed.

One of them happened to be my mother. My mother was brought here at the age of 2 by a mother who didn't speak English. My mother grew up in this country and raised a family, and I was one of the kids. Here I stand on the floor of the Senate. That is my story. That is my family's story. It is America's story.

The people who show such loathing for these young people and what they mean to us have forgotten that. They have ignored that. Let's rekindle our faith in what makes America great—our diversity, the ambition of young people such as Yannick, and the determination of our generation to open a door to give them a chance to prove themselves to make us better. That is what we are called on to do.

All the petty politics aside, we are talking about human lives and about an opportunity for this young man and so many others to prove to us what they can do for the future of America.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if you had to characterize the current Congress with one symbol, I would tell you what I think it should be: an extension cord—you know what I mean?—an extension cord you use at home if the plug doesn't quite reach the outlet.

Why would I pick an extension cord? Because this year, under the leadership in Congress, all we have been doing is extending things a little bit—just a little bit—when we have to.

The Department of Homeland Security appropriation, one of the most important when it comes to the security and safety of the United States, had to be extended and extended and extended, sadly because many in the House wanted to fight the battle of immigration over that bill. Eventually, we prevailed and passed the appropriation after extension and after extension.

Then 2 weeks ago, here on the floor of the Senate, we extended the Federal highway trust fund. What is that? That is a fund where we collect gas taxes every time a gallon of gas is purchased and put it in a fund and then build highways and bridges. We count on that. It used to be a glorious program.

The inspiration for that program was President Dwight David Eisenhower. In the 1950s, President Eisenhower, who had come back from leading America to victory in World War II, remembered what he saw. He saw in Europe, particularly in Germany, an amazing highway system that did not exist in the United States. So President Eisenhower said: We need an interstate highway system in America. It was a bold idea—that the Federal Government would lead in creating an interstate highway system to link every corner of our Nation.

There is not a State that I know of, certainly not in my State, where the interstate highway system hasn't had a dramatic positive impact on the economy. So with the Federal highway trust fund, we built the interstate highway system, we extended the highway system, and now we are in the process of making bridges safer, making certain the highways are extended where they need to be to keep businesses thriving and to create new businesses and jobs in America.

But along comes a group in Congress, a conservative group, that says this is all wrong. Some of them question whether the Federal Government should even have a role in transportation. For them, I have three words: Dwight David Eisenhower, Republican President, who showed the way. Some say it is just impossible to figure out how to fund the building of highways. Well, we have done pretty well so far with the Federal gas tax that is collected. Clearly, we need to look to other forms of revenue. But do we need to give up on the Federal highway program?

Two weeks ago on the floor of the Senate we had the 33rd short-term extension of that program. What it means is we extended it this time for 60 days.

The Federal highway program used to be a 6-year program. Why was it 6 years? Think about the planning, the engineering, acquiring land and building a highway. You can't do it in 60 days, not 6 months, not even in a year. You have to have a commitment of funds that are coming back to the States. In my State, in Illinois, about 75 percent of all the highway construction comes from Federal funds. So when we do short-term extensions, it really says to the States that they can't count on us.

This money will run out at the end of July. Maybe we will extend it again, maybe we won't. Is that any way to run a nation? Is that any way to run a transportation system—again, using the extension cord example, this time for 60 days?

Just a week or so ago, we had another effort on the floor of the Senate here to extend the PATRIOT Act—FISA—which keeps America safe and gives us the power to ferret out those who threaten us. The suggestion was made by the majority leader that we extend it for a few days—a few days. This has become a pattern, and it is a troubling pattern.

One aspect of this that is particularly troublesome is that at the end of June, unless there is a sincere bipartisan effort, we are going to lose the Export-Import Bank. I have heard a lot of speeches in the Senate about how the United States businesses, especially small businesses, are really the backbone of our economy. Oh, we all give those speeches. As these businesses grow and expand, they often look to foreign exports.

We know that every $1 billion in new export sales supports at least 6,000 new jobs in this country. So every opportunity to export U.S. products helps communities and families. The primary Federal program that allows most of these very small businesses to export is about to expire. It is about to expire at the end of this month.

The Export-Import Bank provides financing insurance so that U.S. companies, many of them very small, can compete in the global economy. Here is how it works. The Export-Import Bank makes loans to firms exporting American-made goods. This allows businesses, including 3,340 small businesses across the United States, to sell their goods and services to businesses all over the world. They support about 164,000 jobs.

More than 100 of these companies are located in Illinois, and more than 80 of them are small. The Export-Import Bank supports $27.4 billion in exports. And guess what. It doesn't cost the taxpayers a penny. It actually makes money—money that is returned to the U.S. Treasury for other purposes or to reduce our debt. Over the past two decades—20 years—the Export-Import Bank has returned $7 billion to the U.S. Treasury. It is a moneymaker. It goes directly to deficit reduction.

One of the companies the Bank helped is the NOW Health Group in Bloomingdale, IL. It is a natural food and supplement manufacturer with 640 employees, 35 of whom work in exports. According to their chief operating officer, Jim Emme, ''the flexibility in the payment terms we can offer through

our Export Import Bank policy has allowed us to grow our business in existing markets as well as open new ones.''

This company has grown its exports from 2 percent of its business to more than 10 percent. They could not have done it without the Export-Import Bank.

There are thousands of stories just like that all over the United States.

I am a cosponsor of Senator SHAHEEN's bill that would increase the lending cap for the Bank to $160 billion and reauthorize it through 2021—not these short-term, 30-day, 60-day, 6-month extensions we have seen under this leadership in Congress.

In the past, reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank was a bipartisan measure. Republicans used to support it as much as Democrats. But now there is a small group of Republicans, inspired by the Heritage Foundation, who have decided: Let's put an end to this Bank. Let's put an end to the opportunity for small businesses to hire Americans and export goods overseas.

Their hatred of government blinds them to the reality of this Bank and the thousands of jobs that will be lost if they have their way and eliminate the Ex-Im Bank.

They also refuse to recognize that by failing to reauthorize this Bank, U.S. businesses can't compete with businesses in other countries that will still have access to their own export financing agencies. Do you think China is going to put its export-import bank out of business? No. They just increased its size. Our major competitor has stepped up. In this case, many of the leaders in Congress are stepping back. So we are not only hurting ourselves if we can't find a way to go forward.

The Bank is set to expire at the end of the month, which is less than 4 weeks from now. I hope we can come to an agreement by then to pass a bill to reauthorize a program that is critically important to U.S. exports. I hope reasonable voices in the Republican Party will not allow a vocal minority to prevent us from reauthorizing this important program.

PATRIOT EMPLOYER TAX CREDIT ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as the number of candidates grows for the office of President, we are hearing a lot of proposals for changes in the Tax Code. Many of them are interesting, and some of them are damaging when it comes to working for middle-income families.

Sadly, we are seeing a race to the bottom on who can propose the lowest corporate tax rate, giving huge breaks to the very companies that shift jobs overseas. Most Americans don't realize this. If you want to move your production from the United States to another country, you can deduct the moving expenses from the taxes you owe America. We are subsidizing your decision to pick up and move jobs overseas. American workers—some of them are given the sad responsibility to train the supervisors at the new overseas companies while American workers are checking out their last paychecks.

I have a different idea. Instead of rewarding corporations with lower tax bills, we should reward those companies in America that maintain their commitment to this country and its workers and give fair wages and benefits to the American workers. We call it the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act. It is very basic.

When you look at the Tax Code, it is a huge document full of incentives and disincentives for businesses. We will reward certain things; we won't reward other things. Well, this is something we should consider rewarding.

Senator SHERROD BROWN and I have introduced the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act, which would provide a tax credit to American companies that treat American veterans and workers the best. It puts the Tax Code on the side of these companies. These patriot employers would be eligible for a tax credit equal to 10 percent of the first $15,000 of qualified wages for American workers, which is about $1,200 per worker.

In order to qualify for this tax credit, these companies would have to meet five criteria. See if you think, as I do, that these are good ideas.

First, the company has to invest in American jobs. Businesses must remain headquartered here in the United States if they have ever been headquartered here before. The company would also have to maintain or increase the number of workers in the United States compared to the number of workers overseas, and not decrease the number of workers through the use of contractors. The company can't pick up and leave, move to a foreign capital to avoid paying its fair share of U.S. taxes.

First, invest in American jobs located in America.

Second, pay fair wages. A patriot employer under our bill would have to pay at least 90 percent of its employees $15 an hour. Why do we pick $15 an hour? Do the math: $15 an hour, 40 hours a week, about $30,000 a year. Why? Because if you make that amount of money, you qualify for virtually no Federal subsidies, Federal programs. You are earning a paycheck and you are supporting your family. If you make less than that, you qualify for Federal Government assistance. So we are saying to employers: If you will pay at least $15 an hour, we will give you this tax credit.

Third, provide quality health insurance for your employees consistent with the Affordable Care Act.

Fourth, help your employees prepare for retirement. We want to reward companies that offer at least 90 percent of their employees a defined benefit plan, such as a pension plan or a defined contribution plan with decent employer contributions.

Fifth, employ a diverse workforce. We want companies to have a plan in place to help veterans and people with disabilities. I don't think that is too much to ask. We grab our flags and march in parades as politicians and thank the veterans over and over. Why don't we thank them with a job? And let's reward the companies that do.

That is it, five conditions. And with these five conditions, these patriotic American companies would get a tax break. Wouldn't it be better for us to incentivize American companies to do the right thing rather than pay the moving expenses for those that want to leave the country? That is a choice. I think it is pretty simple.

I know it can be done because in Skokie, IL, there is a company doing it. It is called Block Steel. The company started 100 years ago and has grown to be the largest distributor of aluminized steel in the Nation. It is a family-run business. It has ensured that 77 employees are treated fairly. Each of their employees is paid more than $15 an hour, has good health care, and a good retirement. Block Steel should be rewarded for its efforts. Under the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act, Block Steel could qualify for a tax credit of up to $100,000. That is money they can invest in their business and grow it, with even more people working.

As this debate about tax reform continues, I hope we focus on rewarding companies that really care about America. We shouldn't be blindly focused on a race to the bottom to the lowest wages. And, I might add, this is paid for. It is paid for by eliminating the deduction for moving businesses overseas that is currently part of the Tax Code.

So let's reform the Tax Code the right way, with an eye on helping the workers get a decent paycheck, decent benefits, and rewarding the companies that put American workers first.

I thank Senators SHERROD BROWN, ELIZABETH WARREN, JACK REED, TAMMY BALDWIN, and BERNIE SANDERS for lending their support to this important bill. I look forward to continuing our fight for working families here in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:30 p.m. will be for debate only and equally divided between the bill managers or the designees.

The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 1463

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1463, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 1463.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 2, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from 1 p.m. until 2 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to rise with my friend and colleague from Rhode Island to speak about the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. For 53 consecutive years, Congress has passed this vital piece of legislation, which provides the necessary funding and authorizes—I repeat, authorizes—our military to defend the Nation. The NDAA is one of few bills in Congress that continues to enjoy bipartisan support year after year. This is a testament to the legislation's critical importance to our national security and the high regard with which it is held by the Congress.

Last month, the Senate Armed Services Committee voted 22 to 4 to approve the NDAA, an overwhelming vote that reflects the committee's proud tradition of bipartisan support for the brave men and women of our armed services.

I thank the committee's ranking member, the Senator from Rhode Island. Despite his failure of education at our Nation's military academy, I appreciate the thoughtfulness and bipartisan spirit with which he approaches our national security. It has been a pleasure to work with Senator REED over the last few months and years on this legislation and today as we appear on the floor on behalf of this legislation.

We have worked through some of the toughest issues facing our military today. We have our differences on some aspects of this legislation, but those differences have never interfered with the search for common ground and consensus. This is a much better bill thanks to the Senator from Rhode Island.

I also thank the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, for his commitment to resuming regular order and bringing the NDAA to the floor this week. Under the leadership of the Senator from Kentucky, the Senate will be able to take up this critical national security legislation on time, allowing for thoughtful consideration and amendments and giving our military the certainty they need to plan and execute their missions.

That stands in stark contrast to the last 2 years under Democratic leadership, when this body failed to take up the NDAA until the very end of the year, at the last minute, with no amendments allowed.

Just yesterday the Democratic leader said considering this vital Defense bill is just a ''waste of time''—waste of time. Those comments must be very disappointing to the servicemembers, retirees, and their families in his home State of Nevada who clearly understand the importance of this legislation.

The fiscal year 2016 NDAA is a reform bill. It tackles acquisition reform, military retirement reform, personnel reform, commissary reform, headquarters and management reform. This legislation delivers sweeping defense reforms that can enable our military to rise to the challenges of a more dangerous world, both today and in the future. The Armed Services Committee identified $10 billion of excess and unnecessary spending from the President's defense budget request, and we are reinvesting it in military capabilities for our war fighters and reforms that can yield long-term savings for the Department of Defense. We did all of this while upholding our commitments to our servicemembers, retirees, and their families.

This legislation is a reflection of the growing threats we face in the world. Over the past few months, the Senate Armed Services Committee has received testimony from many of America's most respected statesmen, thinkers, and former military commanders. These leaders had a common warning: America is facing the most diverse and complex array of crises since the Second World War. Just consider some of the troubling events that have transpired over the past year.

In Ukraine, Russia has sought to redraw an international border and annex the territory of another sovereign country through the use of military force. It continues aggressively to destabilize Ukraine, with troubling implications for security in Europe. Yet the President continues to refuse to provide Ukraine with the defensive weapons they need and have repeatedly requested to defend their sovereign nation from Russia's onslaught.

In the Middle East, a terrorist army, with tens of thousands of fighters, many holding Western passports, has taken over a vast swath of territory and declared an Islamic State in the heart of one of the most strategically important parts of the world. Nearly 3,000 U.S. troops have returned to Iraq to combat this threat, with U.S. aircraft flying hundreds of strike missions a month over Iraq and Syria. Unfortunately, as recent reports suggest, nearly 75 percent of those air missions never even dropped weapons, and meanwhile ISIS is taking territory on the ground, most recently in Ramadi and Palmyra.

At the same time, amid negotiations over its nuclear program, Iran continues to pursue its ambitions to challenge regional order in the Middle East by increasing its development of ballistic missiles, support for terrorism, training and arming of pro-Iranian militant groups, and other malign activities in places such as Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Gaza, Bahrain, and Yemen.

Yemen has collapsed, as a Shia insurgency with ties to the Iranian regime has toppled the U.S.-backed government in Sana'a. Al Qaeda continues to use parts of the country to plan attacks against the West, the U.S. Embassy has been evacuated, and a U.S.-backed coalition of Arab nations has intervened militarily to reverse the gains of the Houthi insurgency and to restore the previous government to power.

Libya has become a failed state, beset by civil war and a growing presence of transnational terrorist groups, such as Al Qaeda and ISIL, similar to Afghanistan in 2001.

In Asia, North Korea continues to develop its nuclear arsenal and ever-more capable ballistic missiles, and late last year it committed the most destructive cyber attack ever on U.S. territory.

China is increasingly taking coercive actions to assert expansive territorial claims that unilaterally change the status quo in the South and East China Seas and raise tensions with U.S. allies and partners, all while continuing to expand and modernize its military in ways that challenge U.S. access and freedom of movement in the western Pacific. A recent report in the Wall Street Journal described how China has taken steps to militarize the vast land features that it is actively reclaiming in the South China Sea.

Unfortunately I could go on, but these are just some of the growing threats our Nation faces—threats that are far more serious than they were a year ago and significantly more so than when Congress passed the Budget Control Act in 2011. That legislation arbitrarily capped defense spending

and established the mindless mechanism of sequestration, which was triggered in 2013. As a result, with worldwide threats rising, we as a nation are on a course to cut nearly $1 trillion of defense spending over 10 years.

The Committee on Armed Services has conducted wide-ranging bipartisan oversight on the effects of sequestration-level spending on our national defense, and every single military and national security leader who has testified before the committee this year has denounced sequestration and urged its repeal as soon as possible. Indeed, each of our military service chiefs testified that continued defense spending at sequestration levels would put American lives at risk. I want to repeat to my colleagues: Our armed services leaders have told the Armed Services Committee that American lives are at risk if we continue mindless sequestration. Don't we care about the risks and the lives of the young men and women who have volunteered to serve in our military? Don't we care about them?

I urge my colleagues in the Senate and in the House to come together and repeal sequestration, and however that is accomplished, I will be glad to discuss, but our first priority has always been and always will be American security, our national security and the lives of the men and women who have volunteered to defend it.

Unfortunately, this legislation doesn't end sequestration. Believe me, our committee would have done so if the NDAA were capable of it, but it is not. The NDAA is a policy bill. It deals only with defense and national security issues. It does not spend a dollar. It provides the Department of Defense and our men and women in uniform with the authorities and support they need to defend the Nation.

Although the committee could not end sequestration, we did the most we could to authorize necessary levels of funding for the Department of Defense and our men and women in uniform. As a result, the NDAA fully supports President Obama's budget request of $612 billion for national defense, which is $38 billion above the spending caps established by the Budget Control Act. Let me repeat that. This legislation gives the President every dollar of budget authority he requested. The difference is our legislation follows the Senate budget resolution and funds that $38 billion increase through overseas contingency operations—or OCO—funds.

This is not my preferred option. It is not anybody's preferred option that I know of. I recognize that reliance on OCO spending limits the ability of the Department of Defense to plan and modernize our military. For this reason, the committee included a special transfer authority in this legislation that allows the Department of Defense to transfer the additional $38 billion from OCO to the base budget in the event that legislation is enacted that increases the statutory limitations on discretionary defense and nondefense spending in proportionately equal amounts.

This was the product of a bipartisan compromise, and it was the most we could do in the NDAA to recognize the need for a broader fiscal agreement without denying funding for our military right now. Nevertheless, the White House threatened yesterday to veto this legislation over its additional OCO spending and because the Congress has not provided for similar increases in nondefense spending. This is misguided and irresponsible. With global threats rising, how does it make any sense to oppose a defense policy bill—legislation that spends no money but is full of vital authorities that our troops need—for a reason that has nothing to do with national defense spending? The NDAA should not be treated as a hostage in a budget negotiation.

The political reality is that the Budget Control Act was signed by the President and remains the law of the land. So faced with a choice between OCO money and no money, I choose OCO. And multiple senior military leaders who testified before the Armed Services Committee this year said they would make the same choice for one simple reason: This is $38 billion of real money that our military desperately needs and without which, our top military leaders have said, they cannot succeed. Military leader after military leader has testified before our committee that they cannot carry out their obligations in their various commands to defend the Nation if the Budget Control Act—also known as sequestration—continues.

My message is simple: Let's have our fights over government spending, but let's keep those fights where they belong—in the appropriations process, where money is actually spent. The NDAA is not the place for it. If the President and some of my colleagues oppose the NDAA due to concerns over nondefense spending, I suspect they will have a very difficult time explaining and justifying that choice to Americans who increasingly cite national security as a top concern.

I care about nondefense spending. I really believe we need to fund many of the areas, such as the FBI, Border Patrol, and others. But to somehow equate that with national defense with the world as we see it today is either out of ignorance or partisanship—I don't know which, but neither is a valid ambition or reason.

The NDAA is a policy bill, and this year's version is an incredibly ambitious one. It advances major reform initiatives that can make more efficient use of our precious taxpayer dollars while increasing military capability for our warfighters.

In recent years, the Defense Department has grown larger but less capable, more complex but less innovative, more proficient at defeating low-tech adversaries but more vulnerable to high-tech ones. No one is more cognizant of this unfortunate fact than those of us whose responsibility it is to oversee our defense budget on the Armed Services Committee.

It is a top priority for me, my colleague from Rhode Island, as well as all of my fellow committee members to ensure that every dollar we spend on defense is used wisely, efficiently, and effectively. The fiscal year 2016 NDAA makes important contributions to this reform effort. This legislation contains sweeping acquisition reform.

Many of our military's challenges today are the result of years of mistakes and wasted resources. One recent study found that the Defense Department had spent $46 billion between 2001 and 2011 on at least a dozen programs that never became operational. I will repeat that—$46 billion on programs that never became operational. What is worse, I am not sure who, if anyone, was ever held accountable for these failures. At a hearing 2 years ago, I asked the Chief of Naval Operations who was responsible for $2.4 billion in cost overruns on the USS *Gerald R. Ford* aircraft carrier. He had no answer.

In today's vast acquisition bureaucracy where personnel and project managers cycle through rapidly, everyone is accountable and no one is accountable. We need acquisition reform now because our senior leaders must be held accountable for responsible stewardship of taxpayers' dollars.

But this is not just about saving money. Acquisition reform is needed immediately to preserve U.S. technological and military dominance and is therefore a national security imperative. Over the last decade, our adversaries have invested heavily in modernizing their militaries with a focus on anti-access and area-denial technologies designed specifically to counter American military strengths. Meanwhile, an acquisition system that takes too long and costs too much is leading to the erosion of America's defense technological advantage. If we continue with business as usual, I fear the United States could lose this advantage altogether. In short, our broken defense acquisition system itself is a clear and present danger to the national security of the United States.

The acquisition reforms in this legislation center on five principle objectives.

First, the legislation establishes effective accountability for results. We give greater authority to the military services to manage their own programs, and we enhance the role of the service chiefs in the acquisition process. In exchange for greater authority, the bill demands accountability and creates new mechanisms to deliver it. Service chiefs, service secretaries, service acquisition executives, and program managers would sign up to binding management, requirement, and resource commitments.

The bill also creates new incentives for the services to deliver programs on

time and on budget. If military services fail to manage a program effectively, they will lose authority and control over that program, and they will be assessed an annual cost penalty on their cost overruns, with those funds directed toward acquisition risk reduction efforts across the Department.

Second, the legislation supports the use of flexible acquisition authorities and the development of alternative acquisition paths to acquire critical national security capabilities. The bill establishes a new streamlined acquisition and requirements process for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding within 2 to 5 years. It expands rapid acquisition authorities for contingency operations and cyber security missions, and the legislation allows the Secretary of Defense to waive unnecessary acquisition laws to acquire vital national security capabilities.

Third, the NDAA improves access to nontraditional and commercial contractors. To give our military the necessary capabilities to defend the Nation, the Department of Defense must be able to access innovation in areas such as cyber, robotics, data analytics, miniaturization, and autonomy—the innovation that is much more likely to come from Silicon Valley, Austin or Mesa than Washington. But our broken acquisition system, with its complex regulation and stifling bureaucracies, is leading many commercial firms to choose not to do business with the Defense Department or to limit their engagement in ways that prevent the Department from accessing the critical technologies these companies have to offer. The NDAA creates incentives for commercial innovation by removing barriers to new entrants into the defense market. By adopting commercial buying practices for the Defense Department, the legislation makes it easier for nontraditional firms to do business with the Pentagon. The legislation also ensures that businesses are not forced to cede intellectual property developed at their expense to the government.

Fourth, the NDAA streamlines the process for buying weapons systems, services, and information technology by reducing unnecessary requirements, reports, and certification. The legislation retains positive reforms made in the Weapons System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009, but streamlines processes to support more rapid and efficient development and delivery of new capabilities. It would also establish an expert review panel to identify unneeded acquisitions regulations.

Fifth, the legislation reinvigorates the acquisition workforce in several ways, including by establishing several direct-hire authorities for science and technology professionals to join the acquisition workforce. The legislation seeks to improve the attractiveness of acquisition functions to skilled military personnel through credits for acquisition-related assignments, creation of an enhanced dual-track career path to include acquisition, and increased business and commercial training opportunities.

In a Statement of Administration Policy released yesterday, the White House asserted that transferring some acquisition authority back to the services is somehow inconsistent with the Secretary of Defense's exercise of authority, direction, and control over all of DOD's programs and activities. I could not disagree more with this assertion. What this legislation does is merely switch who does what in certain circumstances from different people who all directly report and serve under the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense. In this legislation, for a limited number of programs to start with, the Secretary of Defense will look to the service Secretaries directly for management of these acquisition programs rather than looking to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics or AT and L. This is not usurpation of the Secretary of Defense's power. It is called streamlining of authorities and reducing layers of unnecessary bureaucracy. There is a section in the legislation that would allow the Secretary of Defense to continue to rely on more layers of management if he chooses but only if he certifies to Congress that this makes sense. There simply is not any undermining of the Secretary of Defense's authority here.

Another concern raised has been that the transfer of milestone decision authority to the services would reduce the Secretary of Defense's ability through AT and L to guard against unwarranted optimism in program planning and budget formulation. Unwarranted optimism is indeed a plague on acquisition, and there is not a monopoly of that in the services. Yet there is nothing in this bill that overrides the requirement to use better cost estimates from the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation. In fact, new incentives and real penalties imposed on the services in the bill are designed to put some of this optimism in check.

There is also belief manufactured in parts of the Department that the current system is working. They are saying the current system is working. That is laughable. The statistics are improving, first of all, because Secretary Gates canceled over 25 programs. It is easier to make your numbers when you are unilaterally disarming and buying less. Still, all of the programs that are left under the U.S. Defense Department AT and L management have over $200 billion in cost overruns. I want to repeat—$200 billion in cost overruns under the current setup. That is why it is imperative we change it. There are a lot of words to describe this, but success is not one of them. The USD AT and L is trying to have it both ways: claiming credit for all the improvements in the acquisition system while blaming the services for its long list of failures. This is exactly the problem this legislation is trying to address—blurred lines of accountability inside the Defense Acquisition System that allow its leaders to evade responsibility for results.

Then, there is the issue of process and documentation. Defenders of the current acquisition system say they have it right. They might have it right if our adversary were the old Soviet Union and their centralized planned economy. The reality for the modern world is that under USD AT and L management process takes too long and adds costs and looks like it was designed by a Soviet apparatchik. For example, an Army study looked at the time it would take to go through all of the U.S. Defense Department AT and L reviews and buy nothing. What was the answer? Ten years to buy nothing.

The Government Accountability Office looked at the much wanted milestone reviews that the office of the Secretary of Defense is touting as a success. Just one review takes on average 2 years. A similar review at the Missile Defense Agency takes about 3 months. Our adversaries are not shuffling paper, they are building weapons systems. It is time for us to do the same. The first step is to eliminate unnecessary calls for data from those outside the program office, just as David Packard recommended 30 years ago. This legislation does that.

The acquisition reforms in this bill are sweeping, but there is much more work to do to transition what is in essence a Cold War management system into one that is more agile and nimble to meet the challenges of a globalized information age. This legislation marks the beginning of a multiyear process to change the acquisition system to be more open to next-generation technologies that can enable the United States to outpace its adversaries.

Acquisition reform is part of a larger effort to reform the management of the Department of Defense. This bill seeks to ensure that the Department and the military services are using precious defense dollars to fulfill their missions and defend the Nation, not to expand their bloated staffs. While staff at Army headquarters increased 60 percent over the past decade, the Army is now cutting brigade combat teams. The Air Force avoided mandated cuts to their headquarters personnel by creating two new headquarters entities, even as it complained it had insufficient personnel to maintain combat aircraft.

I want to repeat that. The Air Force mandated cuts of headquarters personnel, not reducing by a single person but by creating new headquarters entities, even as it complained it had insufficient personnel to maintain combat aircraft. From 2001 to 2012, the defense civilian workforce grew at five times the rate of the Active-Duty military. I repeat that. From 2001 to 2012, the defense civilian workforce grew at five

times the rate of the Active-Duty military.

This legislation initiates a reorganization of the Department of Defense in order to focus limited resources on operations rather than administration, to ensure military personnel can develop critical military skills, and to stabilize organizations and programs. The NDAA mandates a 30-percent cut in funding for headquarters and administrative staff over the next 4 years. These reductions generate $1.7 billion in savings for fiscal year 2016. As the Department implements these reductions, this bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense to retain the best talent available, rather than just the longest serving.

Contrary to the Statement of Administration Policy that the White House issued yesterday, the reductions to Pentagon overhead and management staff are neither arbitrary nor across the board. These cuts are targeted to administrative functions, but they do not inflict unintended harms on functions such as mortuary affairs or sexual assault prevention. The legislation does not seek to micromanage the Defense Department. It cuts money from broad headquarters and administrative functions, but it defers to the Secretary of Defense on how, what, and where exactly to cut, and it instructs him to devise a plan to make these cuts wisely.

Beyond management reform, the NDAA also puts forward wide-ranging and unprecedented reform to the military retirement system. Under the current 70-year-old system, 83 percent of servicemembers leave the service without any retirement assets. This system excludes the vast majority of current servicemembers who will not complete 20 years of uniformed service, including many veterans of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The legislation creates a modernized retirement system and extends retirement benefits to the vast majority of servicemembers through a new plan offering more value and choice. Under the new plan, 75 percent of servicemembers would get retirement benefits. In many cases, the overall benefit of those serving at least 20 years will be greater than the current system. This new modernized retirement system will apply to members first joining a uniformed service on or after January 1, 2018. Current members are grandfathered but may choose to be covered by the new plan. The retirement reforms in this legislation will enable servicemembers to save for retirement earlier in their careers, create a new incentive to recruit millennials, and increase retention across the services. That is why these reforms are supported by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Reserve Officers Association, the National Guard Association, the Enlisted Association of the National Guard, and the Air Force Association, among others.

In addition to retirement reform, the NDAA focuses on sustaining the quality of life of our military servicemembers, retirees, and their families. The legislation authorizes a 1.3-percent pay raise for members of the uniformed services in the grade O–6 and below. The bill authorizes $25 million to support local educational agencies that serve military dependent children, and $5 million in impact aid for schools with military dependent children with severe disabilities.

The NDAA includes many provisions to improve the military health care system and TRICARE. The legislation allows the TRICARE beneficiary up to four urgent care visits without making them get a preauthorization. It requires DOD to establish appointment access standards and wait-time goals, and if a patient can't get an appointment within standards, the military hospital must offer an appointment in the TRICARE network. The legislation requires DOD to focus more on health care quality, patient safety, and beneficiary satisfaction by making them publish health outcome measures on their Web sites, and it requires a plan to improve the delivery of pediatric health care, especially for children with special needs. Furthermore, as military families frequently move from one location to another, their health care coverage must be seamless and portable, but too often families have to leap over several hurdles to get health care in a new location. This has to stop. We take care of that problem in this legislation.

The NDAA also builds on the work of the past few years to prevent and respond to military sexual assault. The legislation contains a number of provisions aimed at strengthening the authorities of special victims' counsel to provide services to victims of sexual assault. The legislation also enhances confidential reporting options for victims of sexual assault and increases access to timely disclosure of certain materials and information in connection with the prosecution of offenses.

This is a fiscally responsible NDAA. I have said that my top priority as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee is to repeal sequestration and return to a strategy-driven defense budget. But I have also made clear that repealing sequestration must be accompanied by a vigorous effort to root out and eliminate Pentagon waste. Given the fiscal constraints and global challenges confronting our military, we simply cannot afford to waste precious defense dollars.

Our committee identified over $10 billion in excessive and unnecessary spending in the President's budget request: headquarters and administrative overhead, troubled information technology programs, weapons systems that are over budget and underperforming, among other items. The NDAA reinvests those savings in providing critical military capabilities for our warfighters and meeting unfunded priorities of our service chiefs and combatant commanders.

Even as challenges to maritime security increase in the Middle East and the western Pacific, our Navy remains well below its fleet-size requirement of 306 ships. Moreover, our shipbuilding budget will experience even greater pressure at the end of this decade, as the Navy procures the replacement for the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine. The NDAA directs savings identified in the budget request to accelerate Navy modernization and shipbuilding to mitigate the impacts of the *Ohio*-class replacement and to increase the Navy to meet rising threats.

The legislation adds $800 million for additional advanced procurement for *Virginia*-class submarines, and $200 million for the next amphibious assault ship. The bill provides incremental funding authority for one additional Arleigh Burke-class destroyer. The bill accelerates the Navy LX(R) Amphibious Ship Program, shipbuilding for the afloat forward staging base, and procurement of the first landing craft utility replacement.

The NDAA upgrades an additional guided missile destroyer with ballistic missile defense capability and funds advanced undersea payloads for submarines.

Across the services, our military faces dangerous strike fighter capacity shortfalls. For example, we have seen delivery of the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter fall well short of projections, even as the Air Force has retired hundreds of aircraft.

Indeed, the President's budget request proposed cutting the Air Force down to 49 fighter squadrons, of which less than half would be fully combat mission ready. The NDAA addresses these shortfalls, and it is all the more urgent in view of the ongoing and anticipated operations in Iraq and Syria against ISIL, as well as a potential delay of force withdrawals from Afghanistan.

The NDAA fully restores the planned retirement of the A–10 aircraft. The Air Force itself has said in its posture statement this year:

> There was a time when the Air Force could trade some capacity in order to retain capability. But we have reached the point where the two are inextricable; lose any more capacity and the capability will cease to exist.

The Armed Services Committee agrees. That is why divesting the A–10 capability at this time incurs unacceptable risk in the capacity and readiness of the combat air forces without a suitable replacement available. The NDAA authorized procurement funding for 12 additional F–18 Super Hornets for the Navy and 6 additional F–35B Joint Strike Fighters for the Marine Corps. The legislation also procures an additional 24 MQ–9 Reaper unmanned aircraft for the Air Force to support increased combatant commander requirements for medium-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconciliation support.

The committee was similarly concerned about munitions capacity

across the services. So the NDAA adds funding for additional PAC–3 missiles for ballistic missile defense and additional AMRAAM missiles. The legislation also increases Tomahawk missile production to the minimum sustaining rate and procures TOW tube-launched, antitank missiles to mitigate shortfalls for the Marine Corps.

The NDAA supports modernization across the services. The legislation invests in lethality by enhancing the firepower of Stryker combat vehicles and increasing the survivability of the Apache attack helicopter against new threats. The NDAA fully supports the President's request for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Program and provides all executable funding for the Long Range Strike Bomber Program.

In addition, the legislation authorizes $6.1 billion for *Virginia*-class submarines, $3.5 billion for Arleigh Burke-class destroyers, and $1.4 billion for the *Ohio*-class replacement program.

While the NDAA supports our military commanders' most urgent priorities, the bill also contains rigorous oversight measures to prevent further cost growth in major acquisition programs, including the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter, the *Ford*-class aircraft carrier, and a littoral combat ship.

As adversaries seek to counter and thwart American military power, the NDAA looks to the future and invests in the technologies that will maintain America's military technological superiority. The NDAA provides $400 million in additional funding to support the so-called third offset strategy to outpace our emerging adversaries. The legislation funds a cyber vulnerability assessment, a new initiative to enable the services to begin evaluating all major weapons systems for cyber vulnerabilities. It also increases investment in six breakthrough technologies: cyber capabilities; low-cost, high-speed munitions; autonomous vehicles; undersea warfare; intelligence data analytics; and directed energy.

Similarly, our Nation has only begun to realize the potential of unmanned combat aircraft, especially in a maritime environment. In the past 2 years, the Unmanned Combat Air System Demonstration Program, or UCAS–D, has achieved a number of historic firsts: the first carrier-based catapult launch, the first arrested landing on a carrier, the first cooperative operations with manned aircraft aboard a carrier, and the first autonomous aerial refueling.

The NDAA funds the remaining research and development work to be completed on UCAS–D, while directing the Secretary of Defense to develop competitive prototypes that move the Department toward a carrier-based, unmanned, long-range, low-observable, penetrating strike aircraft that can enhance the capability of the carrier air wing to meet future threats.

The NDAA supports our allies and partners with robust training and assistance initiatives. The legislation authorizes nearly $3.8 billion in support for the Afghan National Security Forces as they continue to defend their country and the gains of the last decade against our common enemies. The legislation also authorizes the provision of defensive lethal assistance to Ukraine to help it build combat capability and defend its sovereign territory.

The legislation supports efforts by Lebanon and Jordan to secure their borders against ISIL, and it creates a new initiative to provide equipment, supplies, and training to Southeast Asian nations in order to support them in building maritime domain awareness capabilities and addressing growing maritime sovereignty challenges in the South China Sea.

Finally, this legislation contains a bipartisan compromise on how to address the challenge of the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay. President Obama has said from day one of his Presidency that he wants to close Guantanamo Bay. But 6½ years into his administration, the President of the United States has never provided a plan to do so.

The NDAA would require the administration to provide a comprehensive plan to the Congress on how it intends to close Guantanamo, which would then have to be approved by both Houses of Congress. That plan would have to include a case-by-case determination on the disposition of each detainee at Guantanamo Bay, including a discussion of the legal challenges of bringing detainees to the United States and any additional authorities that might be needed.

The plan would also have to address how the Department would ensure the continued detention and intelligence collection from future combatants captured under the laws of war. If such a plan is approved, the Congress would provide the President the authority to proceed with the closure of the facility. If the Congress does not approve the plan, nothing would change. The ban on domestic transfers would stay in force, and the certification standards for foreign transfers included in the NDAA would remain.

This is an ambitious piece of legislation. It recognizes that in order to ensure that the Department of Defense is prepared to meet our present and future national security challenges, we must champion the cause of defense reform, rigorously root out Pentagon waste, and invest in modernization and next-generation technologies to maintain our military technological advantage.

America has reached a key inflection point. The liberal world order that has been anchored by U.S. hard power for seven decades is being seriously stressed and with it the foundation of our security and prosperity. It does not have to be this way. We can choose a better future for ourselves but only if we make the right decisions now to set us on a better course. That is what this legislation is all about—living up to our constitutional duties to provide for the common defense, increasing the effectiveness of our military, restoring America's global leadership, and defending a liberal world order.

This legislation is a small step toward accomplishing those goals. But it is an important step that the Congress must take now and take together. For 53 consecutive years, Congress has passed a National Defense Authorization Act. This year should be no different. I am hopeful that the bipartisan spirit that has carried this legislation for over half a century will prevail once again.

Ultimately, we owe the brave men and women in uniform, many of whom are still in harm's way around the world today, nothing less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the fiscal year 2016 national defense authorization bill, which was recently reported out of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I want to begin by commending the chairman, Senator MCCAIN, for his extraordinary leadership. I also want to reflect—because both the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Alaska, and I had the privilege of being with Senator MCCAIN in Vietnam last week—that to recognize firsthand the heroic service of CDR JOHN MCCAIN is to recognize an extraordinary individual whose service, whose sacrifice, whose valor, whose fidelity to the principles of our military and to our Nation are virtually unique. But more important than that, it is to recognize that after observing the horrors and brutality of war, as few people have, he was able to summon the courage and the capacity to bring two countries together. Without Senator MCCAIN's active participation—not alone but absolutely essential and perhaps the most essential part—the Government of the United States and the Government of Vietnam would not have diplomatic relations today. We would not have been at a university in Vietnam listening to young people talking about their future—a future that is not clouded by war but has the opportunity for peace and prosperity, working with us and working with the world community.

I can't think of any historical examples of individuals working so hard to defeat each other, then so hard to embrace each other, save, of course, General Grant and General Lee. But I know the Senator would be offended by being compared to two West Point graduates, so I will simply say that he has made historic contributions to this country in so many ways. It is no surprise that he has taken the leadership of this committee and made a remarkable contribution. His vision to engage us in a strategic dialogue with some of the most sophisticated and experienced individuals in the country—Henry Kissinger, Madeleine Albright, and a host

of others—gave us the perspective to begin to look at the issues we face in a much more comprehensive and a much more thoughtful way. I have had the privilege of serving on the committee for many years. No one has done that. No one has set the stage so well. And then to bring our DOD witnesses together in that context of both the strategic vision and the operational budgetary requirements was absolutely incredible. All of this has made us better prepared on the committee to write this bill which is before us today.

(Mr. SASSE assumed the Chair.)

Let me also take a moment to thank the professional staff on both sides of the aisle. Their willingness to work together to tackle the hard issues has been the key to this authorization bill. I thank them in advance because their work has just begun. The hours they will spend over the next several days to go through the significant number of amendments—all of that will be unnoticed by many but appreciated certainly by me, the chairman, and all of us on the committee. Thank you.

As the Senator from Arizona pointed out, this is basically a good bill. It has many provisions that were requested by the Department of Defense. It has many necessary reforms. The chairman has highlighted many of them. I think it will further our national security in many dimensions, and most importantly it will provide the training, equipment, and support our men and women in uniform deserve. I will try to focus on some of these important developments.

However, there are some provisions in this bill that cause me concern—indeed, grave concern. One problem, I fear, is the familiar, oft-debated, and very complicated challenge of Guantanamo. While we have had some very carefully crafted compromise language in the bill, there are other provisions that reverse progress, particularly on the overseas transfer of detainees.

We have a number of individuals who have been vetted for overseas transfer—not to the United States—that is not appropriate at this moment—but overseas. I think we have to continue that effort to repatriate these individuals outside of the United States, in areas in which their security and their activities can be appropriately monitored. I will spend a few more minutes—and in a few minutes, I will discuss an amendment that I may propose with respect.

Despite all of these good provisions, however, I was ultimately unable to vote for the bill. After working closely and sincerely, with the leadership of the chairman, I am reluctantly unable to vote for the bill because at the heart, the funding mechanism to provide a significant portion of the resources—$39 billion—is, I think, an unsustainable aspect of the legislation.

As the Senator pointed out, the legislation before us does not end the Budget Control Act's arbitrary caps on spending, and, as he also said, every major military official, every major senior defense official came and told us: We have to end the Budget Control Act caps and the prospect of sequestration. We have not done that.

What the bill does is adopt a device—some have said a gimmick—that uses the overseas spending account to fund base activities of the Department of Defense. As I have indicated and as the chairman has suggested, the one request consistently received—in fact, just a few days ago, the commander of the Pacific forces indicated the same thing—is to end sequestration. We have not been able to do that.

What the President's budget did is he sent up a request for $38 billion above the budget cap levels in the base—not overseas defense spending but in the base. He requested $50.9 billion for contingency operations, overseas operations. We have been funding overseas operations since 9/11. This funding was designed to do what it suggests in the title. We have forces deployed overseas in combat, in contact with our enemies—Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere—and this funding was to provide for those forces and indirectly for our supporting mechanisms, but the key was to support these forces overseas.

Now what we have done—and it was done because we were unable to eliminate the budget caps under the Budget Control Act—is we have taken this OCO account and we have grossed it up dramatically.

This approach has several problems. First, it doesn't solve—in fact, in some cases it complicates the DOD's budget problems. OCO, as I said, was created and should be used for war costs only. OCO has limits and restrictions. There are very strict rules that have to be followed. It is not flexible funds that can be moved around at will.

Defense budgeting needs to be based on a long-term military strategy, which requires the DOD to focus at least 5 years ahead. OCO money is 1-year money. It is just this year. There is no commitment statutorily that it will be available. There is no presumption, because it is in the base, that it will be the starting point of discussions for the next budget. Frankly and obviously, we cannot fight a multigenerational war with 1-year money. And we are in a multigenerational conflict. It has been more than a decade since we started our efforts in the wake of 9/11, and we have challenges that will not resolve themselves in a year. To adopt a major part of our budget, roughly $39 billion, as one-time—supposedly—funds is not a wise, sensible, and appropriate way to fund our security going forward.

Another aspect is it doesn't reduce the deficit; it adds to the deficit. This is all deficit funding, so this is not a way to avoid tough decisions about how we are going to deal with our deficit.

It also does not reach other vital aspects of national security that are housed in domestic agencies which are also critical for our national defense—the FBI, Homeland Security, the Coast Guard. All of these agencies contribute dramatically to our national defense. In fact, particularly with the threat of ''lone wolves''—and that is increasingly more of a concern to all of us—these agencies play an even more significant role in our overall national security. When you are talking about a national security strategy, it is not just the Department of Defense; it is the Department of State and it is engagement overseas.

Again, as we were in Vietnam, we were talking to the Defense Minister, and one of his key priorities is a project to eliminate toxins in Bien Hoa airfield, an airfield we used extensively in Vietnam. To him, that would be a hugely significant indication of our support for their efforts. That is not funded through the Department of Defense; that would be principally funded through the AID. And you could go on and on.

The approach we offer in the bill does not go to the heart of the problem that faces the Department of Defense and every other Federal agency, and that is the BCA caps and the steep cuts that will come into effect if sequestration is invoked. That is the heart of the matter. I offered an amendment in committee to address this problem, and unfortunately it failed. That was one of the reasons I reluctantly—very reluctantly—chose not to support the bill, because there are so many, as the chairman indicated and as I will indicate, important provisions in this bill.

What I tried to do was to say: Let's leave this money on the books, but let's fence it off until we can fix the real problem, which is the Budget Control Act and sequestration, which affects defense and nondefense alike.

In the context of this floor debate, I hope to be able to once again rejoin that issue and ask my colleagues to recognize the heart of the matter—not the consequences affecting defense but the heart of the matter, which is the Budget Control Act.

As I said, this is a bill with many laudatory provisions reflecting in large part bipartisan cooperation. Some of them have been discussed by the chairman, but I would also like to mention them.

The bill provides key funding and authorities for the two major U.S.-led coalition operations: the mission in Afghanistan and the counter-ISIS coalition in Iraq and Syria. Critical to both of these operations are our efforts to build the capacities of our partner nations.

With regard to Afghanistan, the bill includes the full $3.8 billion requested by the President to support the Afghan army, police, and other security forces fighting to secure the hard-fought gains of the past decade and to ensure that Afghanistan does not once again become a safe haven for Al Qaeda or other terrorist groups seeking to attack America.

The bill would also increase the total number of visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program by 3,000, providing a path to safety for Afghans who have put themselves at risk by serving as translators or otherwise helping our coalition efforts.

For coalition efforts against ISIS, the bill provides additional funding for training and equipping the Iraqi security forces and other associated forces in Iraq, including the Kurdish Peshmerga and Sunni tribes, who are confronting the threat of ISIS in heavily contested Anbar Province and in other parts of Iraq. It includes $80 million for the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq. It also provides an additional $600 million for the Syria Train and Equip Fund, to build the capabilities of a vetted, moderate opposition to fight ISIS in Syria. Additionally, $125 million is authorized to reimburse Lebanon and Jordan for operations that help secure their borders against ISIS.

The bill includes funding for an initiative to expand the U.S. military presence and exercises in Eastern Europe, reassuring allies and countering the threat of hybrid warfare tactics like those used by Russia in the Crimea and eastern Ukraine. The bill also authorizes additional military assistance for Ukraine—including lethal assistance—to build the capabilities of Ukrainian security forces to defend against further aggression and ceasefire violations by Russian-backed separatist forces.

With respect to counternarcotics, which is another national security threat, the bill expands an existing authority to permit counternarcotics assistance to the Governments of Kenya, Tanzania, and Somalia. This expansion would allow for additional nonlethal assistance to those nations as they combat illicit trafficking in the region. In Latin America, the bill would provide assistance to support the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign of the Government of Colombia. This assistance remains a key element of our bilateral security operation in Colombia and enables the commander of SOUTHCOM to provide critical enabling support upon request.

The bill also provides an additional $50 million to address unfunded priorities identified by SOUTHCOM, including intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, as well as maritime interdiction support operations in Central America.

As the chairman indicated, the bill adds over $400 million in additional readiness funding for the military services across all branches, Active, Guard, and Reserve. These increases will provide resources for crucial programs aimed at improving our military readiness in many areas, including depot readiness, flying operations, cyber training, reducing insider threat attacks, behavioral health counseling, and other important programs.

With respect to our nuclear deterrence, the committee bill fully authorizes the program for modernizing our triad of sea, ground, and airborne platforms. The last B–52 was produced in the 1960s, and by the time the Long-Range Strike Bomber, its replacement, begins to be fielded in the mid-2020s, the B–52 will be flown in some cases by the grandchildren of its first pilots.

Turning to the undersea deterrent, the current *Ohio*-class submarine, which will ultimately carry upward of two-thirds of our strategic arsenal, is to be replaced by the *Ohio* replacement submarine. If we are to maintain a sea-based deterrent, the current *Ohio* fleet of 14 subs must be replaced starting in 2027 due to the potential for hull fatigue. By then, the first *Ohio* sub will be 46 years old—the oldest submarine to have sailed in our Navy in its history.

Now, the third aspect of our triad—those of our land-based ICBMs—will not need to be replaced until the 2030 timeframe. We have authorized a concept development for replacement of this most responsive leg of the triad which acts as a counterbalance to Russian ICBMs.

As Secretary Carter noted in his confirmation hearing, our nuclear deterrence forms the bedrock of our defense policy. This is an essential mission which must not be neglected.

In the area of technology and innovation, I am pleased this bill takes a number of steps to ensure that DOD has access to the most innovative minds in the private sector and to strengthen DOD's in-house laboratories. It significantly increases funding for university research programs as well as authorizing $400 million to support Secretary Carter's efforts to identify and fund new technologies that will help offset the advancing military capabilities of peer nations, invest in technologies such as lasers, unmanned systems, and undersea warfare.

The bill also supports the DOD's laboratory enterprise by improving their ability to attract and hire the world's best and brightest scientists and engineers. These labs help DOD act as smart buyers and builders of the most advanced weapon systems on the planet and are often underappreciated for their endeavors.

It also improves their ability to build world-class modern research infrastructure, encourages them to hire selected students from friendly foreign nations, and strengthens their ability to partner with industry, allowing small businesses to have access to the great intellectual property coming from DOD labs, as well as access to their research and technical equipment. I believe these policy changes and funding increases will continue to strengthen the technological dominance of our military forces while reducing the costs to build and maintain weapon systems in the future.

There are also specific recommendations on hardware programs that will help the Department to improve management and cope with shortfalls, such as providing an additional 12 F–18 Super Hornets for the Navy and an additional 6 F–35B aircraft for the Marine Corps. These aircraft will help deal with the Department of Navy shortfall in strike fighter aircraft.

It adds $800 million in Virginia-class advance procurement to provide flexibility to begin building Virginia-class boats with the enhanced payload module as soon as that version is ready for production and to help mitigate pressure on shipbuilding funds coming from the Ohio-class replacement program.

It accelerates several other ship programs, including amphibious assault ships, the dock landing ship replacement, the next afloat forward staging base, the new salvage ship/fleet tug replacement, and the landing craft utility replacement.

As the chairman indicated, this bill also includes critical authorities for our men and women in uniform. They are the heart and soul of our military. All the equipment in the world, as sophisticated as it is, will not make the difference that the young men and women who wear the uniform of the United States make each and every day. So this bill includes a 1.3-percent pay raise for most servicemembers, the reauthorization of over 30 types of bonuses and special pays to encourage enlistment and reenlistment in the military, and funds to provide health care to the force, retirees, and their families.

Notably, this bill includes important benefit and compensation reforms either requested by the Department or recommended by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission that helps to ensure the long-term viability of the all-volunteer force.

For example, the bill includes a new retirement system for servicemembers joining after January 1, 2018, as recommended by the Commission, which grandfathers in the current force. For most servicemembers, this new system will provide a greater benefit at less cost to the government and will address perhaps the grossest inequity of the current system, as highlighted by the chairman—the fact that 83 percent of all servicemembers leave military service with no retirement benefits at all. This is especially challenging, difficult, and in some cases even galling for those who have deployed multiple times and leave the service simply because they cannot endure the strain any longer. We essentially ask them to choose between retirement benefits or their mental health or the unity of their family. Under the new system contained in our bill, anyone who completes 2 years of service will be eligible to walk away with something.

Notably, the bill does not include the overall TRICARE system recommended by the Commission. We have heard from the President with respect to TRICARE and agree these recommendations require more study. These reforms are vital. In a budget-

constrained environment, with hard spending caps, it is critical we strike the right balance between a military compensation package that provides a high quality of life for military families and training and modernization funding that provides a high quality of service and a ready force.

As senior Department officials have testified, if we don't have enough money to provide our troops the latest technology and the training they need, we are doing them a disservice. When we send them into harm's way under these conditions, that disservice quickly translates into a breach of trust.

The Department has assumed approximately $1.7 billion in savings in its 2016 budget relating to these benefit proposals and $25.4 billion over the entire FYDP. The committee supported these proposals and has redirected that funding to readiness and modernization accounts to restore those deficits. Difficult choices need to be made and this bill makes them. We might not yet have it perfectly right, but as we move through the legislative year, we will continue to work to ensure that we pay our servicemembers a fair wage while delivering the training and equipment necessary to succeed.

This bill begins a process, long overdue, for reviewing different options, for example, for providing the commissary benefit to our servicemembers—another important aspect of quality of life. Included in one of these options is at least the consideration of privatization. I understand some Members may have some difficulty supporting these provisions, but the bill simply requires a number of studies to generate and evaluate new ideas, and a pilot program to test them, without requiring the actual privatization of the system. This is an experiment which I think is worth conducting, and I believe the chairman's leadership on this point was extraordinarily valuable.

The bill also addresses the Department's management of its civilian workforce in two ways—one of which I agree with and one of which I will raise some questions. We have long heard from the Department that it lacks certain authorities to effectively manage its civilian workforce. This bill includes new authorities which will enable civilian managers to more effectively retain their best performing employees while divesting their poorest. These reforms, while painful for some, are sensible and necessary.

However, this bill also mandates a management headquarters reduction of 7.5 percent in 2016 and 30 percent over 4 years. I am concerned that such deep, and at this point generalized, cuts to the civilian workforce may create more problems than it will solve. I am hoping we can take a more careful approach to headquarters reform and look forward to working with my colleagues on this issue as we move through the floor and through the conference to final passage.

Again, as the chairman highlighted, this bill also contains roughly 50 provisions on acquisition reform, and I commend the chairman for his efforts. The provisions will help streamline acquisition processes, allow DOD to access commercial and small businesses, and improve the acquisition workforce. They build on the successes of the reforms led by Chairman MCCAIN and Chairman Levin in the Weapons System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009.

I did have concerns about one provision in this area, and I thank the chairman for working with me to address it. I am sure we will be continuing this discussion of acquisition reform throughout the year and in the future. I expect the Department of Defense will have concerns over some of the provisions as well, so I look forward to working with the chairman and soliciting the best advice from acquisition experts in the government and industry so we can continue to improve our stewardship of taxpayer dollars and deliver the best technologies to our fighting forces.

Now, let me turn to an area of concern which the chairman has highlighted and on which I may be offering an amendment; that is, Guantanamo. Over the past few years, the Senate Committee on Armed Services has led the way on Guantanamo-related issues, giving careful consideration to our detention policies and finding bipartisan solutions.

In certain ways, this bill continues that tradition of bipartisan progress on Guantanamo issues. For example, it includes the authority, carried in our bill over the last 2 years, for the Secretary of Defense to approve the temporary transfer of Guantanamo detainees to a military medical facility in the continental United States to provide medical treatment in a life-threatening emergency, when that treatment cannot be provided on-island without unreasonable or excessive cost. The detainee would be required to return to Guantanamo at the conclusion of the medical treatment.

Most importantly, the bill contains a provision that would clear a path for closing Guantanamo, including the option of bringing detainees to the United States for detention, civil trial, and incarceration. Under this approach, the current prohibitions on Guantanamo transfers to the United States would remain in place until the President submits to Congress a detailed plan on the disposition of these detainees and Congress votes, under expedited procedures, to approve that plan. If Congress approves the plan, the bans on transfers to the United States would be lifted and the President would have the authority to implement this plan for closing Guantanamo.

I particularly want to thank Chairman MCCAIN and Senator MANCHIN, who worked closely to craft this compromise, which was approved by a significant vote in the committee—19 to 7. This is an example of bipartisan work at its best.

At the same time, on other Guantanamo policies, I must note they take us backward. This is particularly the case with regard to overseas transfers of Guantanamo detainees—not transfers into the United States but to third countries. In the fiscal year 2014 National Defense Act, the committee's bipartisan efforts resulted in real progress on overseas transfers, granting the Secretary of Defense more flexible and streamlined authorities for overseas transfers of detainees, consistent with our national security interests and with measures to substantially mitigate the risk of Guantanamo detainees reengaging in terrorist activities.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today would undo that progress and reimpose restrictions which date back to 2013 that include a burdensome checklist of certifications that the Secretary of Defense would be required to fulfill for any overseas transfers and a prohibition on transfers to any country where there was a prior case of detainee recidivism.

These provisions make it nearly impossible to transfer Guantanamo detainees overseas to a third-party country. In fact, during the 3 years these certifications were previously in place, no detainees were transferred under these certification restrictions. During this period, a total of 11 detainees were transferred out of Guantanamo overseas, 6 under an existing national security waiver and 5 under an exception for court-ordered transfers. This is a fraction of the over 30 detainees who have been transferred under the more recent 2014 transfer authority.

These backward-looking restrictions on overseas transfers create an unnecessary roadblock for disposing of the 57 detainees currently at Guantanamo who have been approved for overseas transfer, most of whom were approved nearly 5 years ago. My hope is that we can work with our colleagues across the aisle to craft a compromise that brings us more in line with present law.

Finally, I wish to discuss more in-depth the reason I was unable to support the committee's bill and why I think we need to have a very serious debate on the underlying financing of this legislation.

Our national defense decisions should be based on actual needs, not on spending caps and ways around the spending caps that don't change the BCA but simply use a device—some have labeled a gimmick—to get us money, not to fix the fundamental problem but to get us money.

The President's fiscal year budget 2016 requested $38 billion above the Budget Control Act spending caps. Senator MCCAIN and I wrote a letter to the Budget Committee that also asked to go above those budget caps because we understand the best approach is to put within the base funding of the Department of Defense those functions which are essential, not just to the year-to-year operations but to the long-term

operations of the Department of Defense and to our long-term national security. The President requested this $38 billion be authorized as part of the base budget.

The request from the President also contained—as Presidential requests have contained since 2001–2002—OCO funding; OCO funding being for those unique, we hope, one-of or at least yearly expenditures that we have to make with respect to current operations overseas. That is why this is called the Overseas Contingency Operations. For some time now, the President and all of our Secretaries—Secretary Carter, Secretary Hagel, Secretary Gates, Secretary Panetta, and Secretary Hagel—have implored Congress to end the damaging effects of the Budget Control Act's sequester and spending caps. However, this bill, following the budget resolution, does not clearly address the BCA issue. Instead, it turns to this OCO fund. This mark transfers $39 billion from the base budget to the Overseas Contingency Operations budget, leaving the base at, surprisingly, the BCA level, and it raises several concerns. I mentioned these concerns, but let me mention them again.

First, adding funds to OCO does not solve, and actually complicates, the DOD's budgetary problems. Defense budgeting needs to be based on our long-term military strategy, which requires DOD to plan at least 5 years ahead. When you are doing technology innovation, when you are investing in programs that are not going to come off the shelf in 6 months, you can't rely on 1-year money. It doesn't provide DOD the certainty and stability it needs. It has to have money in the base.

This instability can undercut the morale of our troops and their families. If vital programs are subject to year-to-year appropriations, if they are not considered to be the norm, if they are not where we begin but are sort of put in at the end, that affects the morale and confidence of our military.

It also affects our defense industry partners. If their funding is in the category of Overseas Contingency Operations, that is less certain to them than money that is in the base and will likely remain in the base for 5 years or beyond that they need.

Then, the second aspect of this is that our national security is more than just the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense is critical. Ask Americans: Where does our national defense come from? Well, it is those men and women in uniform. That is absolutely true. But we need domestic agencies. We can't defend the homeland without the FBI, which is funded through the Department of Justice, which will not have access—direct access—in the way we are proposing, to OCO or the Transportation Security Administration that screens individuals coming in or Customs that additionally screens people or the Coast Guard. All of these are in the Department of Homeland Security.

Furthermore, without adequate support for the State Department, then we can't present the kind of comprehensive approach overseas to national security issues that are essential to success. Gen. James Mattis, whom the chairman and I both know, said: ''If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition.''

There is a symbiotic relationship between our diplomatic activities, our national defense activities, our law enforcement activities, and our Treasury activities, because if we are truly to interrupt these terrorist networks, we have to go after their financing. That is done through the Department of Treasury. This whole-of-government approach to national security has to be recognized, and it is not recognized if we allow the Budget Control Act to continue to be operational on the nondefense side but avoid it on the defense side because we have access to the overseas contingency fund.

Also, I think we are going to see going forward, as we have seen before—and we are saying this OCO funding is for 1 year. But I think we are doing a little bit of a wink-wink, don't worry; we are not going to pull $40 billion out of the Defense bill in the 2017 budget. We couldn't do that. What we are doing, though, is we are sort of inviting the ingenious use of OCO funding in the years ahead, and I think we will see increasingly more esoteric and exotic things in OCO funding because that is where the money is.

If you have a program that you need to get funded and it has a connection to Defense—and in some cases doesn't even need to be Defense. Senator MCCAIN and I were chatting at the hearing about the significant amount of medical research run through the Department of Defense. One reason is because there was money available back in the 1980s for defense spending that wasn't available on the domestic side, and that funding found its way into Defense.

So I think there are several reasons we have to take a different approach. My approach in the committee was, I thought, straightforward. The President recognizes we need these resources for national defense. We recognize we need the resources for national defense, but I believe we should budget honestly and directly, and initially that was our approach in the Budget Committee. Let's put it in the base, and let's take the President's $50 billion—which is the best estimate by the Department of Defense of what we really need for overseas contingency—and let's do that.

So my proposal is certainly just to fence the additional OCO funds until we could, in fact, collectively, as a Congress—what we have to do and what so many people on both sides have argued—until we could repeal, reform, modify, extend the Budget Control Act, much as we did through the great efforts of Senator MURRAY and Congressman PAUL RYAN, which gave us the head room to actually pass legislation—not just the Department of Defense but other agencies—that allowed us to continue the work of the government and allowed us to protect the Nation. My proposal in committee did not succeed, but I would renew that request.

I think we have made great progress in the legislation. I think the last step is to get us to a position where we have essentially recognized that the BCA caps and sequestration have to be eliminated.

I would conclude by commending the chairman for all he has done to get us here, but, second, to repeat what has been said to us by every military leader. What is their first request? It wasn't for more OCO money. Their first request was to eliminate the BCA caps, eliminate the threat of sequestration. I think we have to do this, and I think we can start this process now. In fact, I would say that if we don't start this process now, if we don't send a strong signal—and my proposal would send that strong signal—then I am afraid we will just be victims of the calendar. Before we get to the BCA, we will have tough choices to make about this bill that we don't have to.

So I urge consideration when the amendment comes up.

I yield back to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island, my friend Senator REED, for his thoughtful analysis of the legislation before us. Again, it has been not only a pleasure but an honor for me to have the opportunity to work with him on the issues that are so important to our Nation—none more important.

I am told by the majority leader that he would like to have this legislation completed by the end of next week. That means we have a lot of work to do. We already have a number of amendments that have been filed. I would ask my colleagues to have their amendments in, hopefully, by, say, tomorrow afternoon, when the Senator from Rhode Island and I will ask unanimous consent that no further amendments be considered. We want to give every Senator an opportunity to have their amendments thoroughly vetted and debated and voted on, if that is their desire. That means we have a lot of work to do. I think we will be considering an amendment this afternoon from Senator PORTMAN, and we would like to move forward from there.

So I ask the indulgence of my colleagues that if they do want debate and a vote on their amendments, that they be prepared to come to the floor to do so. Again, on filing of amendments, we would like to have all pending amendments in, in the next 24 hours, so we can have a finite number of amendments for the legislation that is pending today.

I thank all of my colleagues for their cooperation. We look forward to discussion and debate and, I am sure, will come out with a better result.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, the ranking member. There is a lot of good stuff in here, but there is budgetary fakery in here. I want to, in my words, describe this budgetary fakery. But before I do, I want to commend the chairman, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator REED for how they have conducted the committee. I thank them for their professionalism. They show how two leaders of opposite parties can get along, and Lord knows we need a lot more of that around here.

But for this budgetary issue, Senator REED and I would be voting for this on the final passage coming out of the committee. I, too, will be supporting Senator REED's amendment to try to straighten out some of this budgetary trickery. Let me say that in front of our committee, we have had general after general and admiral after admiral and the top enlisted folks come in and say that sequestration is harming the national security of this country. When we do that, it puts us at a risk that the American people would find intolerable if they knew what was going on. Now, let me see if, in my words, I can describe what this is.

After Senator MURRAY and Congressman RYAN put together a bipartisan budget—and for 2 years this artificial ceiling, like a meat-ax approach, sequestration, across the board was enacted to be implemented over the next several years, not a budgetary strategy of program by program but a meat-ax approach across the board, regardless of the importance of the program.

Their bipartisan budget lifted that for 2 years. We are at the end of that 2-year period, so that sequestration is kicking back in. That is why we need to get rid of it. We need to get rid of it not only for defense but nondefense as well. I will talk about that in a second. But in defense, it now kicks in and limits the overall spending for the Department of Defense. But we know we have to spend more than that.

So this defense bill, which Senator REED and I voted against, takes operational and readiness funds out of the Department of Defense request, which is a major part of the defense of the country. You want your troops to be operationally ready so that we can fight two wars if we have to simultaneously. But they take that money—that funding—out of the defense budget, and they put it over here in this special account that is not counted against the budget caps, which is an account for conducting the war originally in Iraq, then Afghanistan, and primarily for purposes of funding Afghanistan now.

As Senator REED has very appropriately and accurately discussed, if you do that, first of all, this is nothing but budgetary fakery to meet an arbitrary cap on budgets, because you are spending a lot more than that ceiling. You are just spending it over here on something that is off budget, and the total amount that is moved over is about $39 billion. In that account, there is approximately $50 billion already for conducting the war in Afghanistan. But now we are going to take operational readiness for the entire Department of Defense and pull it over here.

If we are going to be straight with what we are spending so that we really know what we are spending, why don't we keep it in the budget and let the total budget rise instead of having an artificial ceiling so we know what we are spending? Senator REED is concerned that if you do that and you are spending it over here, then in future years, as this continues to stay there, we are not going to be able to show that operational readiness is something that ought to be a normal part of the funding of the Department of Defense, as it has been for years and years.

That is basically what is going on. Military strategy is not just dependent on defense spending, but it is also dependent upon nondefense national security spending, which at this point is not even being addressed. What will the generals and the admirals tell you? They will tell you that a strong national economy is one of the most important of all the strengths of our country to be able to project American military strength. And as a result, if we continue to budget like this, not only in defense but in nondefense as well, in nondefense areas that directly affect defense—I mean the Coast Guard, the CIA, the FBI, the DEA, Customs and Border Protection, air traffic control, TSA—then all of these areas in the Federal Government are going to be under this artificial meat-ax approach of cutting across the board, and all of those agencies directly affect the national security.

So what we have been doing is artificially avoiding what is the obvious. It is sequestration. It is this meat-ax cut across the board. I want us, as we discuss this budget—now highlighted first by Senator REED—to start talking about how we are going to get rid of the sequester. We did it in the bipartisan Murray-Ryan budget over 2 years ago. We need to do it again. Otherwise, we are going to be wasting our time working on bills that at the end of the day may well not get the 60 votes to proceed to final passage or we will have a veto by the President. So we need to fix the budget caps for defense and nondefense spending. If we have bleeding in an artery, we do not need a Band-Aid.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday we passed the USA FREEDOM Act, and it was quickly signed by our President because it was so important to put it into place. It contained two items that I want to draw particular attention to. One is that there should be no secret spying on U.S. citizens here in the United States of America. The second is that there should be no secret laws here in the United States of America.

These two items are very closely connected together. Our Nation was founded upon the principles of liberty and freedom. Fundamental to the exercise of those principles is the right to privacy, to be free from unreasonable intrusions. This right is central to all other rights protected in the Constitution, especially to the freedom of speech, the freedom of assembly, and the freedom to petition our Government.

Our sense of privacy and to be secure in our homes and secure with our records goes back to common law in England. It was in 1767 that the Earl of Chatham, when he was debating the cider tax, said:

> The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. [His cottage] may be frail, its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter, but the King of England cannot enter.

Certainly, that is the spirit that infused the Fourth Amendment of our Constitution. That amendment says: ''The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. . .''

We need to ensure that our security apparatus, our law enforcement, and our intelligence officers have the tools they need to enact the efforts to keep America secure. But in the process, we cannot sacrifice our constitutional rights as American citizens. There should be no secret spying on Americans and no secret law in a democracy. So how did we end up in that place—the place that I am so glad we took a major stride toward remedying yesterday?

It goes back to section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. This Act was passed after the attacks on 9/11. I was not here in the Senate, but it said that our government can access business records or tangible things if it shows that there is a statement of facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that those things are relevant to an authorized investigation.

That certainly mimics the second half of the Fourth Amendment, which goes on to say that ''no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.''

The responsibility of the government was to prepare a statement of facts, and those statements of facts had to show reasonable grounds and had to show that the things sought were relevant to an authorized investigation.

Each one of those words had a significant influence in constraining the potential for the government to collect business records or, particularly, as we came to learn, to collect phone records on American citizens. However, a problem developed, and that is that a secret court was created here in America, a secret court called the FISA Court, or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. That secret court could interpret the common language of the law, and its interpretations were not disclosed to the U.S. public. So in that process of taking the language of the law that has a clear set of standards and then interpreting it, the court created secret law—secret law that was not disclosed to the citizens of the United States.

This is an enormous risk to democracy—a court with no scrutiny and, quite tragically, no presentation of opposing views from the position presented by the government. What kind of court is it that allows no presentation of an opposing view to the view of the government? That is a court that can create tyranny of the government by secretly reinterpreting the plain language of the law. That is exactly what happened.

Let's think about how this then went forward. Back in December 2012, I proposed an amendment, and that amendment said that there can be no secret law in America; that if the FISA Court makes an interpretation of terms, that interpretation of those terms has to be made public.

Here we have a representation of the importance of shining a light on that secret court, disclosing to the public how it interprets the law and thereby changes the meaning of the law. And what did this court do? This court tipped those terms and said ''authorize investigation.'' That can mean anything that happens in the future, which, of course, makes that term meaningless. It means that there is no authorized investigation. It is just a fictional possibility of the future—nothing existing right now. And then it took the term ''relevant to an authorized investigation,'' and it said that relevant is irrelevant. You have to show no connection, one or two places removed, in order to secure the right to access the papers, the business records, the phone records of U.S. citizens.

So this secret court here in America, the FISA Court, created secret law, wiped out the plain meaning of section 215, put its own interpretation in place, and told no one. This is absolutely unacceptable. That is why I put forward the amendment in December of 2012 that there is no secret law amendment, that this is unacceptable, that we must have disclosure of whatever that court finds so that the public can be informed, so that legislators can be informed, so that we can have a debate on whether that interpretation is consistent with what the legislature intended—what the Senate and the House intended—and consistent with what the President intended when he signed that law.

That amendment did not get a debate at that time in 2012, but the chair of the Intelligence Committee pledged to work with me to ask our government to declassify those opinions of the FISA Court, and she did. I thank very much the senior Senator from California, the former chair of the Intelligence Committee, for her help in doing that. And some of those records, some of those opinions, and some summaries of the interpretation of the law were declassified. That was a step forward, but it should not be dependent on the whim of the executive branch as to whether secret law exists in our country.

So I continued to press forward. And then we had a situation occur. In June 2013, Edward Snowden disclosed the existence of the cell phone program. I could not explain in December of 2012 why it was so important to end secret law, but after Edward Snowden's disclosures, I could explain it.

In fact, when the National Security Agency chief, Keith Alexander, was testifying, which was shortly after that disclosure, I proceeded to pull out my cell phone and ask the chief: What authorized investigation gives you the authority under section 215 to access my, Senator MERKLEY's, cell phone records? He was unable to answer that question but said he would seek legal consultation in order to explain what investigation showed that there was a relevant connection and what statement of facts would justify it. But I never got an answer because there was no answer because the government was collecting everything under this secret reinterpretation of law.

Yesterday, we ended the era of secret law in America. Yesterday, my no secret law act was incorporated into the USA FREEDOM Act and was signed by the President of the United States. This law says the executive branch must declassify opinions of the FISA Court or, if they find that the exact opinion poses a security risk because of details enclosed therein, must declassify summaries or at a minimum must summarize the significant constructions and interpretations of law found by the FISA Court. That is the heart of it. We are not asking that classified information about facts of a case that could endanger our national security be disclosed. We are asking that interpretations and constructions of law be disclosed so that we have no secret law in America, and that is what is required by the act we passed yesterday.

In conclusion, we must not have secret laws in America. We must not have a secret court that has no opposing point of view presented. And when it makes interpretations of law, it must be disclosed to American citizens, who have every right as citizens to know what the law means and to be able to argue whether they like that interpretation, dislike it, think the law should be supported or the law should be changed.

May we never again allow a secret court to authorize secret spying on U.S. citizens under the cover of secret law.

What we did yesterday—incorporating the no secret law act into the USA FREEDOM Act—was important. To paraphrase William Pitt, the humblest American, no matter his wealth or her income or his status within the community—that no American may be in a situation where he may be unable to say to the U.S. Government: Here in my home, within these walls, however modest, you, the government, may not enter.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remain in session for at least 5 additional minutes while I speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I couldn't let the statements that were just made go without a degree of fact check. There is no secret court. A secret court means we don't know it exists. Every Member of the U.S. Senate and every American knows that the FISA Court exists. The FISA Court exists because when the Senate of the United States takes up classified, top-secret legislation, we shut these doors, we clear the Gallery, and we cut the TV off because it can't be heard in public. As a matter of fact, every court in the country operates in secret when they have sensitive information that can't be shared.

I wish my colleague would stay.

The information can't be shared because it can't be public. There are some things that don't meet that classification.

And to get up here and talk about secret courts and secret laws—we pass the laws. The courts enforce the laws, and they are challenged. We have committees and Members who do oversight. It is unfactual to stand on this floor and say we have secret courts and secret laws. That is why the Senate and the House made a mistake this week.

If the Senator were really concerned about privacy, my friend would be on the floor arguing that we eliminate the CFPB, a Federal agency created—not even funded by Congress—that collects every piece of financial transaction on the American people today. They get every data point from credit card companies and the credit bureau, they search the student loan information, and they download all of that into metadata within the CFPB. No Member is down here complaining about that. That is the greatest intrusion of privacy on the American people that could ever happen. It was known upfront, so they made sure it wasn't funded by Congress and made sure we didn't have any oversight responsibilities. That is why they put it under the guidance of the Federal Reserve.

The President of the United States could have ended section 215 at any

time. He had the power. But the President understands that this program works and that there was public pressure to move this data from the NSA to the telecom companies, which is probably a greater concern about privacy than to have this controlled and supervised within the NSA.

The Senator mentioned Edward Snowden—a traitor to the United States. My colleague held him up as though he were a prize because he had come out with this publicly. What do the American people think when we come out here and take some of the most sensitive information and suggest everybody ought to know it? The American people look at us and ask us to keep them safe and do whatever is within the law to accomplish that.

And there is one thing that has never been contested on section 215: It lived within the letter of the law or it lived within the letter of the Presidential directive.

We had a debate, and that is behind us. But to come out here and suggest that there is a secret court and that there are secret laws and that yesterday they eliminated all of that—no, they didn't. No administration in their right mind is going to publicly release those classified and top-secret documents that go to the FISA Court because it would put Americans and foreigners at risk.

I have tried to explain to my colleagues that terrorists are not good people. We can't hug them and all of a sudden change their intent. They want to kill people. And in most cases, we don't find them through association with Boy Scouts; we find them by actually putting agents into a system where they work sources and collect intelligence. Why would we go out and give terrorists the roadmap of how we do things?

I will end on this. As everyone can tell, when somebody gets up and talks about something that just is not true, it can't go without correction.

What we have done in the last 2 months is given every terrorist in the world a roadmap as to exactly how the United States picks up individuals in the United States who might communicate with terrorists abroad.

I will say for the last time what section 215 did. Section 215 was a database that stated the NSA—the only way that any number could ever be queried was if we had a foreign telephone number that we knew was a terrorist telephone number, we could go to the FISA Court and say: We would like to test this against telephone numbers—not Americans; telephone numbers. It was a database that only had telephone numbers, the date of the call, and the duration of the call. The court would give us permission when we were looking to see if there was an American telephone number that actually talked to a known terrorist. And if it did, we turned it over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and said: You might want to look at this person. They then went through a normal court process. If they wanted to find the person's name and get additional information, that is what they did. Some called that an invasion of privacy. I will tell everyone that is not the courts' interpretation. The courts ruled that when my telephone information goes to a telephone company, I have no expectation of privacy. None. That is the law.

The reality is that we are collecting telephone numbers. It has no personal identification on it. I don't know how it would be an invasion of privacy when we don't know who it is. And that threshold is met when the Bureau goes to the court and says they have a different concern about the individual, and the court will then rule on it.

But to believe that the FISA Court does anything different from the Senate of the United States or different from any court in the country when they are faced with classified or secret information—and that is, they shut it down—is wrong. It is just plain wrong. It is important for the American people to understand that there are ramifications to stupid decisions, even by Congress.

It is my hope that this program will work as it is currently designed. But there is no mistake that we have given terrorists every reason to never use a cell phone or a landline again, especially those who are in our country and intend to carry out some act like the gentleman from Boston did yesterday. He pulled a knife on two officers who just wanted to talk to him because he had been under 24/7 surveillance for days. If the news reports were correct, he intended to behead a Boston police officer.

I think the American people want our law enforcement folks to be in that position. If we take away their tools, we will not be able to do it. What we did yesterday was we took some of the tools away. We didn't take all of them away. My hope is that this body will think clearly in the future about the tools we provide to allow this to happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

For the Senator's information, the Senate has an order to recess until 2 p.m.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, when colleagues come to the floor and contend that there have been no secret courts in America, that there has been no secret law in America, that the administration of section 215 matched the plain language of the laws adopted by this body, they are wrong on all three counts.

Mr. BURR. Will the Senator entertain a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. When I have completed my remarks, I will be happy to take a question.

And so my colleague comes to the floor and says that there is no secret law. But the fundamental understanding of law is that there is the plain language of the law and there is the interpretation of that by the court. It is only through the combination of those two things that you can know what a law means. So if you have the plain language but you don't have the interpretation that has been assigned by the courts and used to adjudicate cases, then in fact you have secret law because none of us know what the words mean.

If you look at the plain language of section 215, it doesn't say: Here are restrictions on how the government examines a body of information, interrogates that body of information, and analyzes that body of information. No. The language is completely about how the government collects that information and whether they can collect that information. It sets a series of clear standards for collecting that information. It says that information cannot be collected unless there is stated analysis, a set of facts that show there is evidence that the information being sought is relevant to an authorized investigation.

Now, any common citizen knows, therefore, that the government has to do a statement of facts. They have to state what is the specific investigation, has that investigation been authorized, and is the assorted information relevant that is being requested?

Well, ''relevant'' is a very powerful term in the law. It means one or two steps removed. And that is exactly what the Second Circuit found when they looked at this issue just recently.

The court's opinion explained that as the program is being implemented, the records demanded are not those of suspects who are under investigation, which would certainly be relevant, or of people or businesses that have contact with suspects under investigation, which is one step removed and certainly would be relevant, or even, the court went on to say, of people or businesses that have contact with others who are in contact with the subjects. That would be two steps removed, and that is stretching the boundaries of what is considered relevant under the definition of the law.

The court found that the implementation of the program has extended to every record that exists. The Court found that the implementation of the law extended to every record that exists.

So if the implementation by the administration so diverged from the language of the law passed and debated in this Chamber, how did the government—the executive branch—justify its gross deviation from the plain language of the law? Well, here is how they did it. They went to a court that had been created, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, and they

said: We would like to be able to collect all the information, whether or not it is relevant, because some day, under some situation, we may want to analyze that information, and we would like to have it right at hand.

Now, had there been an adversary in this court, the adversary presenting an opposite point of view would have said: Well, not so quick, because there are standards in the case law for relevance. There are standards for what constitutes an authorized investigation. There are certainly standards for what are the means to present evidence to document this. But there was no contrary opinion in this court because the only one arguing the case with no rebuttal and no examination by any group was the government. So we have the government and a judge. That is not really the theory behind the courts. The idea is that we have an examination of an issue with both sides presented so there can be full articulation and full examination of the issues, and then a judge can decide based on full input. But, in this case, we didn't have that input. The government asked for an interpretation that would allow them to do something far different from the plain language of the law, and they got it from this secret court.

So, yes, we do have secret courts, operated with no input, and they disclose no opinions. And yes, we did have a secret law, and that ended yesterday, as it should have.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. BURR. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. I will yield.

Mr. BURR. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute before the Senate adjourns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. My question to the Senator is this: Did he know the FISA Court existed?

Mr. MERKLEY. The existence of the court——

Mr. BURR. It is a simple yes or no answer. Did the Senator from Oregon know the FISA Court existed?

Mr. MERKLEY. The Senator from North Carolina can ask a question, and I get to answer the question.

Mr. BURR. Well, no, you don't. I asked the question, but I did not yield the Senator from Oregon the time.

Mr. President, regular order.

I don't want to take any more of the Senate's time, and I certainly don't want to take any more of my colleague's time.

The fact is that he knows the court existed. Congress has reauthorized section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. The FISA Court has reauthorized it. They reauthorized it. They are asked every 90 days, and they ruled 41 times to allow section 215 to exist.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BURR. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. MERKLEY. Were the opinions of this court, established by law—and, yes, it is transparent to the public that the court exists. But the question of secrecy is not one of whether it exists; it is a question of whether the process is open in any feasible way to debate between two points of view. Did the Senator from North Carolina know that the opinions of the court, including interpretations of the law, were never disclosed to the American public and were, in fact, kept secret?

Mr. BURR. I actually do know that.

Mr. MERKLEY. Well, thank you, because that does show that in fact there were secret——

Mr. BURR. The Senator asked his question, and I answered, and I still control the time. Thank you.

Now, clearly, it is evident that if we say something wrong enough times, people start to believe it. It is not a secret court. It is not a secret law. The President knows about it, and Members of Congress know about it. We have voted on it. We know what goes on. Fifteen Members of this body have oversight responsibility over the program. We do our job, and we do it well.

Now, we may disagree with what tools we use to try to defeat terrorism in this country, and clearly the Senator and I have a big canyon between us. But I have to tell my colleagues that America expects the Senate and the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to defend them. I am going to continue to do everything I can to make sure law enforcement and the intelligence community have the tools to do their job because their job is a big one and the threat is big, and for people to ignore that today is irresponsible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the people of the United States expect the Constitution to be upheld and the principles of the Fourth Amendment. They expect that the law that is passed on this floor will be implemented in an appropriate fashion and consistently, and when it is not, our liberty is diminished, our freedom is diminished, and our privacy is diminished.

Indeed, what we did yesterday with the USA FREEDOM Act was to end a system in which a court, in secrecy, changes the meaning of the law and does not expose it to the American public. That is a very important improvement, taking us back to the democracy that we are all a part of and that we all love.

Thank you, Mr. President.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:21 p.m., recessed until 2:01 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. TOOMEY).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1494 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor, and I know we are talking about the Defense bill. I know my colleagues are trying to work things out as it relates to the Defense bill, but I am just as concerned about the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank—a credit agency that helps small businesses in the United States of America—which is expiring at the end of this month, June 30.

As we had discussions on the trade promotion authority act, I was very concerned that we were going to be passing trade policy while at the same time allowing very important trade tools to expire. I still remain very concerned about the small businesses that are here in the Capitol today and that have given much testimony at various hearings—yesterday in the Senate Banking Committee and today in the House Financial Services Committee—about the need for this type of credit agency that helps small businesses ship their products to other countries that are new market opportunities for them.

The reason why this is so important is because other countries have credit agencies—if you will, credit insurance. You are a small business. You want to get your products sold in developing markets. You can't find conventional banking or you can find conventional banking but that bank says it is not going to insure these losses. Thus, what has emerged for the United States of America, Europe, China, Asia, many parts of the world, is what is called credit insurance.

That credit insurance takes the conventional banking and says: We will help secure that conventional banking loan. So that if you are a manufacturer in, say, Columbus, OH, making machinery and you are selling that in China, you actually have an opportunity to sell that product, use commercial banking in Ohio, have that guaranteed

through credit insurance. A lot of business gets done on behalf of the United States of America.

We know this well in the Pacific Northwest because we do a lot of international trade. There are a lot of companies that have learned that the best way for them to grow small business is to become an exporter. So, yes, it may have started with our agricultural economy, where people started trading our agricultural products, but many of our agricultural markets are big export markets. Washington wheat, 90 percent of it is exported. Obviously, people know a lot about aerospace and the fact that the aerospace market is also an export market.

But what people do not realize is a lot of small businesses also became exporters, and they understood that the big market opportunities that are out there for their products are in growing economies around the globe. In fact, there is going to be a doubling of the middle class around the globe in the next several years. There are huge opportunities as those economies have higher income individuals to buy products and services.

So it is natural for us to want to increase exports. That is why the President has had an initiative to double exports over the last several years. I think he has set it for a 5-year period. We made good progress toward that growth in exports. So it really remains one of the biggest economic opportunities for our country, which is to have U.S. companies grow jobs by becoming exporters.

The Import-Export Bank costs zero to the U.S. Treasury. In fact, it actually generates money to the U.S. Treasury. So the notion that we would let a tool of the American economy expire, which literally helps us grow small businesses in the United States and throughout our country, when it actually generates money to our economy and costs us nothing, is something that is pretty hard to believe.

In fact, I do not know where my colleagues are going to come up with the money to pay for the $670 million hole that you will have in the Treasury if you do not do the Export-Import Bank. It has been a great tool for growing that economy. What we have heard from small businesses now is that they are actually seeing their deals affected. They are in the process of trying to negotiate with a country. Maybe it takes months and months to negotiate a final sale. They are showing up for those negotiations, and the businesses are saying: We are going to buy from somebody else. We are not going to buy from you, U.S. manufacturer. We are going buy from an Asian manufacturer because it is clear their credit insurance company still works and we don't have to wait. We don't have to wait for the uncertainty of the U.S. Senate or the House of Representatives, so we are going to go ahead and do that business deal with them.

In fact, we have U.S. manufacturers on the Hill today saying they are losing business because the U.S. Senate will not vote on the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. So we worked very hard during the trade discussion to guarantee that we would get a vote on the Export-Import Bank before June 30 on a vehicle mutually agreed upon by the supporters here of the Export-Import Bank and Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate leader.

I think what we are saying is we do not think the Defense authorization bill is that vehicle. Obviously, the Defense authorization bill, now under criticism by the White House and threatened to be vetoed, is not a vehicle that is going to get done any time soon, certainly not by June 30, and that is when the Bank expires.

So I guess to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who continue to hide behind the Heritage Foundation and will not declare whether they support the Export-Import Bank or don't support the Bank, the attempt to put it on another vehicle that is not going anywhere is not going to help American business and the American economy.

The Export-Import Bank in the State of Washington has helped generate $102 billion in exports and has helped over 230 exporters in our State. Those companies have grown their businesses. We have heard from one. In fact, there is a Web site you can go to for Manhasset Specialty Company, which makes music stands. You can hear a lot about them and how they have grown their business around the globe because they have used the export credit agency.

They do not understand why this Agency is about to collapse. They are concerned about their business. What we hear from a lot of businesses is, if this credit agency is curtailed—which is the wish and desire of the Heritage Foundation, an organization that does not even support our export agenda—basically, about 25 percent of their business, on average, is related to the export market. They say that about roughly 25 percent of their employees will then end up being laid off as those business deals are unwound over the next several months. That means they will not be able to keep and retain current workers.

So my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, by refusing to bring up the Export-Import Bank on a vehicle that could be voted on by the House of Representatives before the end of June, are literally saying to small businesses across America: Go ahead and lay off workers; we don't care.

Now, the reason I have been so passionate about this and out here fighting is not because I don't think the aerospace industry can take care of itself—there is a lot of discussion that the aerospace economy can be built where there are economies that will support credit agency financing—but why I am here is because there are a lot of small businesses that are crafting their products every single day to be the best on the globe. They are working hard to figure out how to stay ahead of the competition. In fact, we had a hearing when I was the chair of the small business committee with one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle whose constituents said to us: You know, small business exporting is not for wimps.

I thought that was a great statement. Because what they were saying is it is hard enough to be a small business person, take the financial risk, build a company, have employees, but then you have to go to the point of saying: Well, OK. I am going to ship my product to a new or developing market. How am I going to make that work? It is not like you can just go down the street and figure it out.

So this employer, a big manufacturer—medium-sized, small business manufacturer but big in this small town said: You know, exporting is not for wimps. You are taking risks. One of the things that we have done as a country to help minimize the risk of that small business owner who is helping the U.S. economy grow by expanding his market and hiring new employees is to have a credit agency that provides the insurance to his local bank so the deal can actually get executed.

Well, for some reason, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, after years and years and years of supporting the Export-Import Bank, now all of a sudden do not want to support it anymore because the Heritage Foundation is saying it is something they should not support. In fact, they are giving bonus points on a ranking system as a way to say: We will reward you for trying to get rid of what has been a viable tool for small businesses in our economy.

So we hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will soon wake up to the fact that the expiration of such an important tool is not in the interests of our economy and not in the interests of small businesses and will come up with a vehicle for this to get done.

Those on the other side of the aisle who think it is OK that the Bank lapses are putting about $18 billion of deals at risk that are before the Bank but will not get executed if the Bank closes at the end of this month. So I hope my colleagues will work toward a solution on this issue. I hope they understand the export credit agency is a job creator for small business and will come up with a vehicle so that it must pass by June 30.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to Senator MCCAIN and Senator JACK REED for their leadership on the Armed Services Committee. It is unusual, indeed, and good for the Republic that both of them are Academy graduates—though, the Navy and Army Academies sometimes can be quite competitive. They get along very well and respect each

other, and the committee has done a very good job.

I understand there is some concern by some of our Members concerning the desire to spend more on nondefense money and perhaps use this bill as a hostage to force the Congress to spend more money on other pieces of legislation. I think that would be a very grievous mistake. I have served on the Armed Services Committee now for 18 years, for quite a long time on the Budget Committee. I have spent a lot of time looking at the challenges we face.

I think the world has changed since the Budget Control Act was passed in 2011. In 2011, the President told us: Don't worry. We are pulling everybody out of Iraq and there are not going to be any more problems in Iraq. He did not mention ISIS. In 2011, we did not have the Russian invasion of Crimea. We did not have the continued vicious, violent fight in Syria. We did not have the chaos that is happening in Libya. We did not have the threat to the Iraqi Government's existence—we thought it was on the right path. We did not have the problem in Yemen.

So this is just a different world. Unfortunately, we are going to have to spend some more money for national defense. That is just the way it is. I am a budget hawk. I have looked at the numbers. We are going to have to spend some more money. However, what kind of argument can be made, that if you have to spend more on national defense—and we do have to make some tough choices on national defense—we have to spend more on nondefense? What kind of an argument is that, just for commonsense sake? If you were in a household budget and you had to spend more money on one item, you would probably spend less on the other items. So I would just say that the nondefense discretionary spending that some of my colleagues are insisting need more money before they would vote for the Defense bill, basically has flat funding this year. There is not a cut in nondefense spending. It grows the next 4, 5 years at 2.5 percent growth a year, which is faster than the economy has been growing, frankly. Last quarter the economy was negative.

So we just have to understand that we cannot hold this bill hostage to that kind of argument. I believe we are on the right track with a good armed services bill, with very strong bipartisan support. Apparently, over this budget issue, we lost a few votes in the Committee, but it was a strong bipartisan vote for the bill. As far as I can tell, there are few, if any, big differences on any provisions that are in the bill. So that is good. I think America is going to be pleased that our committee was able to work effectively. So we will spend about $612 billion for Department of Defense and Department of Energy defense issues. That is a large sum of money. It includes a base budget of $497 billion and $89 billion in the Overseas Contingency Operations fund. It is an increase in OCO over last year, but it is still well below the peak of OCO's funding that we had in years past.

I just have to say, the world is a more dangerous place than it has been. The legislation authorizes $135 billion for military personnel, including pay, allowances, bonuses, death benefits, and permanent change of station moves. It authorizes an across-the-board pay increase of 1.3 percent for uniformed servicemembers in grades O–6, colonel and below.

The legislation authorizes $32.2 billion for the defense and health programs, authorizes fiscal year 2016 Active-Duty strength for the Army—475,000. Some are saying we are going to have to go to 450,000. Maybe we will have to go to 450,000. But right now, we need to slow that reduction based on the world situation. The Navy forces will be 329,000; Marine Corps, 184,000; Air Force, 317,000. So this is a good markup. I think it moves us in the right direction.

The strategic forces provisions contained in the 2016 authorization bill are important. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that the bill before them represents a bipartisan consensus in support of the President's plans and the Congress's plans to modernize nuclear forces and improve and expand U.S. missile defense capability.

I want to express my particular appreciation to the ranking member, Senator DONNELLY of Indiana, who approaches these sometimes difficult and controversial issues in a nonpartisan, constructive manner. He has been closely involved in every aspect of the work of the subcommittee, from the hearings we have held to the bill's final markup.

This year, the portion of the budget request falling under the subcommittee's jurisdiction for missile defense, nuclear forces, military space, and the Department of Energy atomic defense activities included a total of $70.5 billion, including $22.5 billion for procurement, $27.8 billion for research and development, $1.4 billion for operations and maintenance, and $18.7 billion for the Department of Energy.

The Missile Defense Agency. In the area of missile defense, the bill fully funds the President's request of $8.2 billion for the Missile Defense Agency. I think we agree with that. It recommends an increase of $330 million for Israeli cooperative missile programs, including U.S. coproduction of the David's Sling and Arrow systems of Israel, and recommends an increase of $50 million to support modernization of the interceptor used for the U.S. ground-based midcourse defense system that would protect the homeland.

So this needs to be done. We have to get our interceptor systems at the highest level, and there are some difficulties we face now with that system. I think some of the criticisms or concerns are overstated, but it is not where we want it to be, and we need to be moving in that direction. It can be fixed. We know that. And there are just some things we need to work on there.

The bill recommends an increase to facilitate MDA's ongoing development of laser programs, which is a new system. It is different from what it has been in the past. And I am proud—I believe it has real potential and a lot of other things.

The nuclear forces issue is significant. The bill would fully fund the President's budget request to operate, maintain, and modernize the nuclear triad and associated systems. This is essential. We must modernize these weapons, many of which are 40 years old and utilize vacuum tubes in their systems.

The bill includes an additional $1 billion in 2016 to support the recommendations of the nuclear enterprise review completed in 2014. We need to listen to those review systems and respond appropriately. I believe this mark does.

To ensure that the Department is planning for the full range of nuclear conflict scenarios, the bill includes a provision that would direct the Department of Defense to conduct a net assessment of the global nuclear security environment, including the range of contingencies and scenarios where U.S. nuclear forces might have to be used.

I would just say personally that I think it is time for us, in this dangerous world, to quit talking about nuclear zero—people who doubt our resolve sometimes doubt that we are willing to follow through. I wish zero would happen. It is not going to happen anytime soon, that is for sure, so we are going to have to maintain a nuclear arsenal. We need to talk about maintaining it, modernizing it, making it safer, and making it more reliable and more accurate. Maybe we can reduce the numbers some more, but we need to be talking less about reducing numbers and more about assuring the world that we have the best nuclear capabilities anywhere on the planet and that they are ready to be deployed and can be deployed, Heaven forbid that would be necessary. That is just why we have these forces.

The bill includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop options to respond to the Russian violation of the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, including countervailing, counterforce, and active defense programs. We have violations going on; those can't just be accepted.

The Department of Energy gets funding for its defense nuclear capabilities, and we continue rigorous oversight of the warhead life extension and construction program that would support a reliable and modernized nuclear stockpile. I think we are on the right track there for sure.

The bill includes a number of provisions to improve congressional oversight of NNSA activities and track the

recommendations of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of NNSA.

We need better coordination with the Department of Energy. I think we are moving in that direction. Over the last several years, I have pushed for it aggressively, and I think progress is being made. More needs to be done.

Military Space. Our whole Defense Department depends more than most people realize on our ability to maintain space capabilities, and I think this bill funds those programs effectively. The bill would require the Secretary of Defense, in a new idea, to designate one individual to serve as the principal space control adviser who shall act as the principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense on space control activities. I think that will help.

With respect to program oversight, the bill would prohibit the use of funds for the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program or the launch of the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellite number 20 until the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs provide a certification that nonmaterial or lower cost solutions are insufficient. Senator MCCAIN has challenged us all to maintain oversight of these programs and to contain costs. I think this can help do that.

In conclusion, I restate my belief that our committee has worked in a positive way. We have taken the advice of the President and of the Defense Department. We have examined it in an appropriate way and produced this bill that I believe will strengthen our national defense, with strong backing to modernize and expand our missile defense capabilities and to strengthen our deployed forces, allies, and partners.

So I hope we don't have a fuss over demands to increase spending for nondefense when we are supposed to be funding the Defense Department. If there are arguments to be made in that regard, they should be made on another bill when those bills come up and ought to be brought forth in that fashion. I think it would be wrong and a big mistake to use the Defense appropriations and authorization bills in any way as some sort of a hostage to force spending in other areas.

The bill is a good bill. It puts us on the right course. It has broad bipartisan support. If we can avoid those kinds of political gymnastics, I think we will be in a good position to properly take care of the people we have deployed to defend our country and to maintain the security of our homeland.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 1456 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1456, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 1456 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels)

At the end of subtitle C of title X, add the following:

SEC. ____. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING LONG-RANGE PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS.

Section 231(b)(2)(C) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''by ship class in both graphical and tabular form'' after ''The estimated levels of annual funding''.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, in consultation with Senator REED, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendments in order be Reed No. 1521, Portman No. 1522, Reed or designee amendment, followed by Cornyn No. 1486—whether those amendments will require yeas and nays or voice vote we will figure out as we move through the amendments; further, that the regular order with regard to these amendments be the order as I stated regardless of the order offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1521 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I call up Reed amendment No. 1521.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] proposes an amendment numbered 1521 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the availability of amounts authorized to be appropriated for overseas contingency operations pending relief from the spending limits under the Budget Control Act of 2011)

At the end of subtitle B of title XV, add the following:

SEC. 1523. LIMITATION ON THE AVAILABILITY OF OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATION FUNDING SUBJECT TO RELIEF FROM THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.

(a) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, of the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this title for overseas contingency operations, not more than $50,950,000,000 may be available for obligation and expenditure unless—

(1) the discretionary spending limits imposed by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by section 302 of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), on appropriations for the revised security category and the revised nonsecurity category are eliminated or increased in proportionally equal amounts for fiscal year 2016 by any other Act enacted after December 26, 2013; and

(2) if the revised security and the revised nonsecurity category are increased as described in paragraph (1), the amount of the increase is equal to or greater than the amount in excess of the $50,950,000,000 that is authorized to be appropriated by this title for security category activities.

(b) USE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE UNDER SATISFACTION OF LIMITATION.—

(1) TRANSFER.—Any amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title in excess of $50,950,000,000 that are available for obligation and expenditure pursuant to subsection (a) shall be transferred to applicable accounts of the Department of Defense providing funds for programs, projects, and activities other than for overseas contingency operations. Any amounts so transferred to an account shall be merged with amounts in the account to which transferred and available subject to the same terms and conditions as otherwise apply to amounts in such account.

(2) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to transfer amounts under this subsection is in addition to any other transfer authority in this Act.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am prepared to debate this. I have talked about it before, but I am prepared to debate it extensively over the next several days, and my colleagues are also.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 1522 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the National Defense Authorization Act and offer a bipartisan amendment with Senator PETERS that will strengthen this very important underlying legislation we are working on.

As you know, the security threats around the world continue to grow. A lot of experts believe that ISIS is now the best trained, best equipped, and best financed terror organization we have ever seen. Al Qaeda continues to threaten our own country. If you look at what is going on around the world, Hamas and Hezbollah are constantly looking to wage war on Israel. The regime in Iran remains the world's No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism, and they are pursuing nuclear weapons. China continues to intimidate its neighbors in the South China Sea.

We live in a dangerous and volatile world. As a result of these international events and developments, among others, it is absolutely imperative that we maintain a strong national defense to protect our homeland and to defend our allies.

With all these crises around the world competing for our attention, we sometimes neglect another crisis, one that Chairman MCCAIN has constantly reminded us about, and that is the situation in Ukraine, which could easily spin out of control at any time. In fact, news out of eastern Ukraine this morning is particularly troubling. It appears that the latest Russian and separatist attacks on Ukrainian positions this morning may be the final blow to what was, in fact, a ceasefire in name only.

Russia is increasingly aggressive on the European continent. We need to be acknowledging that and dealing with that in this underlying legislation.

I just returned from a trip to Ukraine in April, a year after I had the privilege to be there leading the congressional delegation to monitor the election of President Poroshenko. I went with my friend and colleague, Senator BEN CARDIN. A lot has happened since that last election. I learned about this in my meetings most recently with Prime Minister Yatsenyuk, President Poroshenko, and other Ukrainian individuals. They have reached a pivotal moment in Ukraine.

The Ukrainian people have sacrificed in hopes of securing a democratic future for their country. However, they need our help. They need sustained economic, military, and political support from the United States and from our NATO allies. It is absolutely critical to this vision of a democratic Ukraine, a free Ukraine, coming to fruition.

In my view, the people of Ukraine have made a very clear and unequivocal choice, and we need to stand with them. Their choice is to pursue a pro-Western, democratic path. Their government has been responsive to that choice by making progress in fighting decades of endemic corruption that has left the country weak and, frankly, unprepared for the Russian aggression that has occurred. However, none of these reforms will mean much if Ukraine is unable to secure its borders or defend its sovereignty.

The NDAA before us has a lot of important provisions related to this crisis in Crimea and along the eastern border of Ukraine. I applaud Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED for their efforts on it. I hope we will be able to entertain a few other amendments in this process that will even strengthen the U.S. posture and support of Ukraine.

I look forward to being on the floor later this week to talk about this situation in Ukraine in more detail. This afternoon, however, I have come to the floor to talk about a related amendment that is of great importance as this situation in Eastern Europe continues to destabilize.

Following my visit to Ukraine this spring, I visited Latvia. I went there because I wanted to spend some time with U.S. soldiers from an Abrams tank company who were there on a NATO mission. I am sure most of my colleagues know that recent force structure changes moved our two heavy armored brigades out of Europe. This armored unit I saw in Latvia and the other two companies in the Baltics today are only there on a rotational basis this spring, and they will soon return home to the United States, in this case to Fort Stewart.

These units are sending an important message to our allies, such as those in the Baltics—and, believe me, the Latvians are extremely appreciative—but they are only temporary. What they are really looking for is a permanent presence. That is what sends the stronger message.

The big news when I was over there was that there was a road march being conducted by the 2nd Calvary Regiment through Central and Eastern Europe. The 2nd Calvary Regiment is in Europe, but they were taking this road march through Central and Eastern Europe. This was taking their Strykers, which is the only permanently stationed U.S. armored vehicle in Europe, on roads and through small towns—towns that fear an increasingly aggressive Russia on their doorstep.

The unit was doing all it could to help reassure our allies and demonstrate U.S. resolve, but, frankly, they were doing all they could with what they have, and what they have is not enough. They do not have what they need.

This unit has communicated this urgently to us here in the Congress. Their weapons systems are, frankly, inadequate to meet their potential mission requirements if they are called upon. They need a more powerful gun. They need to replace their .50-caliber machine gun with a 30-millimeter cannon. The soldiers understand that. The Army understands that.

The Army has already identified this requirement, and prior to the deteriorating situation in Europe, they slated to field this improved weapons systems to these Strykers starting in 2020. So they knew it was a problem. They knew they had to address it. Then we saw this deteriorating situation in Europe caused by Crimea's being annexed and now the situation on the eastern border of Ukraine.

The soldiers manning these Strykers today know that 2020 is just too far in the future, and Army leadership agrees with them. On March 30 of this year, U.S. Army Europe submitted an operational needs statement to Army Headquarters to address this urgent capability gap in the 2nd Cavalry Regiment. Specifically, according to the needs statement, the unit lacks ''the lethality of a direct fire weapons system to engage similar units or those supported by light-armored vehicles.''

On April 22, Army Headquarters validated this high priority need and assigned this requirement to the program manager for execution. To shave several years off of the fielding timeline, however, the Army needs additional funding in fiscal year 2016. They need it now.

That is exactly what this amendment does. The review of these requirements by the Army was occurring while the Defense bill was being marked up in committee. The House appropriators, the first to mark up since the Army communicated its requirement, have fully funded the need.

I want to thank Chairman MCCAIN and the ranking member for their consideration and for including this important funding into this bill, even though the urgent need was communicated only very recently.

By the way, just to be clear, because I have heard discussion about this on the floor today, this turret and gun system—the cannon itself—will be competed, and that is appropriate.

This increase in funding is fully offset by taking additional reductions from the expected surplus from the foreign currency fluctuations as identified by GAO. The additional reductions taken by this amendment still won't match the reductions, by the way, that the House has taken from these accounts.

I want to thank the Members of our body here in the Senate for their support of this amendment. Senator PETERS, my colleague from Michigan, has been my partner on the other side of the aisle in this effort. He has been a strong supporter of giving our soldiers what they need in Europe and sending that strong message we talked about earlier.

Senator COTTON talked about this issue in the Armed Services Committee. He is chairman of the Airland Subcommittee, and he has worked hard on this, as well as have other Armed Services committee members, including Senator INHOFE, Senator SESSIONS, Senator WICKER, Senator TOOMEY, who is our Presiding Officer, and, of course, Senator MCCAIN.

This amendment is of vital importance for our forward-deployed troops. It also sends a critical message at this time of great uncertainty in Europe. I urge my colleagues to support this. It is bipartisan and it is needed, and I urge its swift adoption.

Because of that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 1522.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] proposes an amendment numbered 1522 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide additional amounts for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation for Stryker Lethality Upgrades, and to provide an offset)

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle E—Army Programs

SEC. 161. STRYKER LETHALITY UPGRADES.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR PROCUREMENT, ARMY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 101 for procurement is hereby increased by $314,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for procurement for the Army for Wheeled and Tracked Combat Vehicles for Stryker (mod) Lethality Upgrades.

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for

procurement for Stryker (mod) Lethality Upgrades is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for procurement for the Army for Stryker (mod) Lethality Upgrades.

(b) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RDT&E, ARMY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation is hereby increased by $57,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army for the Combat Vehicle Improvement Program for Stryker Lethality Upgrades.

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Stryker Lethality Upgrades is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army for Stryker Lethality Upgrades.

(c) OFFSET.—The aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by division A is hereby reduced by $371,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be achieved through anticipated foreign currency gains in addition to any other anticipated foreign currency gains specified in the funding tables in division D.

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCAIN. 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. REED. 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. REED. Mr. President, while the Senator from Ohio is here, I want first of all to commend him for his interest in the Stryker program. It is one of those vehicles that have been extraordinarily effective in protecting our soldiers in their efforts both in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is a critical program.

The amendment would add $371 million of funding. We all understand this is a very difficult budget environment, and I would point out that the Army submitted their unfunded requirement list to the committee in March. This was not on their request. However, it is my understanding that the request for additional funding is driven by a new requirement that actually became evident in April of 2015. So the issue could have been that they weren't as aware of it as they should have been. But for the record, this is not part of the unfunded requirement list of the Army.

We did not have the chance, as a result, to look at this as an approach that we would include in our Defense appropriations bill. It was not literally on the radar screen until April, and it didn't come up formally with their unfunded request. So I am concerned that these lethality improvements have not been fully vetted by the committee, by the Department, and also by the Department of Defense.

There is another issue here, too. This is a first step in a multiyear program, and we are not quite sure at this point, over the next several years, how much more money we would have to commit to production, testing, training, and logistics.

The other area of concern—not just in terms of looking closely at the program, the need, and the long-term budgetary effects—is the pay-for, which is an offset for foreign currency accounts. The Department's request has already been reduced by $550 million. We have literally taken that money from their currency accounts, and now we are going to take another $371 million. So we are really getting very, very close to what this account can bear in terms of costs added to it.

Again, I think since it is O&M—that is the basic account we are taking it from to put in a platform—it raises the other issue that is so central to everything the chairman and many of us have been doing, which is how do we keep the Army ready, and there is a trade-off. There is a trade-off between new platforms and making sure the soldiers we have are training on the existing platforms and doing their work.

So I would express some strong reservations. I would be happy to work with the Senator from Ohio. I understand this is driven by his commitment to making sure our soldiers have the best equipment in the world.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, first, I appreciate the ranking member's comments, and I look forward to working with him on this. We talked about this on the floor a moment ago. This is something the Army has requested. They came late; he is absolutely right. They did make a request in March, in terms of submitting this operational needs statement, but it wasn't until April 22 that they actually validated this high priority need and assigned it to the program manager. So the committee didn't have the opportunity to look at it as they have others.

I will say it is urgent, and having just been over there and seeing one of those temporary armored companies about to leave, they need this badly. What they are saying is that the 30-millimeter cannon is necessary to go up against any potential enemy, and the .50-caliber machine gun simply is not. So this is not moving more Abrams tanks into the area. It is taking these Strykers and upgrading them, and they have identified this as an urgent need.

So I look forward to working with the ranking member on this. I hope we can work through this, even in the next several days here, to get this done, because it is so important. It will be competed. It is a turret and gun system. It is something that does require an offset, and that offset—by the way, the account the GAO has identified as having a certain amount of funding does have that much room left in it and more, we are told. And also the House has already taken more out of this currency fluctuation account than the committee has.

So I again thank the ranking member for working on this. I know he too has a strong commitment to our soldiers who are there to be sure they have what they need in order to complete their mission in an increasingly volatile environment in Europe.

With that, I yield back for my colleague from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 1486 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as we begin this very important discussion about how we go about the business of defending our country and preserving the peace and our national security, I think it is really important we look at all of the elements of American power. We are very familiar with the fact that we have the world's best military—best equipped, best trained, with the most technologically advanced weapons systems. But we also ought to look at America's other sources of great power, and that means things such as soft power.

Let me explain. Here is the problem. Many NATO countries—our allies in Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries—many of which are former satellites of the Soviet Union and are now being intimidated by the Russian Federation, rely heavily on energy resources from Russia, creating what I think can euphemistically be called a strategic vulnerability. Many of them are just downright scared about what it means in terms of their ability to survive a Russian intimidation.

According to a recent Wall Street Journal op-ed by former National Security Advisor Steven Hadley and former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, 14 countries that are a part of NATO buy 15 percent or more of their oil from Russia.

The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who is not on the floor right now, famously said: Russia is a gas station masquerading as a nation. It produces prodigious sources of energy, but, unfortunately, they view energy as one of their weapons.

So the fact that 14 of these NATO countries buy 15 percent or more of their oil from Russia is a real vulnerability for them. Several other countries in Eastern and Central Europe buy more than 50 percent of their energy supply from Russia. As I said, Russia has huge sources of oil and gas, but they are using them not only as a source of economic strength and to provide for the Russian people, but they are using them as a source of intimidation and coercion.

For example, in January of 2009, Russia effectively turned off the natural gas to Ukraine. This affected at least 10 countries in Europe that rely upon natural gas that crosses Ukraine from Russia. According to a report released last fall from the European Commission, several countries in Europe could

lose up to 60 percent of their gas supply if their supply lines from Russia are disrupted. That is the problem.

Here is what I propose is one of the things we can do about it. The United States, of course, has experienced an energy renaissance in recent years, thanks to the technology produced by the private sector—most specifically, the use of fracking in conjunction with horizontal drilling—which has turned America into an energy powerhouse. Not that many years ago, people were talking about peak oil. In other words, they basically were making the argument that all the oil that could have been produced was being produced, and we would now then be in a period of decline. That proved to be wrong.

Now, thanks to this huge production of American energy, we know we can use our ample energy resources not only to supply our own needs here at home but to use the surplus to reassure our allies and our partners and to reduce their dependence on bad actors, such as Russia and Iran.

If we think about it, some of the sanctions which we have deployed against both Iran and Russia for their bad behavior—one of the most effective ones is the indirect sanction of lower oil and gas prices because, frankly, Mr. Putin has calculated that oil prices would remain very high, and when they get low, that means he doesn't have the financial wherewithal in order to make some of the mischief that he and Iran are so noted for.

The United States, of course, has significantly diversified our energy resources. The United States has consumed the lowest level of imported petroleum in the last 30 years. That was this last year. Let me repeat that lest it be lost.

Last year, the United States consumed the lowest level of imported petroleum in the last 30 years. According to the International Energy Agency, today the United States is the largest oil and natural gas liquids producer in the world, surpassing Saudi Arabia, for example.

I have filed a number of amendments, and I intend to call up one of those in a moment, but let me describe briefly the amendments we have filed that I think help provide some progress toward a solution for the problem I have described.

In light of this new geopolitical landscape, I have offered several amendments that would further our strategic position in the world while also strengthening our allies, making them less vulnerable to the intimidation and bullying tactics of the Russian Federation under Vladimir Putin. These amendments aim to help NATO and our other allies in Europe diversify their energy resources and lessen their dependency on energy supplies of some of our major adversaries such as Russia and Iran.

The first amendment would point out the existing authorities the President already has under current law related to energy exports if he determines it is in our national interests. Of course, this is an authority under current law that applies not only to the present occupant of the White House but would also apply to his successor.

This amendment expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should exercise these current authorities to aid our allies and partners in Europe and elsewhere. To help the United States get smart on how Russia currently uses its energy program as a weapon against our allies and partners, this amendment would mandate also an intelligence assessment to better understand the vulnerabilities of NATO and our other allies and partners in Europe. Then, it would also expand the requirements of the Pentagon's annual Russia military power report to mandate analysis of Russia's ability to use energy supplies as a tool of coercion or intimidation against our allies and partners in Europe.

So this would restate the present authorities the President of the United States currently has to produce and sell oil and gas to our allies in Europe, such as Ukraine and other NATO allies. It would require an additional intelligence assessment to make sure we understand fully the implications of this vulnerability that Europe and our NATO allies have to Russia and its intimidation tactics. Third, it would expand the requirements of a current report that the Pentagon makes on an annual basis called the Russian military power report to mandate an analysis of Russia's ability to use energy supplies as a tool of coercion or intimidation.

Two other amendments which we filed—which I will not call up at this time—would help reduce the need for U.S. allies to purchase energy from Russia and Iran. It would do this by adding a specific exception to the law that would allow crude and natural gas exports to allies and partners when their energy security is compromised.

For example, if a NATO ally or partner—such as Ukraine or Japan—requests additional energy exports from the United States, the President must approve it in a timely fashion if he finds it to be in the national interests of the United States. This would provide our allies and our partners with an additional source of fuel and a little additional reassurance that if they are subjected to the kind of intimidation and coercion I mentioned a moment ago, that we, as their friend and their ally, would supply them with an alternative source of energy they need in order to keep the lights on and keep their economy running.

Finally, we filed an amendment that would amend the Natural Gas Act to require the Secretary of Energy to approve liquefied natural gas exports to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries and other named partners and allies. This uses the same preferential treatment that is already given to our free-trade agreement partners, which are automatically deemed to be in the public interest.

In conclusion, these amendments are designed to address a very specific problem and a very specific vulnerability of some of our closest allies in Europe and to relieve them from some of the pressure of Russian intimidation and coercion when Russia attempts to use energy as a weapon. We can use this as an important element of our soft power to help our allies relieve this coercion and intimidation.

These amendments would strengthen the strategic hand of the United States in a world that grows more complicated by the day, not to mention more dangerous.

I encourage my colleagues to support them and, by doing so, take a long-term view of our own national security as well as the peace and stability of some of our most trusted allies and partners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 1486.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 1486 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security)

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1257. REPORTING ON ENERGY SECURITY ISSUES INVOLVING EUROPE AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) ADDITIONAL MATTERS IN ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY AND SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS INVOLVING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—Section 1245(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3566) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (15) as paragraph (16); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

''(15) An assessment of Russia's ability to use energy supplies, particularly natural gas and oil, as tools of coercion or intimidation to undermine the security of NATO members or other neighboring countries.''.

(b) REPORT ON EUROPEAN ENERGY SECURITY AND RELATED VULNERABILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing the energy security of NATO members, other European nations who share a border with the Russian Federation, and Moldova.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include assessments of the following issues:

(A) The extent of reliance by these nations on the Russian Federation for supplies of oil and natural gas.

(B) Whether such reliance creates vulnerabilities that negatively affect the security of those nations.

(C) The magnitude of those vulnerabilities.

(D) The impacts of those vulnerabilities on the national security and economic interests of the United States.

(E) Any other aspect that the Director determines to be relevant to these issues.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON WAYS THE UNITED STATES COULD HELP VULNERABLE ALLIES AND PARTNERS WITH ENERGY SECURITY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (Public Law 94–163) gives the President discretion to allow crude oil and natural gas exports that the President determines to be consistent with the national interest;

(2) United States allies and partners in Europe and Asia have requested access to United States oil and natural gas exports to limit their vulnerability and to diversify their supplies, including in the face of Russian aggression and Middle East volatility; and

(3) the President should exercise existing authorities related to natural gas and crude oil exports to help aid vulnerable United States allies and partners, consistent with the national interest.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesies of the chairman and the ranking member to allow this amendment to be called up and to give me a chance to explain its importance and how it fits into the national security strategy of the United States. I know we don't typically tend to think of our energy resources as being an element of our national strength and power that we can project beyond our borders in a way that helps aid our allies and friends and reduces the influence of our adversaries, such as Iran and Russia, but I hope my colleagues will take a close look at this amendment and, when the time comes, vote to support it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. 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. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1540 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and, on behalf of Senator BENNET, call up amendment No. 1540.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so orderd.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for Mr. BENNET, proposes an amendment numbered 1540 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Comptroller General of the United States to brief and submit a report to Congress on the administration and oversight by the Department of Veterans Affairs of contracts for the design and construction of major medical facility projects)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. COMPTROLLER GENERAL BRIEFING AND REPORT ON MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) BRIEFING.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall provide to the appropriate committees of Congress a briefing on the administration and oversight by the Department of Veterans Affairs of contracts for the design and construction of major medical facility projects, as defined in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the administration and oversight described in subsection (a).

(c) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required by subsection (a) and the report required by subsection (b) shall each include an examination of the following:

(1) The processes used by the Department for overseeing and assuring the performance of construction design and construction contracts for major medical facility projects, as so defined.

(2) Any actions taken by the Department to improve the administration of such contracts.

(3) Such opportunities for further improvement of the administration of such contracts as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. REED. 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. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, once again, the truth proves elusive when we are dealing with Iran's unpredictable regime. I refer to a New York Times article that is entitled ''Iran's Nuclear Stockpile Grows, Complicating Negotiations.'' Among elements of the article—and I know the article is being disparaged by the State Department; I will talk about that in a moment—but among the elements of the article is the fact that Iran's stockpile of nuclear fuel has increased about 20 percent over the last 18 months of negotiations—increased—increased 20 percent in the last 18 months of negotiations.

In essence, we are to be convinced ''that Iran will have to shrink its stockpile by 96 percent in a matter of months after a deal is signed, even while it continues to produce new material and has demonstrated little success in reducing its current stockpile.''

I am reading from the Times article.

It goes on to say, in part, ''That means Iran . . . would have to rid itself of more than nine tons of its stockpile in a matter of months.''

In a matter of months.

Now, this is a continuing challenge that we have as we look at these negotiations. We are supposedly in the final months. The end of this month is when we are hopefully going to come to some type of an agreement. We see what has been a challenge from the very beginning. It is a challenge I have cited time and time again.

How much of these numbers are done because of Iran's desire to push the numbers upward? Is that for a political purpose? Is it for a negotiating purpose? Is it for a technological inability? Whatever it is, the numbers published Friday by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the independent agency for which so much of the Joint Plan of Action and any future agreement that might be consummated—this is the entity we are depending upon. Well, this entity has said that Iran has continued to enrich uranium aggressively, even though it knew it was not meeting its goals of converting its stockpile into reactor rods. This is a real question that I have.

Another independent group, the Bipartisan Policy Center, said in February that Iran has failed to do the conversion.

We knew from the beginning it was going to be difficult for the Iranians to blend down rather than ship out because they have this aversion to shipping out. This was all possible if they would ship out, but they have consistently said they will not ship out their fuel. We knew it would be a concern if they weren't able to do what they pledged to do and, frankly, I am concerned.

I am concerned this is just another diplomatic sleight of hand by an untrustworthy negotiating partner. I am concerned Iran is still saying it will not ship out excess low-enriched uranium but rather blend it down and

store it. I am concerned this is more of an issue than the administration is willing to concede, particularly if there is no deal, and we, in essence, with sanctions relief have paid them to convert, and then they walk away with massive amounts of low-enriched uranium that can be fed into their centrifuges and converted to highly enriched uranium.

Let's be clear. The tracking and verification of uranium mines and mills—which were often talked about as part of why we will have a safeguard if there is a deal—to centrifuges only works if Iran gets rid of its stockpiles. It doesn't work any other way. It does not work any other way. The New York Times has identified a real problem with the mechanisms being used to control Iran's nuclear stockpile. The simplest solution would be to ship Iran's stockpile out of the country. This would prevent any question of a buildup of material. However, Iran has refused to do this—at least to this date publicly—and opened the potential for Iranian manipulation about what is going on.

There may be technical reasons for the 20-percent increase in low-enriched uranium, but one certainly has to wonder: Are they delaying? Are they really having problems building a conversion facility—something I specifically expressed concerns about early in the process—or is this simply another attempt to play fast and loose with the truth, cover it up, and buy time? Is it a negotiating posture? So as they come closer and closer to the deadline, they have all of this enriched uranium, and there is this compulsion to strike a deal—not a good deal but a deal at any cost.

While this may not be a technical violation of the Joint Plan of Action, the Iranians were supposed to have reached the agreed-upon goal. The fact is, midway through the process, we are told there could be a delay. But clearly the timetable has slipped even further away.

I know the State Department has gone after the article, which, in part, is based on facts from the International Atomic Energy Administration. The administration has gone out of their way to attack the premise of the article because I guess anything that would upset the fundamental belief that we have to have a deal at any cost is problematic for the State Department.

But I have to be honest with you. As I read the State Department's response, it means to me that their main response appears to be that Iran is not in technical violation of the Joint Plan of Action because it still has a month left to transform all of the extra low-enriched uranium that it has created in recent months into oxide.

This pushback is pretty much something we should have expected because it is the only argument the administration actually has available to it to explain this, and it is the same argument they used when many of us were raising the concerns that Iran was busting through their oil export caps set under the Joint Plan of Action every month. We were consistently told: Well, next month the Iranians will ship even less, and therefore it will all even out. Well, the fact is that when time ran out, the exports of Iran remained way above what was allowed, and then the administration shifted to an explanation only to suggest that certain types of oil just do not count. There is always a reach here to try to get a justification for Iran.

I think the State Department's response totally misses the point of the New York Times article. The upshot of the piece is not that there is no way for Iran to meet its Joint Plan of Action obligations in theory—in theory; it is that Iranians have stockpiled so much low-enriched uranium that it is all but impossible for them to meet those objectives in practice. The Iranians may have calculated that they do not have to do so and that the administration is not about to blow up an impending nuclear deal over a violation of past agreements if those violations bear directly on Iranian intentions and capabilities to implement the agreement.

There is another group who has been before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. When I was the chairman, we called them several times, and I think Senator CORKER, the new chair, has a deep respect for them as well—the Institute for Science and International Security. They have posted their analysis of this specific question: Will Iran be able to meet its obligation regarding its 5 percent low-enriched uranium?

In the response to that question, the Institute for Science and International Security, David Albright, who is arguably one of the most respected voices on Iran's nuclear program, comes to this conclusion: Iran has fallen behind in its pledge to convert its newly produced low enriched uranium hexafluoride into oxide form. There are legitimate questions about whether Iran can produce all of the requisite LEU oxide.

Iran has fed a total of 2,720 kilograms of 3.5 percent low-enriched uranium hexafluoride into the EUPP—the vehicle by which they ultimately have the conversion—but it has not fed any 3.5 percent low-enriched uranium hexafluoride into the plant since November of 2014—November of last year.

By the end of June—they go on to say—in order to meet its commitment under the Joint Plan of Action, Iran must finish converting the 2,720 kilograms of low-enriched uranium into oxide, introduce it into that vehicle and convert it into oxide.

They go on to say: Thus, Iran has clearly fallen behind in its pledge under the Joint Plan of Action.

On a policy level, the institute's analysis emphasizes that Iran's refusal to meet its obligation ''show the risk posed by relying on technical solutions that have not yet been demonstrated by Iran''—so technical solutions that we say: If, in fact, they can do this, this may be part of our way in which we can strike a deal, but Iran has not demonstrated meeting those technical solutions. Iran is under sanctions and in the middle of negotiations. Yet, we still cannot rely upon them.

I think this is a serious concern not to be minimized. This is at the same time that Iran is boarding commercial ships in the Strait of Hormuz, firing at some of them. This is the same Iran that is in the midst, as a country, of going ahead and is engaged as the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world, in Lebanon, in Syria, in Iraq, in Yemen. Yet, even as we are in the midst of the negotiation, all of these things are taking place, and even if we want to wall off all of the nonnuclear acts of Tehran that have to worry us and concern us in terms of our national security and international order, as it relates to the nuclear portfolio, they do not seem to be headed in the direction of what is clearly necessary in order to meet their obligations under the Joint Plan of Action. They do not seem, at least in this point in time, to be technically capable of doing that even though these are the fixes we are looking for.

At the end of the day, you have to really wonder why we continue to find a way to excuse Iran in every element. We had something that was found independently and reported to the United Nations Security Council commission that deals with questions. They were ultimately fueling one of their rods. This was raised and, again, it was responded to. It was deemed de minimis. We had oil exports greater than what they were allowed. We explained it away, saying: Well, certain types of oil were not counted. We have a set of circumstances where they have raised their fuel capacity, not lowered it, even as they are headed toward an agreement in which they have to dramatically reduce it.

So I have a real problem in consistently seeing the willingness to stretch to allow Iran to get where it is today. It is that view which let the world, unfortunately, allow Iran to get to the point of a precipice of having nuclear power that it can convert to a nuclear weapon. That is not in the national interests and security of the United States.

I have the intention in this period of time to consistently come to the floor and raise these issues as they evolve and rear their heads at a critical moment. I think we have to be very committed to knowing the truth here.

While all of us aspire to have an agreement that can truly stop Iran's path toward a nuclear weapon and that that be something which is not just limited in time because the Persians have for 5,000 years been trying to have the power in the hegemonic interests they have—they are closer to it, from my perspective, than at any other

time. If they already have their people suffering under sanctions as a result of their actions and they are using the resources they have not to help their people but to continue to spread terrorism throughout the region, then we can only wonder, when a deal is struck and large flows of money begin to return to Iran, what they will do with that money. It seems to me that you would have a strategy set up to think about that before you even get to a deal, assuming you can achieve a good deal.

But when I see them taking actions that, in my view, may not be a technical violation but are contrary to everything they are supposed to do, when you have independent groups such as the Institute for Science and David Albright and when you have the IAEA making these observations, for me, it has alarm bells and those alarm bells are worrying.

I think it is incredibly important, on what I believe is one of the most significant national security and international security order questions that will come before the Senate, that we not just look the other way but that we challenge, when these facts continue to come forward, about what is the truth behind them and what does it mean for any potential agreement and how we continue to judge Iran's actions in light of any potential agreement.

I know we are told constantly: This is not on hope, and that it is all going to be verified. It is not on trust, but it is all going to be verified. But I have to be honest with you—it depends when you keep defining what is or is not permissible. From my perspective, where we are headed is not what I think is in the national interest and security of the United States.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I know that we have a lineup of speakers. We have a speaker from Hawaii who is going to be here shortly, at which time I would be very pleased to yield, but I wish to make a couple of comments.

First, the fact that we are getting to this bill is great, because if you look at the last few years, we have not had a chance to do this until late in the year. The last 2 years it was December before we actually got around to it. It could have been a real crisis, because I think most of us in the Senate know that if we had gone to December 31, all kinds of things would have stopped—funding for a lot of our reenlistment bonuses and other things.

I applaud the chairman for using his influence to get this bill on floor so we could go ahead and get it passed. It is something that we need to make sure the people who are out there risking their lives on a day-to-day basis know and that they know we are having this as our top priority.

I want to make one comment about sequestration. People are talking about putting equal amounts of increases—not just in the military or in the defense portion but also in the other portions of government, such as the IRS and the EPA—without recognition that as we went through the funding mechanism, we were taking money out of military on a 50–50 basis with nondefense moneys, while the military is only 16 percent of the budget. So we have already started at a great disadvantage.

As far as the OCO is concerned, that is kind of a desperate effort. It is not the way we should be doing it, but we must have the support and keep the readiness up with our troops.

We do have some good things that are in this bill, such as funding for the KC–46, the Paladin Integrated Management Program, the Long-Range Strike Bomber, and the F–35. So we are at least treading water here.

I wish to say one thing, though, that I didn't approve of in this bill, and we may try to make some changes on the floor. It is the BRAC process. I think we all know that the base realignment and closing process has been going on since 1987. This is no time to be doing something with that. I am very pleased that we are able to continue that and not see one for a period of time.

One thing that is consistent about BRAC rounds is that they all cost a lot of money in the first 5 years. People, if there is ever a time in the history of this body and of the military when we can't afford to take money out, it is now.

We have addressed a couple of things. There are some things that need to be fixed as we move on to the floor. I know that our chairman, Senator MCCAIN, has been asking people to bring down their amendments. I think we should be doing that, and I anticipate a lot of amendments will be coming down.

I wish to say one thing about Gitmo. There is this myth out there that somehow the terrorists think that we hurt people at Gitmo. Somehow they think it is something that should be altered and should be changed, but I don't believe that is the case.

I see the Senator from Hawaii is on the floor. I am cutting into his time right now. So I am going to continue comments throughout the rest of the afternoon, tomorrow, and yield back the time to him, which I have taken away from him for a few minutes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee for his gentlemanliness and for our ability to work together in spaces where we agree and when we have to disagree, to be agreeable about it. I really appreciate that relationship.

Mr. President, I wish to talk about climate change, and I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, climate change is real, it is caused by humans, it is urgent, and it is solvable. Climate change is real, it is caused by humans, it is urgent, and it is solvable. This year we have had some debates about climate change on the Senate floor and a majority of Members, including more than a few Republicans, have admitted that climate change is real and caused by humans. We have passed bipartisan amendments calling for the United States to reduce carbon pollution and to fight human-induced climate change. That is a necessary step in the right direction, but it is not enough.

We need to take real action. We need to focus on real solutions, and here is the exciting part. There are plenty of real-world cost-effective solutions to climate change. A lot of them empower every day Americans, giving them more control in terms of how they get their energy.

One of these solutions is distributed energy generation, or DG. DG is creating a real revolution in the energy sector by putting individuals and homeowners in control. The ability to own carbon-free power generation is helping everyday Americans realize that even though Washington is slow in the extreme on these questions, they can be part of the solution.

DG systems are small, but they provide major benefits. They can be more efficient, help promote national security, reduce electricity and fuel bills, and provide power during blackouts. Most important for fighting climate change, distributed generation lets us take advantage of major advances in clean energy. Through the use of renewable DG, such as small-scale wind, solar, and geothermal, Americans can take simple steps to reduce their carbon footprint.

This is the important thing about distributed generation, and we are seeing it across the country in red States and blue States, among conservatives and liberals. You don't have to be as passionate as I am about climate change to be enthusiastic about distributed generation, because nobody wants to pay more than is necessary on their electricity bill. The idea of generating your own electricity is very attractive to individuals—regardless of their ideology, regardless of their partisan affiliation. This has tremendous potential to save individuals, business, and institutions real money.

DG is changing the nature of the U.S. energy system. It is especially true in Hawaii, where more than 12 percent of our residents have rooftop solar, which is by far the highest rate in the United

States. Rooftop solar is the most well-known renewable DG resource—and for good reason. The price of solar panels has come down 80 percent since 2008, and the cost to install residential systems has dropped by about half since 2010—80 percent cheaper since 2008 for the panels and about half as expensive just to get them on a roof since 2010. The prices are going down and down, and the economics are changing. What we thought was possible with respect to distributed generation a couple of years ago is changing everything we know about the U.S. energy system.

In 2006, about 30,000 homes in the United States had rooftop solar. By 2013, that number had risen to over 400,000 homes. According to the Energy Information Administration and the Department of Energy, as many as 4 million homes could have solar panels within 5 years. But DG is far more than just rooftop solar. Small wind systems sized for homes, schools, farms, and remote communities are taking off, with over 74,000 turbines installed in all 50 States.

One family in upstate New York installed a small wind turbine on its farm in 2012. Rated at 50 kilowatts, it will actually run at 60 or 70 when the wind is strong. They liked it so much, three branches of the family decided to lease three 10-kilowatt turbines for their homes, expecting to make back their initial investment within 5 years and to make a profit after that.

Ed Doody, one of those farmers, says:

> My wife says it's like change in your pocket. When it's running, you make a little money.

Small-scale biogas systems offer farmers and ranchers opportunities to save money on energy and reduce methane emissions. Over 250 farms in the United States have made this investment, and the economics work for many more.

One dairy farm in California has installed a system that uses manure to create and capture gas to run a 700-kilowatt generator. The farm saves $800,000 per year in electricity and propane expenses and will earn back the money from its initial investment in just 4 years.

As you know, I am passionate about climate change, but you don't have to care about climate change to be excited about distributed generation. This is going to save people money, and that is the exciting thing about it.

There are many factors that are adding to the dramatic growth of distributed energy, including evolving State-level incentives and interconnection standards. But the most important reason has been the reduction in cost, especially when it comes to solar. It is simply getting cheaper for a homeowner or a farmer to see real savings by investing in clean energy.

A major reason for these cost reductions has been consistent, predictable, Federal and State support. From about 2005 until recently, Congress has done a fairly good job of providing consistent support for clean energy and distributed generation. We provided long-term tax credits that helped industries scale up and appropriated funds for the DOE necessary to spur real innovation and bring down the costs.

But that consistent support has tapered off in recent years with the expiration of a number of important credits. The clean energy industry will suffer further when the business and homeowner tax credits for renewable energy expire at the end of next year. That is why I plan to introduce, in the coming weeks, a bill that would extend the homeowner tax credit for solar, wind, and geothermal. This credit allows Americans to take control of their own energy futures, and Congress should extend it.

The explosion in DG does pose real challenges. Electric utilities must adjust to a world where power flows in all directions, and the lines between ratepayers and generators become blurred. This challenges the traditional utility business model, and there is nowhere that is facing this challenge more seriously than the State of Hawaii, where we have a series of island grids and we have unprecedented penetration of renewable energy into the grid. The old standard used to be a maximum of 15 percent of intermittent energy onto the grid, but we have parts of our grid that are in the 25 to 35 percent intermittent energy. So there are real challenges in upgrading our grid system, upgrading our electricity system, and creating a smart grid that can accommodate all of this distributed generation.

But it also provides opportunities for innovation and the development of new American markets. This is not in the distant future, this is happening now. Each home, each business, each farm is now within reach of controlling its own energy future, often with carbon-free clean energy.

Distributed energy is a real solution to climate change, both in the United States and around the world. It has created a revolution in energy production that we must harness and accelerate for the challenge of climate change, but it is a challenge we meet.

What excites me so much about distributed generation is that as much as we were fighting about Keystone several months ago, as much as we are likely to have a fight over the Congressional Review Act, having to do with the President's Clean Power Plan, as much as I am, with Senator WHITEHOUSE's leadership, going to introduce a carbon fee, there are lots of things where we are, frankly, not going to be able to find agreement any time soon, there are spaces where we can work together. Allowing individuals to generate their own electricity and reduce their power bills seems to be a good place to start in terms of bipartisan energy legislation.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the time to speak about this exciting new possibility, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

REMEMBERING ELDER L. TOM PERRY

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Elder L. Tom Perry, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Elder Perry passed away on Saturday, May 30, 2015, at the age of 92.

L. Tom Perry was a giant of a man with an even larger soul. His enthusiasm for life energized and inspired all who came under his extraordinary influence. It has been said that ideas go booming through the world like cannons, thoughts are mightier than armies, and principles have achieved more victories than horsemen or chariots. Inspiring ideas, transformational thoughts, and powerful principles—these were the driving forces in Elder Perry's life and ministry and what made him such a positive force for good throughout the world.

It is true Elder Perry's booming voice carried his words far and wide, but it was his spiritual strength and positive perspective that set his cherished ideas on faith, family, and freedom booming to the four corners of the world and into the hearts of millions.

As a marine, as a businessman, and as an ecclesiastical leader, Elder L. Tom Perry was committed to helping people elevate their thoughts and lives. He was a man who knew what it meant to dream big, to be bold, and to never accept anything less than your best. His passion for life, people, and service was contagious. He was among the wave of marines to arrive in Japan as World War II drew to a close. Though he entered as a member of the occupation forces, his thoughts were focused on elevating those around him. He convinced a number of his fellow servicemen to spend their free time rebuilding a decimated Protestant chapel. Later, while in Saipan, he similarly lifted others by repairing a Catholic orphanage. Throughout his service as an LDS apostle, he was known for praising positive performance. Yet he also made sure that thoughts and sights were forever lifted up so individuals, families, and entire communities would strive to do, be, and become better. Elder Perry proved that thoughts are indeed mightier than armies.

L. Tom Perry was a man of principle and a man who recognized that believing in, living by, and teaching true principles was the key to success in every area of life. He taught that the family is the bulwark of society and central to the strength and vitality of

communities and nations. He believed the principle of freedom was universal and that all people should have the privilege to live in liberty. He declared that freedom was not a spectator sport and that we all have a sacred duty to defend and protect it. His faith carried him through difficult days and trying times. The principle of faith helped him help others. Elder Perry simply believed. He believed simply and showed that positively and enthusiastically believing was simply a better way to live. He believed in people, even—no, especially when they didn't have the faith to believe in themselves. His life demonstrated that true principles have achieved more victories than horsemen or chariots.

Elder Perry often claimed he was just an ordinary man. Yet his ideas, thoughts, and principles enabled him to live an extraordinary life. As an apostle in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, he traveled the world sharing his profound testimony of Jesus Christ and his love for people from every walk of life. Elder Perry reminded us that we are to live our lives not by days but by deed, not by seasons but by service.

I am thankful for the life and ministry of Elder L. Tom Perry. He made a difference for his family, his community, his church, and our Nation.

Mr. President, I would like to finish where I began: Ideas go booming through the world like cannons, thoughts are mightier than armies, and principles have achieved more victories than horsemen or chariots. The booming legacy of Elder L. Tom Perry will echo in the hearts, reverberate in the minds, and warm the souls of many for generations to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. LEE. I will.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am going to seek recognition.

Mr. TILLIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, we do have Senator ALEXANDER scheduled briefly. Could I have a moment before the Senator seeks recognition?

Mr. DURBIN. I will be seeking about 5 minutes, no more. So if Senator ALEXANDER comes to the floor, he will not have to wait long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the ranking member of this important committee, the Armed Services Committee, Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, will be offering an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, which I support. I hold the title of vice chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and have served as chairman of that subcommittee as well.

This is an awesome responsibility—to handle the authorization bill for the greatest military in the world, and I salute both my friend Senator REED and my friend Senator MCCAIN for the hard work they have put into this bill, but there is a fatal flaw in this bill. Senator JACK REED addresses it, and I want to speak to it for a minute.

Senator MCCAIN has stated publicly, with others on the Republican side, a sentiment that is shared on the Democratic side. We have to do away with sequestration once and for all. Sequestration is a bad idea. It was supposed to be so bad that we would never see it. It was supposed to be such an extreme, outrageous idea that it would never happen, but it did—because when we fail to hit the budget numbers, we automatically go into sequestration, which leads to across-the-board cuts, mindless across-the-board cuts. Those cuts hurt every agency of government when we did it, but most of all it hurt the Department of Defense.

If there is one agency that needs to be thinking and planning ahead, it is the Department of Defense, and sequestration, sadly, made cuts making it impossible for the planners at the Department of Defense to think ahead, to plan ahead.

So Senator MCCAIN has said—Senator REED has joined him and others have been in the chorus, me included. Senator MCCAIN has said: Once and for all, we need to get rid of sequestration. We need to have a budget process here that befits a great nation, and we don't.

Unfortunately, this authorization bill perpetuates some of the fundamental flaws of sequestration instead of solving the problem.

I am cosponsoring the amendment of Senator JACK REED. I believe we have to eliminate the budget gimmicks that are cooked into this Defense authorization bill. It doesn't do our servicemembers any service or our country any good for us to perpetuate this.

For the entire Federal Government to still face ultimately the threat of sequestration, across-the-board cuts—as vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I have heard testimony from the leadership of the Army, the Navy, Air Force, Marines, our Guard and Reserve that sequester-level budgets really harm our national security, and it makes sense.

How can you plan acquisition of important equipment? How can you be sure you can train our courageous young men and women if there is so much uncertainty with the budget? We know these cuts are going to have a dramatic negative impact on training for our servicemembers, grounded planes, wasted wrongheaded impacts to acquisition programs and more.

The National Defense Authorization Act includes the same budget gimmick that was offered in the Republican budget resolutions. It increases spending on something called overseas contingency operations by the same amount as sequestration would cut from the budget of the Department of Defense.

Let me explain. We fought two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and we didn't pay for them. We added the cost of those wars to the national debt.

So this President came in and said we have to put an end to that. So we have to have actual appropriations, and we have to accept the reality that we may face future wars. They created an account called the overseas contingency operations account anticipating that wars might come along. Well, thankfully we have brought our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan but for the limited commitment of troops to fight ISIS in Iraq at this moment.

What we have seen in this budget is the attempt to take these overseas contingency funds and take what was an emergency expenditure and build it into this budget, which is the problem. It was the wrong way to fix the problem earlier this year. It is the wrong way to try to fix sequestration now. Cranking up OCO spending on a 1-year basis just to get us through in the Department of Defense does nothing but add to our deficit and create a bigger problem next year. What are we going to do next year? No answer. That is why this is a gimmick. It is not fixing the sequestration challenge.

What do the Department of Defense leaders say? Are they celebrating because they are going to get this emergency money to come ride to the rescue this year? No. Secretary Ash Carter testified last month to the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee. He criticized this approach which is part of the bill before us. He called it ''managerially unsound'' and ''unfairly dispiriting to our force.'' He then went on to say:

> Our military personnel and their families deserve to know their future, more than just [one budget] one year at a time. . . . [O]ur defense industry partners—

Think about the contractors, for example, who are building the planes, the tanks, and the ships of the future—

> [O]ur defense industry partners, too, need stability and longer-term plans, not end-of-year crises or short-term fixes, if they're to be efficient and cutting edge as we need them to be.

That is what the Secretary of Defense said.

Then General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, came in uniform. What did he say about the budgetary approach we have before us in this bill? He emphasized that it, too, created problems because of the lack of predictability in defense budgets.

In testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, Admiral Gortney of Northern Command and General Kelly of Southern Command pointed out that numerous domestic agencies also contribute to our national security, and they noted the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and other law enforcement agencies that are all subject to these across-the-board cuts. So if we say that in the name of America's national security defense and security, we are going to take care of the

Department of Defense and then subject all these other agencies to across-the-board cuts, we will diminish protection for America. These agencies are important, too, not just the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, but also the FBI. For goodness' sake, they fight terrorism every day. The Department of Homeland Security has the same responsibility, the same type of mission. As we go through the list on the so-called nondefense side, we find a lot of agencies that are critically important to keeping America safe, and this approach in this bill does nothing for them.

This gimmick will also come at the expense of other programs not directed exclusively at homeland security and national defense.

So if the Department of Defense gets relief from sequestration by using this overseas contingency operations maneuver, what are the odds that we are going to do the same for the FBI, the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the National Institutes of Health, or America's infrastructure?

Let me say a word about that. The last time we did sequestration, I am embarrassed to say that we did an across-the-board cut at the National Institutes of Health. It was so damaging to NIH—which is the premier medical research agency in the world—it was so damaging that they are still trying to recover today. Before we went into sequestration—consider this—if you had an application for a medical grant at NIH, your chances before sequestration were one out of three. One out of three. After sequestration and the cuts that took place—one out of six.

There was recently a Fortune magazine which had a cover story about the Alzheimer's crisis facing America. I have done a little work in this area, and it is frightening to think about what we face. One American is diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease every 67 seconds in our Nation. I didn't believe that number and challenged my staff. They are right. Once every 67 seconds.

Last year, we spent $200 billion in Medicare and Medicaid when it came to the Alzheimer's patients across America. That didn't even touch the amount of money families put into the care of their loved ones who are suffering from this disease. The projection of the rate of growth of Alzheimer's in America says that in just a few years, we will be spending more than $1 trillion a year on that disease alone—the government, over $1 trillion a year.

The Fortune magazine article—and the reason I rushed to buy it—says that at least two major pharmaceutical companies are starting to develop research that is promising to treat the onset of Alzheimer's, the early stages, and perhaps to alleviation some of the suffering. We have new imaging devices that are coming through that really can show Alzheimer's in living human beings at the earliest stages when it can be treated or at least ultimately should be treated—let me make certain I say that correctly.

But if you look at these breakthroughs, as promising as they are, you will find that in every single instance, the National Institutes of Health was there before, doing the basic research leading to the new drugs that are being developed, leading to the new technology. What happens when you go through sequestration and cut the National Institutes of Health? You stop the research. You slow it down, at least, and in some areas actually stop it. Is that really in the best interests of this country?

So when we come to the rescue of the Department of Defense, as we should, and we say that the Budget Act—sequestration—has to come to an end when it comes to the Department of Defense, we can't ignore what sequestration's across-the-board cuts will do to so many other critically important agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health. Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, is going to offer an amendment to try to address this honestly and directly, and I am going to support him.

Let's talk about infrastructure for a minute. Two weeks ago on the floor of the Senate, we gave the 33rd short-term extension of the Federal highway program, a short-term, 60-day extension. Let me ask, if you are planning to build an interstate highway, is 60 days enough? Hardly. Most of our Transportation bills have been long-term bills, 5- and 6-year bills, as they should be.

There are some Members of the Senate who question whether there should be a Federal program, but most of us believe there should be. And if there is going to be one, we can't limp along every 60 days or 6 months in funding it. Keeping this Budget Control Act and sequestration guarantees we are going to face this over and over again until Congress faces its responsibility.

The unfortunate reality is, if Congress cannot tackle the issue of sequestration honestly, directly, and head-on, our domestic agencies will likely be stuck with these artificial caps for years. America will pay a heavy price for our inability and unwillingness to tackle this challenging issue.

The Senate should be providing real sequestration relief not only to the Department of Defense but to all of the agencies of our government that do such important work. That should be our focus—not a budget gimmick using overseas contingency funds to get through 1 year with the Department of Defense but something more befitting of a nation like ours that deserves real leadership.

I urge my colleagues to support Ranking Member JACK REED's critical amendment so that we can begin to get serious about the challenges that face us.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Thursday, June 4, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1735; that there then be 30 minutes equally divided in the usual form on the following amendments; and that following the use or yielding of time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed: Portman No. 1522; Bennet No. 1540. I further ask that there be no second-degree amendments in order to any of these amendments prior to the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators SHAHEEN and TILLIS or their designees be permitted to offer the next first-degree amendments during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Senators should expect up to two votes tomorrow morning at 10:15. There are several more amendments in the queue, and my colleagues should expect votes throughout the day tomorrow to make progress on the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1506 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 1506.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. TILLIS] proposes an amendment numbered 1506 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the stationing of C–130 H aircraft avionics previously modified by the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) in support of daily training and contingency requirements for Airborne and Special Operations Forces)

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 141. STATIONING OF C–130 H AIRCRAFT AVIONICS PREVIOUSLY MODIFIED BY THE AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP) IN SUPPORT OF DAILY TRAINING AND CONTINGENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR AIRBORNE AND SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall station aircraft previously modified by the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) to support United States Army Airborne and United States Army Special Operations

Command daily training and contingency requirements in fiscal year 2017, and such aircraft shall not be required to deploy in the normal rotation of C–130 H units. The Secretary shall provide such personnel as required to maintain and operate the aircraft.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1494 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and, on behalf of Senator SHAHEEN, call up amendment No. 1494.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for Mrs. SHAHEEN, proposes an amendment numbered 1494 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To revise the definition of spouse for purposes of veterans benefits in recognition of new State definitions of spouse)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DEFINITION OF SPOUSE FOR PURPOSES OF VETERANS BENEFITS TO REFLECT NEW STATE DEFINITIONS OF SPOUSE.

(a) SPOUSE DEFINED.—Section 101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''of the opposite sex''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (31) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(31)(A) An individual shall be considered a 'spouse' if—

''(i) the marriage of the individual is valid in the State in which the marriage was entered into; or

''(ii) in the case of a marriage entered into outside any State—

''(I) the marriage of the individual is valid in the place in which the marriage was entered into; and

''(II) the marriage could have been entered into in a State.

''(B) In this paragraph, the term 'State' has the meaning given that term in paragraph (20), except that the term also includes the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.''.

(b) MARRIAGE DETERMINATION.—Section 103(c) of such title is amended by striking ''according to'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''in accordance with section 101(31) of this title.''.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in order to maintain the practice of alternating between Republican and Democratic amendments, that the Shaheen amendment be considered as having been offered prior to the Tillis amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator MURPHY, Senator MARKEY, Senator CASEY, Senator MURRAY, and Senator FRANKEN as cosponsors of the Reed amendment No. 1521 to H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. 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. REED. Mr. President, if I may take this opportunity to urge all of my colleagues to submit whatever amendments they may have to the underlying legislation as quickly as possible. We have made some progress today, and we want to continue to make progress in terms of offering the amendments as well as setting up votes so we can continue to move the legislation along. That would require that we get, as quickly as possible, all of the possible amendments from both sides.

I particularly want to ask that my Democratic colleagues do so and that they also be prepared if they wish to comment and speak on the amendments if called upon to do so or at their convenience. I hope that advice will be followed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I have also been asked to announce that there will be no rollcall votes this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

THE COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the managers of the bill for allowing me a few minutes to report on a very interesting hearing we had this morning before our Senate education committee. It is a different subject than the one on the floor right now, but it is one that both Senator REED and Senator MCCAIN have been interested in over time. It has to do with whether 22 million undergraduate students in America can afford to go to college and whether millions more high school students can look forward to going to college, and then we have millions more in graduate school who are continuing their education.

This affects our country as vitally as any subject, and I thought I would report to the full Senate and to the American people on the excellent, bipartisan hearing we had. This was the fourth hearing we have had in Congress on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Our committee has already come to an agreement on a bill to fix No Child Left Behind that includes continuing important measurements of how we measure the progress of students in schools in America and then restore to States the responsibility for figuring out what to do about that.

We have 22 members on our committee, and we represent as much diversity of opinion in the Senate as exists, which is a lot of diversity of opinion. Yet, our work on fixing No Child Left Behind was unanimous.

Our next step will be to reauthorize the Higher Education Act that affects more than 6,000 colleges and universities in America. I am working with Senator MURRAY, the Senator from Washington, who is the ranking Democrat on the committee, and we hope to have that bill ready for the committee's consideration in early September.

The question before us this morning was, Can you afford to pay for college? I believe the answer for most Americans is yes, and for millions of Americans 2 years of college is free. It is never easy to pay for college, but it is easier than many think, and it is unfair and untrue to make students think they can't afford college. We should stop telling students they can't afford college.

Four weeks ago, I spoke at the graduation of 800 students from Walters State Community College in Morristown, TN. Half of those students were low income. Their 2 years of college was free or mostly free because taxpayers provided them a Federal Pell grant of up to $5,700 for low-income students and the average community college tuition in the country is about $3,300. So for the nearly 4 out of 10 undergraduate students in our country who attend roughly 1,000 2-year institutions, college is affordable. That is especially true in Tennessee, where our State has made community college free for every student who graduates from high school.

In addition to that 40 percent of students who attend the 2-year colleges, another 38 percent of undergraduate students go to public 4-year colleges and universities where the average tuition is about $9,000. For example, at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville,

one-third of the students have a Federal Pell grant to help pay for their tuition, and 98 percent—virtually all—of the instate freshmen have a State HOPE Scholarship, which provides up to $3,500 annually for freshmen and sophomores and up to $4,500 for juniors and seniors. So for most students, 4 years at a public university is affordable, and these include some of the best colleges and universities in the world.

What about the 15 percent of students who go to private universities where the average tuition is $31,000? Well, I will give an example of one of those universities. I had dinner this week with Jack DeGioia, the president of Georgetown University. He told me that the cost at Georgetown is about $60,000 annually. Here is how they deal with that.

He said: First, we determine what a family can afford to pay. Then we ask students to borrow $17,000 over 4 years from the Federal Government, to which they are entitled. Then we ask the student to work for 10 to 15 hours under our work-study program.

President DeGioia said: Then we pay the rest of the $60,000, which costs Georgetown University about $100 million a year.

He said that 21 other private universities that work together on financial aid policies have about a similar policy. He also said that Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and Princeton are even more generous. So even these so-called elite universities may be affordable for students in America.

Finally, another 9 percent of students will go to for-profit colleges where tuition averages about $15,000 a year.

Despite all of this, let's say your family is still short on money to pay for college. Well, taxpayers will loan you money on generous terms. We hear a lot about student loans. These are some of the questions being asked: Are taxpayers being generous enough? Some Senators say we need to be more generous. Is borrowing for college a good investment? Are students borrowing too much? One way to answer these questions is to compare student loans to automobile loans.

When I was 25 years old, I bought my first car. It was a Ford Mustang. The bank made my father cosign the loan because I had no assets and no credit rating. It made me mad, but I had to do it. I had to put up the car's collateral and I had to pay off the loan in 3 years.

Compare that to your opportunity if you are an undergraduate student today. You are entitled to borrow $5,000 or $6,000 from the taxpayers each year. It doesn't matter what your credit rating is, you don't need collateral, and the fixed interest rate for your loan is 4.29 percent this year.

It gets better. When you pay your loan back, you don't have to pay more than 10 percent of your disposable income each year, and if that rate of payoff doesn't pay it off in 20 years, the loan is forgiven.

The next question I hear is, Is your student loan a better investment than your car loan? Well, cars depreciate the minute you drive them off the lot. The College Board estimates that a 4-year degree will increase your earnings by $1 million on average over your lifetime.

A third question I hear is, Is there too much student borrowing? The average debt of a graduate from a 4-year institution is about $27,000 or about the same amount as the average new car loan. About 8 million undergraduate students will borrow about $100 billion in Federal loans next year. The total amount of outstanding student loans is $1.2 trillion. That is a lot of money, but the total amount of outstanding auto loan debt in the United States is $950 billion. I don't hear anyone complaining that the economy is about to crash because we have nearly $1 trillion worth of auto loans, nor do I hear that taxpayers should do more to help borrowers pay off their auto loans.

You might ask: What about all of those students with over $100,000 in student loan debt we hear about? The answer is that student loan debt of over $100,000 make up only 4 percent of student loans, and 90 percent of those are doctors, lawyers, business men and women, and others who have earned graduate degrees.

Nevertheless, it is true that college costs have been rising and that a growing number of students are having trouble paying back their debts. According to the U.S. Department of Education, about 7 million or 17 percent of Federal student loan borrowers are in default, meaning they have not made a payment in at least 9 months. The total amount of loans currently in default is $106 billion or about 9 percent of the total outstanding balance of Federal student loans. The Department says that most of these loans get paid back to the taxpayer one way or another.

The purpose of our hearing this morning was to find ways to keep the cost of college affordable and to discourage students from borrowing more than they can pay back. Here are five steps the Federal Government can take to accomplish that:

No. 1, stop discouraging colleges from counseling students about how much they should borrow. The Federal law and regulations actually prevent colleges from requiring financial counseling for students, even those clearly at risk for default who may be overborrowing.

At a March 2014 hearing before our committee, we heard from two financial aid directors who said that there was no good reason for this. One said:

> Institutions are not allowed to require additional counseling for disbursement. We can offer it, but we're not allowed to require it. And without the ability to require it, there's no teeth in it.

No. 2, help students save money by graduating sooner—for example, our bipartisan FAST Act that Senators ISAKSON, BURR, and I on this side of the aisle and Senators BENNET, CORY BOOKER, and ANGUS KING on that side of the aisle have sponsored, would make Pell grants available year-round to students so they can complete their degrees more quickly and start earning money more rapidly with their increased knowledge and skills.

No. 3, make it simpler to pay off student loans. There are nine different ways to pay off student loans. The Federal Government offers very generous repayment options. One allows you to pay 10 percent of your disposable income every year, and if that doesn't pay it off after 20 years, the loan is forgiven. Last week, I met a college president from Tennessee who said he spent 9 months trying to help his daughter pay off her student loan, and he needed the help of a financial aid officer.

We have legislation introduced by Senator BURR and Senator KING and sponsored by others, as well as those of us I just mentioned, to simplify the application and the repayment options for Federal student loans.

No. 4, allow colleges to share in the risk of lending to students. If colleges have skin in the game—a concept that Senator REED of Rhode Island and I with others have suggested should be seriously explored—it could provide an incentive to colleges to keep costs down and ensure students borrow no more than they can pay back. Senator DURBIN and Senator WARREN have also worked with Senator REED on introducing legislation on this subject.

No. 5, point the finger at ourselves. Congress is the culprit for the high cost of tuition across this country more than many Members of Congress would like to admit. The main reason State aid to public universities is down is the imposition of Washington Medicaid mandates and a requirement that States maintain their level of spending on Medicaid.

For example, in the 1980s when I was the Governor of Tennessee, Medicaid was 8 percent of our State budget and the State was paying 70 percent of the cost to go to the University of Tennessee. Today, Medicaid is 30 percent of Tennessee's State budget and the State is paying roughly 30 percent of the cost to go to the University of Tennessee.

It is pretty simple. Lower State support has caused higher tuitions, and the decrease in State support, in my opinion, is mainly because the Federal Government's Medicaid mandates have made the Medicaid Program so expensive while tying the hands of States so much that Governors have to take money from higher education and direct it toward Medicaid; therefore, tuition is up.

That isn't the only thing the Federal Government does to cause the cost of college to go up. A couple of years ago, four of us on the education committee—Senators MIKULSKI and BENNET, Democrats; and Senator BURR and I, Republicans—invited a group of distinguished educators to do a study of

the cost of Federal regulations on the over 6,000 higher education institutions. The group did an excellent job and came back with 59 specific recommendations about how to simplify the Federal regulation of colleges and universities, saving money, saving time. Time and money that would be better spent on education.

Chancellor Zeppos of Vanderbilt University and Chancellor Kirwan of the University System of Maryland were the two leading this project. Chancellor Zeppos described the Federal regulation of higher education as having ensnared colleges in a jungle of red tape.

Chancellor Zeppos took another step: He hired the Boston Consulting Group to tell Vanderbilt University how much Federal regulation of colleges and universities cost Vanderbilt during the year 2014. The answer was $150 million in order to comply with well-intentioned rules and regulations from the Federal Government.

What does that have to do with tuition? Well, spread that out among Vanderbilt students, and it equates to $11,000 in additional tuition for each of Vanderbilt's students. Mr. President, $11,000 per student is $2,000 more than the average tuition at State universities across this country. That is the average tuition for institutions like the University of Georgia, the University of Tennessee, and the University of Florida. So the Federal Government, through its Medicaid mandates and excessive regulation of colleges and universities, is driving up tuition and increasing college costs and discouraging students from going to college.

We should take steps to make college more affordable, but we should also cancel the rhetoric that is misleading and causes many students and families to believe they cannot afford college. It is untrue and unfair to say this. It is untrue because if you are a low-income community college student, your education may be free or nearly free thanks to a Federal Pell grant. And 38 percent of our college students attend those 2-year schools.

If you are an in-state low-income student at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, between a Pell grant and a HOPE Scholarship, you have already covered 75 percent of your tuition and fees. That is the opportunity for another 40 percent of our students who attend public universities.

Even at elite, private universities, if you are willing to borrow $4,500 a year and work 10 to 15 hours a week, many of these universities will help pay the amount your family isn't able to pay, so you can afford what would appear to be an insurmountable sticker price of $50,000 or $60,000.

If you still need to borrow money in order to help pay for a 4-year degree, your average debt is going to be roughly equal to an average, new car loan, and your college loan is a better investment than your car loan. Student loans are also a better investment for our country. As Dr. Anthony Carnevale of Georgetown University says, without major changes, the American economy will fall short of 5 million workers with postsecondary degrees by 2020.

So I urge my colleagues to follow the Senate education committee. The Committee is well on our way to preparing legislation that we hope to have ready for the full Senate early in the fall to reauthorize the higher education system in America.

We hope to simplify college regulations. We hope to make it simpler to apply for a Federal grant or loan to pay for college. We hope to make it simpler for students to pay off their loans. We hope to instill year-round Pell grants so students can go through college more rapidly and get into the workforce. We hope to allow students to be able to apply for student aid in their junior year of high school rather than their senior year, which will permit them to shop around and make it easier to obtain the information they need. We will also take a look at accrediting, and we will try to understand better ways to accommodate the tremendous amount of innovation that is coming our way because of the Internet in terms of new ways of learning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a 1-page summary of the FAST Act, which was introduced by Senator BENNET and myself, along with Senators BOOKER, KING, BURR, and ISAKSON, to simplify and reform the Federal student aid process.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL AID SIMPLIFICATION AND TRANSPARENCY (FAST) ACT

Eliminates the Free Application for Financial Student Aid, or FAFSA by reducing the 10-page form to a postcard that would ask just two questions: 1—What is your family size? And, 2—What was your household income two years ago?

Tells families early in the process what the federal government will provide them in a grant and loan by using earlier tax data and creating a simple look-up table to allow students in their junior year of high school to see how much in federal aid they are eligible for as they start to look at colleges.

Streamlines the federal grant and loan programs by combining two federal grant programs into one Pell grant program and reducing the six different federal loan programs into three: one undergraduate loan program, one graduate loan program, and one parent loan program, resulting in more access to college for more students.

Enable students to use Pell grants in a manner that works for them by restoring year-round Pell grant availability and providing flexibility so students can study at their own pace. Both provisions would enable them to complete college sooner.

Discourages over-borrowing by limiting the amount a student is able to borrow based on enrollment. For example, a part-time student would be able to take out a part time loan only.

Simplifies repayment options by streamlining complicated repayment programs and creating two simple plans, an income based plan and a 10-year repayment plan.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, in the middle of the last century, our Michigan automakers were selling thousands of cars and trucks to an outstanding and expanding American middle class. We are proud to build those automobiles in Michigan.

Unfortunately, the roads of that day were too narrow, and it took drivers and truckers much too long to get to their destinations. Our Nation's leaders recognized that these delays were hurting our workers' productivity and stifling the American economy.

In October of 1964, President Dwight D. Eisenhower made a trip to Detroit and speaking in Cadillac Square he declared: ''We are pushing ahead with a great road program that will take this Nation out of its antiquated shackles of secondary roads and give us the types of highways we need for this great mass of automobiles.''

Of course, this vision gave rise to the interstate highway system which ignited the American economy, and by the late 1950s, our new interstate highways were responsible for 31 percent of the annual increase in the American economy. That is quite amazing, when we think about that. Our highways were the envy of the world, which is why other nations that aspire to be like us, now as economic superpowers, are investing in their infrastructure—from China to Brazil and everywhere in between—in roads and bridges and airports and seaports and all of the other infrastructure they know supports a robust, growing economy.

President Eisenhower, the architect of our interstate highway system was, of course, a Republican. So it is ironic that 60 years later my Republican colleagues are the ones blocking us from building on President Eisenhower's legacy for growing the economy by investing in long-term infrastructure—not 60 days, not 30 days, not 6 months, but long-term infrastructure investment.

Over the last 6 years, Congress has passed short-term extensions over and over again, repeatedly patching over the shortfall in the highway trust fund. Today, we are actually at a point where we are 57 days away from the highway trust fund actually going empty—shutting down—57 days before the highway trust fund is empty.

This is no way to invest in our country and jobs and the roads and bridges and other infrastructure we need to support a thriving economy. It makes it hard for States and for local transportation agencies to plan. The uncertainty drives up costs, as we all know.

The World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report from 2014 to 2015 ranked America 16th in the quality of our roads—16th in the quality of our roads in the world—one spot below Luxembourg and just a little bit ahead of Croatia. Now, if that isn't something that motivates all of us to come together around a long-term plan for investing in our roads and bridges and other infrastructure, I don't know what should. America, the world's superpower, is 16th in the world today in terms of investing in the future of our economy and what we need for fixing roads and bridges and other infrastructure investments.

The American Society of Civil Engineers' most recent report card for America's roads and bridges gave our roads a D—a failing grade. We talk about the importance of education and striving for excellence for our children in schools, yet we have been given—the Congress—a failing grade of D for lack of action and vision and investment in long-term infrastructure spending in our country. It said that 42 percent of the major urban highways are congested, that this costs $101 billion in wasted time and fuel every year—$101 billion every year, year after year that we don't address this—and countless jobs. And on the other side, we all know that investing in long-term infrastructure creates good, middle class jobs. Why in the world we are not coming together and making this a top priority is beyond me.

Since we can't afford to effectively repair and replace our bridges, engineers have to add plywood and nets—if you are driving along and look up and see the plywood and nets—to the bottom of bridges so they don't crumble and fall on to cars. We have had pieces fall down on to the road over the last number of years. In fact, that is what happened to a motorist in Maryland back in February.

Just a few miles from here, the Arlington Memorial Bridge, a historic bridge, has corroded support beams and columns and big signs on it now with lane closures in both directions for the next year because of emergency repairs. This is the Capital of the United States of America we are talking about and the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

Across the country, potholes are getting bigger, freeways are getting more congested, and our workers, our schoolchildren, our products—agricultural products, manufacturing products—and small businesses and large businesses trying to get to market are caught in gridlock.

In my home State of Michigan, the average person pays $154 a year to pay for improvements to roads and bridges. That is actually the lowest in the Nation, not nearly enough for what we ought to be doing to invest in improvements. Because of the poor road conditions in Michigan and the damage to cars, the average person spends $357 a year to fix their car—more than a lot of the efforts we have talked about in terms of looking for a long-term solution to be able to fund the highway trust fund when it runs empty in 57 days.

I have heard from workers in Michigan who hit potholes on their way to work and had to stop on the way to work to go to a repair shop. Some tell me they have to swerve around major potholes. I drive, of course, Michigan roads all of the time, going home almost every weekend, and I am constantly doing that. I have had to take my car in as well to get major repairs—realignments, new tires—because of what is happening on the roads.

This is a case where we know what the cure is for the disease, but instead we are treating the symptoms. Instead of fixing the roads, we are fixing our cars. That makes no sense. It is shortsighted. Our economy depends upon having roads and bridges and rail that is safe and effective across the country—short rail, by the way, for our farmers and agriculture and the passenger rail that is so critical. We have seen what happens when there are not safety provisions and when tragedies occur.

Our infrastructure is crumbling in the United States of America. Who would ever have thought we would have gotten to this point, 57 days until the highway trust fund is empty—57 days?

A previous generation of Americans responded to this challenge to invest and to build America by making bold investments that powered our economy into the 20th century, that made us an economic powerhouse, that created the greatest middle class in the world. Now, the question is how our generation will respond to the challenges of putting in place the investments, the plans, the commitments to not only fix our roads and bridges but to be able to create the infrastructure that will take us to the next level in terms of spurring jobs in the economy.

There is talk that once we get to the end of 57 days, we will just kick the can down the road again. How about this time until December? That is a good time for finding some patch of putting together $10 billion or $11 billion to be able to get us to the end of the year. And of course what do we say to communities, to cities, to States? What do we say to the county road commissions in Michigan? What do we say to those who are trying to negotiate contracts and are spending more money because of the stop-start short-term efforts? What do we say to those spending hundreds of dollars a year trying to fix their cars and wondering what in the world is going on with something so basic—so basic—as roads and bridges and other infrastructure? And yet every time we get to a place where a decision needs to be made, the decision gets kicked down the road.

If there is one thing we have learned, it is that short-term patches don't fix long-term potholes. It is time to step up now. We are tired of seeing this happen over and over. Where are the hearings? Where are the bills on the floor? We have 57 days. That is enough time to get a long-term plan together, to find a bipartisan plan. There are a number of different alternatives. Colleagues on both sides of the aisle have proposed solutions, and 57 days is enough time for us to be able to come together.

First, we need to have hearings, and we need to see bills reported to the floor. Where is the activity going on, the sense of urgency about the fact that in 57 days the highway trust fund will be empty?

We are committed to working with colleagues in a bipartisan way to find solutions. Every time we see a short-term patch, a short-term extension happen, we are letting down our businesses, our workers, our farmers, and the next generation of Americans. It is time—it is pastime—to have a long-term fix.

Frankly, I know what difference it makes when we can put in several years of policy in funding in an area of the economy. We came together to do that last year, and I am very proud of the work that we all did together on a bipartisan basis for rural America—for farmers, for ranchers—when we put together the farm bill, a 5-year bill of economic policy, funding, and investments that allowed people to plan, allowed communities to grow, allowed rural development to happen, and businesses to be able to invest, providing the economic certainty that they needed for looking longer than 2 months or 6 months. We need to do that as it relates to the highway trust fund. We are long past doing that.

The time has come for a long-term fix. It is time for our generation, and it is time for our Republican colleagues who have traditionally worked with us on a bipartisan basis to emulate the bold action of the previous generation. President Eisenhower said in 1952: ''A network of modern roads is as necessary to defense as it is to our national economy and personal safety.'' Fixing roads and bridges, expanding the ability for business to move and for agriculture to move and to create jobs should not be a partisan issue. We should not be at an impasse here. We should not be coming to the floor every day—which we will be doing—to count this down. What we ought to be doing is sitting together in committee, sitting together and working on a solution to get it done in the next 57 days. That is what we need to be doing.

I think it is important for each of us to answer this question: Are you happy with the D on America's report card on the roads? Is D enough? We would certainly not say that to our kids. Are you willing to let Croatia pass America in the Global Competitiveness Report? Croatia with better roads and better bridges than the United States of America—really?

Are we willing to spend the resources that we need to work together to find

a bipartisan solution to fix our roads and bridges, to invest in safe rail and in opportunities for us to have the infrastructure and transportation we need? Are we going to force American drivers to pay even more on repairs year after year after year? Are we going to be like Ike or are our Republican colleagues in the majority going to just kick the can down the road one more time?

In Eisenhower's time there was a bipartisan agreement for investing in America's infrastructure. We can do that again. There is absolutely no reason why we should not be able to do that. We have to come together. Republican colleagues who chair the committees need to be sending us a signal. We need to be holding hearings and working together to develop bills and bringing bills to the floor and debating them and making clear that now is the time to get it done.

Don't kick the can down the road again. Step up. Let's fix our roads and bridges. Let's invest in rebuilding America for the future. Let's create jobs and send a signal that we can work together to get that done in the 57 days until the highway trust fund is empty—57 days. It is enough time to do it if people think this is important. I hope they will.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor this evening to join my colleague Senator HEITKAMP from North Dakota and to follow Senator CANTWELL from Washington, who spoke earlier this afternoon to talk about the importance of taking action to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank before that Bank expires at the end of this month.

At the end of June, the charter for the Export-Import Bank will expire, and that means billions of dollars of lending by the Bank to support American manufacturing and exports will come to a halt. I am sad to say that what we face right now is a completely unnecessary crisis. There is bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate for the Export-Import Bank, but we have just days until the charter expires. We need to begin now the process of reauthorizing this critical job-creating program.

I know there may be some different ideas in this Chamber about what the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank should look like. I have introduced a bill that would reauthorize the bank for 7 years instead of 4, which has been one of the proposals. My bill would raise the cap on the lending for the Export-Import Bank instead of keeping it flat, and I know there are other discussions around language that addresses the financing of coal-fired powerplants abroad. But regardless of our different views on the specifics of the reauthorization bill, Democrats and Republicans should all be able to agree that letting the Bank expire would be bad for America's businesses, bad for the employees of those businesses, and bad for our economy. That is because the Export-Import Bank supports American jobs at zero cost to taxpayers.

Let me just say that again, because I think there is this perception in some quarters that because we don't have an agreement on reauthorization, there must be some huge cost involved to the Export-Import Bank. In fact, it is just the opposite. The Export-Import Bank puts money into the Treasury of the Federal Government. It doesn't take money out.

In New Hampshire the Bank has supported $314 million in export sales for our businesses since 2009. That support translates into more exports, into more manufacturing, and ultimately into more jobs.

Just this morning we had a number of businesses that rely on the Export-Import Bank come in to speak to some of the Senators. One person who was very eloquent with his comments was Michael Boyle from Boyle Energy in New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Boyle's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXAMINING THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK'S REAUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN EXPORT FINANCING

BES&T is an exporter of U.S. Patented Commissioning Technology know as SigmaCommissioning. The most advanced equipment and engineered process available in the world today. BES&T and Sigma significantly helps its clients (global energy companies) start (commission) their energy infrastructure projects for far less cost, fuel, water and time.

In short, we convert the largest power plants and refineries from a construction environment into an operating environment faster, less costly and with a higher degree of quality than is available anywhere else in the world.

In the first 10 years of BES&T's history we did 90% of our work in the US.

We then spent 4 years inventing and perfecting our new commissioning technology before declaring our services, equipment, and engineering to be out of the R&D stage and therefore commercially viable.

We began exporting the work. Foreign companies had very limited technical support for our work and the competition for technical services was very weak. This meant that our clients would most likely be first adopters of this new technology. We were right. We also wanted to be tested, to apply our services in remote locations, in extraordinary terms on the toughest projects.

To be certain we could pay our people and vendors should clients not pay in far off lands, we insured our work with the EXIM bank. We sought to protect against major cash-flow disruption as we had little knowledge of collection, legal recovery, or any other understanding of the commercial codes of the countries where we were deploying our services. We could do the work but did not know what we would do if a foreign buyer did not pay us.

As our service became accepted and our abilities grew, so did our receivables. We solicited a National US Bank to provide us with the needed credit to support our working capital. They were agreeable to it domestically but we were informed that they had no means of securing our collateral to perfect full collection from foreign countries if we were to default. Even though those receivables were insured. So we worked with them to apply for a working capital guarantee package with EXIM much as we had done when we bought our first building using 504 support through the SBA. We were approved and fees were required and paid. Since the time we began with the credit insurance and the working capital LOC we have had neither claims nor losses that required EXIM support to the bank.

Here are some of the results. In the 7 years since we began exporting and working with EXIM we have:

Become known as the most advanced technical commissioning service company in power in 22 countries

Spent $71 million on the cost of producing our work:

Trucking, Pipe and materials, Valves, Pumps, Filters, Manpower, Airfare, Fabrication, Chemicals, Hoses, Fittings, Ocean Freight, Air Freight

Spent $25 million on back office or SGA support.

Paid 25% of our profits in federal taxes to the Treasury Department

Repatriated all of our profits.

Increased our revenue 4x

Increased our employment 6x

Paid 100% health insurance for all our workers.

Paid Christmas and Profit sharing bonuses

Provided an average wage of $100K USD over our entire employment force

Increased benefits by adding dental, 401k, Life insurance, PTO, Family Leave etc.

Worked in 22 countries

Filed for and received further US Patents

Received an Audit by the IRS with received a notice of no changes or faults.

Donated $218,000 to local charities and nonprofits in New Hampshire

Successfully completed 60 projects

Completed 5x the revenue in the second 10 years of the company as was completed in the first 10 years

Eliminated 80,000,000 gallons of hazardous chemical waste in foreign countries.

Opened new markets in Oil and Gas production to augment power plant work.

Commissioned more than 27,351 megawatts of power and 200,000 barrels of oil per year from natural gas.

I personally have so enjoyed, and our company has benefited so much from the experience of and value derived from the EXIM bank that I was honored to be asked to volunteer my time to serve on the Advisory Committee of the bank, and have cosigned the 2013 and 2014 Competitiveness Report to the Congress of the United States. During that time I was chosen to serve as Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Public Engagement to the Advisory committee. I have also worked and consulted directly with Chairman Fred Hochberg on the issues impacting small business. I have also been asked to consult on the operational content and usability of the website offered by the bank. I have given voice to my experience to members of Congress, regional resource and economic development offices in New Hampshire, to local businesses thinking of working with EXIM. I have even been so honored as to join Chairman Hochberg in a discussion of the EXIM bank in the Roosevelt Room of the Whitehouse. To date my finest hour.

I can therefore state that I have been witness to positive changes in the bank's operating approach since my colleagues and I

volunteered to serve on the advisory committee. We, and the information we have imparted, have had a direct impact on the bank because the bank's leadership was fully intent on providing the best support not just to small business, but to all businesses using the bank's services. The bank and each and every employee of the EXIM bank I met and worked with cared greatly about our concerns and took action to make the experience and value greater.

I have very good knowledge of the value of this bank to both the US exporter companies using the bank and the taxpayers in the US.

While I wish that there were no ECA global competition for credit support, there is. In as much as I have read and been required to review and make comment on the OECD and Non-OECD research of the activities of the global competitors to US exporting I am fully aware that both good and bad actors are in abundance across the world, and that their supporting ECAs are outspending in both percentage and real dollars the EXIM bank of the US. These actions are deliberate and these organizations will go to great lengths to create the unbalanced competition that we would like to have eradicated.

Until such time as there is no further need for global ECA competition, I would therefore ask the House and Senate of the United States to consider the following actions.

1. Re-authorize the EXIM bank for 7 years.
2. Add an additional 20 billion USD authority to the Bank
3. Allow the bank greater flexibility to advertise its existence and benefits.
4. Allow the bank greater budget flexibility to conduct regional training and recruitment of customers.
5. Establish treaties with Non-OECD countries to severely restrict and penalize unfair ECA support or non-competitive actions related to exports
6. Ensure 100% compliance with the law of the United States and all foreign Borrower nations.
7. Ensure that US policy support by the bank is fair and equally balanced.
8. Promote the establishment of a global Uniform Commercial Code or similar instrument for the security of international assets derived from commercial transactions.
9. Empower domestic banks to further support export credit of viable receivables and exported collateral under some strict country limitation schedule.
10. Negotiate ECA interest rates worldwide to stabilize differentials.
11. Vigorously promote the bank to small businesses.

In conclusion, we, as American business people value our support from our government. I personally have benefited from being a citizen of the United States. When I was young my mother reached out for food stamps and welfare to assist us till we could get on our feet. I had school lunch programs in the public schools I attended. Not being able to afford college I joined the United States Navy. I was trained to be a boiler technician over a 6 year period. I traveled the world on 3 destroyers and a tender and earned a great education in life, leadership, steam, and boilers. I was honorably discharged and have gone on to build a family and a company. My company has 60 families employed and we all still travel the world and we still work on boilers. I have been blessed to have the people and government of these United States beside me then and beside me now. I have estimated that my work in this regard has returned many times over the money given to my mother for my benefit and the salary I earned in the Navy. I have visited the White House, and am now here in the Capitol speaking to our Congress. Beyond all that I have accomplished, my mother and father are proud, my wife and sons too.

So I will make you a promise. When I don't need to use the EXIM bank any longer, when we have grown our business and employed hundreds more people, I will stop using the bank. But even then, I will volunteer my time to defend this organization and its people, and to help each and every small business that asks me to help them learn to export and how to do so with EXIM.

I love my country, am grateful to have its help, and wish to thank the Congress for making this valuable tool available.

Thank you for the honor of participating in this discussion.

God Bless the United States of America.

MICHAEL P. BOYLE,
President and CEO.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Michael Boyle is the CEO of Boyle Energy Services and Technology. They have a facility in Concord, NH, which I have had the good fortune to visit. They do great work. This testimony is what Michael gave before the House Committee on Financial Services this morning at a hearing that examined the Export-Import Bank's reauthorization request and the government's role in export financing.

As I said, Boyle Energy does impressive work. They optimize energy performance in power and energy infrastructure construction projects. Their services have reduced greenhouse gas emissions and eliminated millions of gallons of hazardous waste at facilities around the world. It is a great American small business story. Boyle Energy got connected with the Export-Import Bank a number of years ago at a forum in New Hampshire where the Ex-Im Bank announced its Global Access for Small Business Program to help small businesses export.

Right now, about 40 percent of large businesses export, but only 1 percent of small and medium-sized businesses export in the United States. Yet 95 percent of markets are outside of America. We need to help businesses such as Boyle Energy get into those international markets. That is exactly what the Ex-Im Bank has done. With the Export-Import Bank's support, Boyle Energy has grown its international sales 75 percent over the last 3 years.

Before using the Export-Import Bank's credit insurance, the company shipped just to Mexico and Canada. But now Boyle has customers in over a dozen countries. Their exports comprise 60 percent of the company's $15 million in sales, and 10 of its 50 employees support their increase in international sales. Without the Bank, Boyle Energy's success just wouldn't be possible.

Last year the Ex-Im Bank supported $10.7 billion worth of exports by American small businesses. So this is not just the big guys. It is not just the General Electrics and the Boeings. It is small businesses such as we have in New Hampshire where 96 percent of our employers are small businesses. We should not take this important tool—this financing tool for our small businesses—away from America's job creators.

I think it is important to note that it is not just the direct users of the Bank's products that will suffer. It will also hurt those smaller companies that sell to larger companies who use Ex-Im Bank financing, for example, manufacturers such as Albany Engineering in Rochester, NH, which makes parts for airplane engines. Timken in Keene and Lebanon sell their products to Boeing. When we cut off financing for those products, it is going to have a real impact on American manufacturing. It is going to have an impact on jobs in New Hampshire and across this country.

Now is the time for us to come together. We can do this. We can get this authorization done. We have support in this Chamber to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, to help our small businesses so we can get them into the international markets. We need to do this reauthorization before the Bank charter expires at the end of this month, and I urge my colleagues to join us in taking action.

I yield the floor, and I thank Senator HEITKAMP for her leadership on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, this is a story and a movie we see all too frequently in this Chamber and in the Congress—manufactured crisis after manufactured crisis after manufactured crisis. Here we are a few short days away from actually seeing the charter of the Export-Import Bank expire.

Think about that—a 70-year institution, a critical piece of trade infrastructure. We spent the better part of the last work period talking about trade promotion authority, and for very many of us this was a very difficult vote. It was a conflicting vote. At the end of the day, the one argument that sells the day is that 95 percent of all consumers in the world live outside the United States.

If we are not participating in trade, if we are not working to make sure our exports are competitive, if we are not making a difference for American manufacturers, we are going to lose the competition for the customer. We are going to lose the opportunity to grow our manufacturing base.

So the Export-Import Bank—not a lot of people know what it is, but the people who do and the businesses that do know this is a critical piece of trade infrastructure. The irony perhaps of this whole issue is there is no one—there is no group outside of conservative think tanks that does not agree the Export-Import Bank needs to be reauthorized.

We have the U.S. Chamber of Commerce begging us in the Banking Committee to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. We have the National Association of Manufacturers that tells us overwhelmingly—the people who support that trade association, who are represented by that trade association, want reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. We know the unions that

represent the workers who work in these industries have been asking us to do the right thing.

So here we are, once again, at the eleventh hour. Last year, we agreed to a short-term extension, 6 months, believing we would not be in this spot today, believing we would not be at the last minute threatening the charter of the Export-Import Bank. So guess what. We have over $15 billion of credit in the pipeline. Think about 15 billion dollars' worth of manufacturing exports in this country. I want you to think not about the manufacturing exports, I want you to think about what that means, what that means for the American worker who works in those manufacturing facilities. They look at this and they say that you are all about the economy. You all run saying that we are all about jobs, we are all about improving the economy, creating opportunity by getting American manufacturing back on its feet. Yet we cannot do something that has been done for 70 years and frequently by unanimous consent in this body.

So where is the opposition? The opposition is nothing more than ideology. The opposition comes from conservative think tanks that score this, that scare Members and say that if you agree to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, that will be a black mark on your record. You will not be with us. You know what. It is time we were with the American workers. It is time we were with the small businesses. It is time we dispel the myth of this institution, the Export-Import Bank, and start talking about this as a job-creating entity.

I have a chart here. It is a theme that Senator KIRK and I are sounding. Senator KIRK and I have the bipartisan bill that we would like to see advanced in this body to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. We have tried very hard to balance the concerns people have for reform with a reauthorization that gives some level of certainty to American manufacturing, to the institutions that finance them. Make no mistake, it is not that this is public money. Simply what we are saying is, if a bank gives a loan to an American manufacturer, if a smalltown bank gives a loan to an American manufacturer, we will help guarantee that loan. It is like an SBA—it is like an SBA for manufacturing exports.

What is next? We are going to take on the SBA because they are doing too much good to help American businesses? So I want you to think about this: 164,000 American jobs. Those are direct American jobs, not the secondary jobs that we know come from this primary sector, development. When you look at economics, you think about those jobs that are secondary and those jobs that are primary sector.

Every manufacturing job that deals with exports is a primary sector job. It is new wealth creation for our State. Economically, that is manna from Heaven because that new wealth comes here in the payments for exports. It circulates around our economy, allows our retail businesses to thrive, allows our restaurants and our secondary businesses, whether they are dry cleaners, whether they are people in the service industry, to support those primary sector jobs.

So 164,000 primary jobs, exports of $27.5 billion—$27.5 billion—those are all U.S. exports supported by the Ex-Im Bank. When we look at it, guess what. People say: Well, it must cost us something to do this. It must cost the American taxpayers something to fund the Export-Import Bank if we are seeing those kinds of results. Guess what. Not only does it not cost us, it returned $7 billion to the Treasury.

Think about that. What is wrong with this? What is bad about this? Where is this failing the taxpayers of this country? Where is this failing the American worker? The simple answer is it is not. What is failing the American worker is this institution, the United States Congress, because we are failing to hand the tools to those businesses that can, in fact, create jobs, create economic wealth, and move our country forward. People will say: Oh, my goodness. It is all of those big companies. It is GE, it is Boeing, and that is really whom we are talking for.

Well, I want to kind of look behind the curtain of that a little bit, not just talk about small businesses in my State that are going to benefit and the agricultural producers that benefit from this institution. Think about the literally thousands of small businesses that support Boeing, the thousands of small businesses that support the folks at GE. Think about the businesses that actually are the contractors with these large institutions that make parts, that make the sandwiches that feed the employees. This is primary sector growth. We know that adds to the benefit of the entire economy.

So let's talk a little bit about why someone from North Dakota cares about the Export-Import Bank. If you look at more than 58,000 small businesses around the country depending on the Export-Import Bank to finance the export deals, they will all lose if we do nothing. There is $15.9 billion, as I said, in the pipeline.

The Export-Import Bank has supported $139 billion in sales in North Dakota alone, since 2007, and $102 million in exports from our State. Think about that—the little State of North Dakota, how significant this institution is.

I want to tell the story of a small business. We heard just heart-wrenching stories, one from California, an entrepreneur who gave his all in Vietnam, 100-percent disabled. He has a small business, had a dream, living the American dream, serving his country. Guess what. He lost. Because of the uncertainty here, he lost a $57 million contract putting over 100 people out of work. Right now, he is challenged because he has a $200 million contract on the line waiting for reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Because—guess what—the people he is selling to are not going to wait to find out if he has financing. They are going to turn to the next manufacturer. Do you know who that next manufacturer is? That next manufacturer is China.

Do you think our competitors across the world, whether it is India or China, who are not looking at reforming their export credit organization—guess what they are doing. They are pumping billions of dollars more. They are taking advantage of this. They are taking advantage of this opportunity. This is a sign in the Beijing airport: ''The Export Import Bank of China. Want to be the best in a better world?''

They are not hiding this. They are not saying that is inappropriate. They are bragging about it. They are bragging where they think those businessmen are coming in and taking a look at where that financing opportunity is. You might say: Well, the private sector can do it. That is not true. That is absolutely not true. We have had representation from almost every financial organization in this town saying we need the Export-Import Bank to support our customers who need to have that credit for their exports.

So I want to close talking about a great business in Wahpeton, ND, a town I grew up very close to. WCCO Belting in Wahpeton, ND, is a great example. It is a 60-year-old, family-owned rubber supply company, which started out as a shoe repair business and diversified into repairing parts for farm trucks and then into new seats for tractors, canvass belting, and wooden slats.

Today, the company provides rubber products used in farm equipment, such as belts for harvesting grain or producing round bailers or tube conveyers to move seeds and grain. Those are supplied to major farm equipment companies around the world. You know what. The simple fact is—and they will tell you if they were standing right here—that company could not have done it without the Export-Import Bank 12 years ago, which allowed WCCO Belting to pursue export opportunities it had been ignoring. The Bank has supported more than $830,000 in exports from WCCO since 2007. The Export-Import Bank helps make sure small businesses get paid in a timely fashion for what they sell. Not getting paid in a timely manner from foreign entities very quickly can put a small business out of work.

The company now has 200 employees who generate more than 60 percent of their annual sales from revenues from customers who are located outside of the United States, all possible because of the Export-Import Bank. Without the Bank, they would be unable to compete in this global marketplace. This is one of those stories in Washington, DC, that makes the rest of the world believe Washington does not get it, that the United States Congress

does not get it. Because they do not live in their world, they live in the real world, where you have to finance what you have, where those challenges get harder and harder every day, and where you are competing in a market where people do this.

There are 70 export credit agencies in the world, all competing for the same business, all helping their homegrown businesses compete for the same business we are competing for. Unilateral disarmament. So it was not for any other purpose than the passion we have for this institution that Senator CANTWELL and I started talking about this during the TPA discussion, started saying: We need a path forward so the charter of the Bank does not expire, so that we actually reauthorize the Bank before the end of this month.

I would like to tell you that the prospects are great, that the overwhelming economic logic of the Export-Import Bank has overcome all of the ideological discussions. I would love to tell you that. I would love to tell you we are absolutely doing something in a timely fashion, we are doing something that makes common sense. Guess what. We are not. We are going to see the charter expire unless we, every day, come here and beg for a vote, unless we see movement in the House of Representatives, so that the charter does not expire. I am saying: Do not leave the small businesses of this country, the hope of this country behind. Let's reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, let's do it sooner rather than later, and let's actually respond to the concerns of the American manufacturing population.

I yield the floor.

URBAN FLOODING AWARENESS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, big storms and heavy rain often lead to flooding in cities. It seems like that is happening more frequently and the floods have been more damaging. In May we saw the extent of the damage that can be done when flood waters inundate a city. Twenty-seven people died in Houston, TX as a result of the rainfall and flooding there. Eleven people are still missing. The truth of the matter is, we don't have very much data on frequency, severity, or how we might better prepare for the kind of weather that turns into flooded streets, businesses, and homes.

I introduced a bill this week, with Senator WHITEHOUSE and Congressman QUIGLEY in the House, to address that. The Urban Flooding Awareness Act calls for a study to document the costs to families, business, and government associated with urban flooding. There are many ways we can do a better job of preparing for storm flooding—including creative, environmentally sound, ''green infrastructure'' approaches—but first we need to have a firm understanding of the scope of the problem.

Stronger, more destructive storms are pounding urban areas at an alarming rate. They threaten the quality of drinking water. Urban floods erode river banks and spread pollution. They bring massive damage to homes and businesses. When you consider events like Superstorm Sandy and Hurricane Katrina, it is clear we need to do more to understand how flooding can be predicted and prevented.

In Illinois we have had more than our fair share of urban flooding in recent years. Chicago has seen three ''hundred year floods'' in the last 5 years.

Just a few inches of water can cause thousands of dollars in damage for both home and small business owners. Wet basements from flooding events are one of the top reasons people do not purchase a particular home. Industry experts estimate flooding can lower property values by 10 to 25 percent. Moreover, nearly 40 percent of small businesses do not reopen following a disaster, according to FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Most homeowners in urban areas do not have Federally backed flood insurance through FEMA's flood insurance program. They are not able to participate in the flood insurance program because it focuses entirely on designated floodplains along rivers, not in urban areas. With the frequency and severity of storms growing year by year, we need to gain a better understanding of flooding in our cities.

A clear definition of urban flooding—which this legislation would establish—would allow experts to understand the scope of the problem, develop solutions, and consider more than just coastal and river flooding when designing flood maps. The bill also would require FEMA to coordinate a study on the costs and prevalence of urban flooding and the effectiveness of green and other infrastructure.

The Urban Flooding Awareness Act will help American communities identify ways to protect our investments and our environment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

REMEMBERING MARSELIS PARSONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to pay honor to a Vermont legend who passed away last month. Marselis Parsons, known to friends as ''Div,'' was a deeply respected newsman in my home State. His low, steady voice in anchoring the evening news became a mainstay in living rooms for decades. Div Parsons knew news. He knew the importance of having personal connections, and he built trust based on his integrity and fairness.

Div Parsons rose through the ranks at Vermont's CBS affiliate, WCAX Channel 3, and he never became too important in his own mind that he wouldn't report on a fire or track down a lead. In short, he knew the pulse of the State, and he reported on what he knew. He also shared his years of experience with young reporters, many of whom he hired straight out of college and gave them the break they needed.

When he wasn't working long hours at the station, he was known to take to the waters of the great Lake Champlain, either on his antique power boat or, if the winds held up, under full sail. In retirement, he still relished tracking the latest political news.

I am grateful for our friendship and our many conversations over time, and I am grateful that he was able to cherish the recent birth of his granddaughter, Pippa. Div Parsons' death will leave a void, no doubt, but we'll have many memories to share.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fitting tribute to Div Parsons that ran in the Times Argus newspaper.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Barre Montpelier Times Argus, June 1, 2015]

'DIV' DEPARTS

This last week saw the departure of Bob Schieffer from the anchor desk of the CBS show ''Face The Nation,'' and closer to home, the passing of a Vermont television icon, Marselis Parsons. While Schieffer occupied a place in the national consciousness, it is not a mistake to place the two men in company. They represent the best of an era in television that is rapidly receding into history.

For Vermont, Parsons was the face that a generation of Vermonters grew up with, in an era when the habits of the populace were still to turn on the local news at 6 p.m., followed by the national report at 7 p.m. He was both larger than life, and unassuming in a way that led us to welcome him into our homes. ''Div,'' as he was nicknamed through obscure origins, was for many the one and only local news anchor they knew.

Because of the vagaries of television transmission over the hills of Vermont, many children in rural homes—and their parents—had just one or two options on the dial beyond the local PBS station. Even then, the reception was sometimes tricky leading to elaborate coat hanger antennas on the TV and ''snow'' making the picture a bit fuzzy. But the television was often the window to the wider world—both the world at large, and because of Parsons and family-owned WCAX, the world in the next town over, or in the state of Vermont at large.

He was the guide to the stories that connected Vermont and gave us a sense of shared identity, whether we turned on the evening news in Derby Line or in Tinmouth. He reported on the first Green Up Day, in 1970, on the return of hostages from Iran in 1980, and was the anchor the day that Dick Snelling died and Howard Dean was sworn in as governor. Parsons became synonymous with Channel 3, and both remain Vermont institutions.

He looked us in the eye and told us the bad news when tragedy had struck; he also shared the triumphs of the day, or narrated some kind of community gathering in one of the tiny towns that Vermont is known for. He often shared a chuckle with his co-anchors, but never allowed his personality—of which there was plenty—or his demeanor to outshine the efforts of the team as a whole.

He could be, as his former colleague Kristin Carlson recalled, unscripted and direct on live television, meaning the reporters in the field had better know their story and be able

to go off the script. Carlson grew up watching Parsons, and like dozens of television reporters, was mentored by him and grew to serve the state of Vermont better because of it.

After his start in television in 1967, Parsons worked as a reporter for years, and only took over the anchor desk in 1984, on the death of his predecessor, Richard Gallagher. By then much of the most tumultuous period in Vermont's modern history was over: Act 250 was in place, Vermont had rapidly transitioned from a conservative, rural state to a politically diverse, rural state, and the social and governmental change ushered in by the '60s and '70s was in full swing. There was much to come, however, and Parsons was a constant throughout—the rest of the Kunin years, the rise of Howard Dean, civil unions and the Jim Douglas era.

The days of the network evening news are rapidly passing on. The news world has further fragmented with the rise of the Internet. In some ways, the new world is better. We have many choices now, and our ability to connect to others around the state and the world has never been greater. Our choices for information are more diverse.

In other ways we feel the pangs of nostalgia for times gone by, when there was a constant presence who would share the news of the day before saying ''Good Night''. The sense of loss is for one of our familiar community, and of a person who did not put himself before the news.

There are many examples of the anchor desk lending too much ego to the occupant. Often today an anchor desk is almost like a podium or a stage. But Parsons had no need to exaggerate or embellish who he was. He was a different kind of anchor. In the current era of flamboyance and exaggeration, his humility, compassion and honesty stand out. Parsons was not a ''personality.'' He was not acting or putting on a show while on air—the man he was was what you saw. He was steady and sometimes deadpan, and committed entirely to the Green Mountain State.

While we are grateful to have had him, it is our great loss that he is gone.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING JIM WEBER

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Jim Weber, a welding and machining teacher at Capital High School in Helena, MT. Mr. Weber uses Mastercam CAD/CAM software to give his students real world, practical skills, as well as the work ethic necessary to complete any task. His instruction helped lead one of his students to victory at the National Machining Competition for creating a custom fly fishing rod and display case.

Mr. Weber's fly fishing rod project not only leads to great and necessary personal skills, but he inspired this years' senior class to make an even bigger impact with their fly fishing rods. Mr. Weber's class designed and machined 15 custom fly fishing rods for the Big Hearts under the Big Sky project which helps to create free and gratifying opportunities for service men and women, life-threateningly ill children, and women battling breast cancer to explore the vast and beautiful Montanan outdoors. Not only was he able to teach high school students how to make rings, knives, and fishing rods, he was also able to motivate his students to help themselves by helping others.

The ability to educate students and make them ready to take on the challenges that our world contains is a valuable asset to the young adults. Each and every day Mr. Weber provides a great service to our future leaders that words cannot adequately express. I am excited to see what comes of the great men and women Jim Weber is able to teach and inspire.•

TRIBUTE TO JOE DOWLING

• Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Joe Dowling, the outgoing artistic director of the Guthrie Theater. For 20 years, Mr. Dowling has served the Guthrie with integrity, creativity, and style. His passion, talent, and years of international theater experience have added so much to the Guthrie Theater and the entire Twin Cities theater community.

Mr. Dowling joined the Guthrie Theater as artistic director in 1995. Since then, he has directed 48 plays and build relationships with esteemed theater artists, such as Angela Bassett, the late Arthur Miller, and T.R. Knight, just to name a few. But his legacy reaches far beyond the plays he has directed and the relationships he has formed. Under Mr. Dowling's leadership, the Guthrie moved into its beautiful new building, allowing the company to expand its repertoire and reach over 400,000 patrons each year.

Joe Dowling has also focused on developing the next generation of theater artists. He led the development of two new actor training programs at the Guthrie and initiated the WorldStage Series, a program that invites international theater companies to perform on Guthrie stages. His vision and leadership have brought tremendous positive change to the Guthrie Theater, and his legacy will be felt long after he has gone.

Tyrone Guthrie founded the Guthrie Theater with a specific goal in mind—to create a first-rate regional theater that would nourish the minds and souls of artists and audiences alike. In the 52 years since its founding, the Guthrie Theater has become just that—a shining example of everything regional theater is and can be. Whether producing Shakespeare's ''Hamlet'' or more contemporary fare, the Guthrie has tackled some of humanity's most pressing issues with innovation, compassion, and professionalism. On its stages and in its classrooms, the Guthrie brings people of all walks of life together to laugh, cry, and contemplate some of life's deepest questions.

I hope you will join me as I say thank you to Joe Dowling for his 20 remarkable years of service to the Guthrie Theater, the people of the State of Minnesota, and the United States of America.•

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate on January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 2, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 802. An act 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.

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 devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the enrolled bills were signed on June 2, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. DAINES).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 3, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 802. An act 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.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1777. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the global defense posture (OSS–2015–0825); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1778. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James M. Kowalski, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1779. A communication from the Acting Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Offset Costs'' ((RIN0750–AI59) (DFARS Case 2015–D028)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1780. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Minimum Requirements for Appraisal Management Companies Joint-Agency Rule'' (RIN2590–AA61) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29,

2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1781. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations'' (RIN0694–AG62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1782. A communication from the Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's 2014 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1783. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2014 management report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1784. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Russian Sanctions: Revisions and Clarifications for Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine'' (RIN0694–AG54) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1785. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to the Congress on the Profitability of Credit Card Operations on Depository Institutions''; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1786. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Communications Reliability Standards'' ((RIN1902–AE92) (Docket No. RM14–13–000)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1787. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Real Power Balancing Control Performance Reliability Standard'' ((RIN1902–AE94) (Docket No. RM14–10–000)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1788. A communication from the Director of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, seventeen (17) reports relative to vacancies in the Environmental Protection Agency, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1789. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates—June 2015'' (Rev. Rul. 2015–14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1790. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Purchase Price Safe Harbors for sections 143 and 25'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1791. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Credit for Renewable Electricity Production and Refined Coal Production, and Publication of Inflation Adjustment Factor and Reference Prices for Calendar Year 2015'' (Notice 2015–32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1792. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress: The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' Evaluation of For-Profit PACE Programs under Section 4808(b) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1793. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0828); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1794. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0829); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1795. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0827); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1796. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2015–0826); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1797. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15–014); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1798. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1799. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Opportunity to Develop Alternative Fuels and Dual Fuel Technologies for Class 8 Heavy-Duty Long-Haul Trucks''; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–1800. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Biennial Report to Congress on the Food Safety and Food Defense Research Plan''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1801. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2010 Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) Report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1802. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Requirements for Blood and Blood Components Intended for Transfusion or for Further Manufacturing Use'' ((RIN0910–AG87) (Docket No. FDA–2006–N–0040; formerly Docket No. 2006N–0221)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1803. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Dow Chemical Company in Pittsburg, California, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1804. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Report on FDA Advisory Committee Vacancies and Public Disclosures''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1805. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Hanford site in Richland, Washington, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1806. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1807. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Grand Junction Facilities site in Grand Junction, Colorado, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1808. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''ANC 7F Did Not Fully Comply with the ANC Act''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1809. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1810. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans Affairs' Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1811. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1812. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–67, ''Prohibition of Pre-Employment Marijuana Testing Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1813. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–69, ''Workforce Job Development Grant-Making Reauthorization Temporary Amendment Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1814. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–70, ''Soccer Stadium Development Technical Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1815. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–71, ''Medical Marijuana Supply Shortage Temporary Amendment Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1816. A communication from the Chairman and Members of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1817. A communication from the Director of the Office of Government Relations, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Corporation for National and Community Service's Report on Final Action for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1818. A communication from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1819. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1820. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2015 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 2nd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1821. A communication from the Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1822. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administrator's Semiannual Management Report to Congress for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1823. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1824. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Met Many Requirements of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 but Did Not Fully Comply for Fiscal Year 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1825. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–68, ''Events DC Technical Clarification Amendment Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1826. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth annual report relative to the Department of Justice's activities regarding pre-1970 racially motivated homicides, as required by the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1827. A communication from the Program Manager of Regulation Policy and Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Grants for Adaptive Sports Programs for Disabled Veterans and Disabled Members of the Armed Forces'' (RIN2900–AP07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1828. A communication from the National Chairman, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports entitled ''2014 Annual Report of the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps'' and ''2014 Financial Statement of the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1829. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21–72, ''Jubilee Maycroft TOPA Notice Exemption Temporary Act of 2015''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1830. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Local Number Portability Porting Interval and Validation Requirements, Telephone Number Portability, and Numbering Resource Optimization'' ((RIN3060–AJ32) (DA 14–842)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1831. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program; Amendment 45; Pacific Cod Sideboard Allocations in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–BD61) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1832. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries'' (RIN0648–XD902) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1833. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel for Regulations and Security Standards, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustment of Passenger Civil Aviation Security Service Fee'' (RIN1652–AA68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1834. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2015 Management Measures'' (RIN0648–XD843) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–29. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, urging the United States Department of Transportation and the United States Department of Energy to immediately enact rules that mandate the stabilization and reduction in volatility of Bakken crude oil to be transported by rail and urging the United States Congress to pass the Crude-By-Rail Safety Act of 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM–30. A communication from a citizen of the State of Illinois memorializing a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State's General Assembly urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to review the national tariff policy on steel goods and take action similar to the 2002 actions of President George W. Bush and Congress; and urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to consider all possible trade and economic policies to protect this vital American industry and minimize the financial impact on these hardworking men and women; to the Committee on Finance.

POM–31. A concurrent memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to enact legislation that confirms that state law determines the entire scope of R.S. 2477 right-of-way; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL 1002

Whereas, in order to promote settlement of the American West in the 1800s and provide access to mining deposits located under federal lands, the United States Congress granted rights-of-way across public lands for the construction of highways by a provision of the Mining Law of 1866, now known as Revised Statute (R.S.) 2477; and

Whereas, the United States Congress repealed R.S. 2477 in 1976 as part of its enactment of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, along with the repeal of other federal statutory rights-of-way, but it expressly preserved R.S. 2477 rights-of-way that already had been established; and

Whereas, in its entirety, R.S. 2477 provided that ''the right of way for the construction

of highways over public lands, not reserved for public uses, is hereby granted''; and

Whereas, R.S. 2477 was self-executing and did not require government approval or public recording of title, which resulted in uncertainty regarding whether particular rights-of-way had in fact been established; and

Whereas, in April 2014, the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals issued a decision in San Juan County v. United States in which the court rejected the notion that state law should determine the entire scope of R.S. 2477 rights-of-way, holding that state law has provided ''convenient and appropriate principles'' for determining the scope and validity of an R.S. 2477 right-of-way, but it can be dismissed when it ''contravenes congressional intent''; and

Whereas, in October 2014, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals issued a decision in County of Shoshone v. United States in which it confirmed that state law controls, or is ''borrowed,'' in determining what constitutes sufficient public use, reflecting a rejection of the approach taken by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Juan County v. United States; and

Whereas, outdoor recreation is an essential industry in Arizona, generating $10.6 billion in consumer spending, 104,000 direct Arizona jobs, $3.3 billion in wages and salaries and $787 million in state and local tax revenue; and

Whereas, the reduction of public roads in this state would diminish access to and enjoyment of outdoor recreation opportunities on public lands, detrimentally impacting Arizona's economy.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, prays:

1. That the Members of the United States Congress enact legislation that is consistent with the decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in County of Shoshone v. United States and that confirms that state law determines the entire scope of R.S. 2477 rights-of-way.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM–32. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to review the national tariff policy on steel goods and take action similar to the 2002 actions of President George W. Bush and Congress; and urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to consider all possible trade and economic policies to protect this vital American industry and minimize the financial impact on these hard-working men and women; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 0335

Whereas, The Granite City Works steel mill has operated since 1878: it was originally founded by brothers William and Frederick Niedringhaus as the Granite Iron Rolling Mills, and most recently, owned by United States Steel Corporation; and

Whereas, The Granite City Works has been an industry leader in sheet steel products for customers in the construction, container, piping and tubing, service center, and automotive industries; and

Whereas, Granite City Works has an annual raw steelmaking capability of 2.8 million net tons; and

Whereas, Global influences in the market such as reduced steel prices, unfair trade practices, & imports, and fluctuating oil prices, continue to have a dramatic negative impact on the steel production industry: and

Whereas, Domestic steelmakers continue to lose substantial sales to foreign countries, particularly China and South Korea, which have ''dumped'' their steel products into the United States market at prices below fair market value; and

Whereas, Due to these disruptions in the steel market, on March 25, 2015, United States Steel Corporation announced that it will temporarily idle the Granite City mill and lay off 2,080 steel workers by or after May 28, 2015; and

Whereas, Granite City Works is a vital part of the Metro-East economy, and the loss of this mill would be devastating to thousands of families and the financial well-being of the entire region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Ninety-Ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we urge the President of the United States and Congress to review the national tariff policy on steel goods and take action similar to the 2002 actions of President George W. Bush and Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the President of the United States and Congress to consider all possible trade and economic policies to protect this vital American industry and minimize the financial impact on these hard-working men and women; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be presented to the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, and the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives.

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. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1487. A bill to require notice and comment for certain interpretative rules; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1488. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow for fair application of the exceptions process for drugs in tiers in formularies in prescription drug plans under Medicare part D; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1489. A bill to strengthen support for the Cuban people and prohibit financial transactions with the Cuban military, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1490. A bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1491. A bill to provide sensible relief to community financial institutions, to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 1492. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1493. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2015, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1494. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and update the National Child Traumatic Stress Initiative for grants to address the problems of individuals who experience trauma and violence related stress; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions .

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1495. A bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1496. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1497. A bill to exempt the Indian Health Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and certain other programs for Indians from sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1498. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that military working dogs be retired in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1499. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide eligibility under certain highway programs for projects for the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1500. A bill to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1501. A bill to promote and reform foreign capital investment and job creation in

American communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 190. A resolution encouraging reunions of Korean Americans who were divided by the Korean War from relatives in North Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 191. A resolution relative to the death of Joseph Robinette Biden, III; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 30

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 48

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 48, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 202

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 202, a bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 469

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 469, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 860, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 1073

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1073, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor 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 name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor 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 Utah (Mr. LEE) 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. 1159

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1159, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 1193

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1193, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent and expand the temporary minimum credit rate for the low-income housing tax credit program.

S. 1211

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1211, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that payment under the Medicare program to a long-term care hospital for inpatient services shall not be made at the applicable site neutral payment rate for certain discharges involving severe wounds, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor 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 California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) 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. 1270

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1270, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize hydroelectric production incentives and hydroelectric efficiency improvement incentives, and for other purposes.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. 1364

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1364, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the payment of an additional rebate to the State Medicaid plan in the case of increase in the price of a generic drug at a rate that is greater than the rate of inflation.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1385, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring race or ethnicity to be disclosed in connection with the transfer of a firearm.

S. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. VITTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1466

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1466 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1468

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1468 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, a bill 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1487. A bill to require notice and comment for certain interpretative rules; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I often hear from Montanans how Washington, DC, regulations stifle the ability to create jobs and prevent our small businesses from reaching their full potential. Too many Montana businesses face regulatory burdens that hinder innovation and block opportunities for growth. In fact, when I drive around Montana, I have yet to hear a small business owner stop me and say: You know, we would like to see more regulations from Washington, DC.

In today's environment, business owners are left with few options. They either struggle to keep up with frequent regulatory changes or they suffer the penalty of regulatory fines. That is unacceptable. There is something fundamentally wrong when your business owners spend more time adapting to Washington regulations than focusing on their business's growth and their job creation.

We need to reduce the redtape that is holding our small businesses back and work towards commonsense regulations that don't place unnecessary burdens on Montana families and small business. Today, I have introduced legislation to help fix the regulatory burdens facing Americans. My bill facilitates public input on Federal rulemaking and provides a more predictable regulatory environment so that businesses can make plans to expand and have a predictable environment to create good high-paying jobs.

Currently, bureaucrats in Washington, DC, can issue interpretative rules without warning and without public input. In fact, oftentimes, interpretative rules are dramatically changed at the whim of the President.

I would also like to thank Senators LANKFORD and BLUNT for joining me in introducing this critical piece of legislation. The Regulatory Predictability for Business Growth Act will ensure that Americans' voices are heard in the rulemaking process, providing a crucial planning period for individuals and businesses. I want to give a special thanks to Senator LANKFORD and his staff for his leadership on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management Subcommittee. Our staffs worked closely

to make this piece of legislation possible today.

For far too long, government bureaucracy has stifled our small businesses' potential. With commonsense reforms such as this bill, we can encourage both innovation and job growth. The Regulatory Predictability for Business Growth Act will decrease regulatory uncertainty, and it will empower Montanans and their businesses to grow again.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1494. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and update the National Child Traumatic Stress Initiative for grants to address the problems of individuals who experience trauma and violence related stress; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am here this afternoon to talk about an issue that is so important to my State and to communities nationwide; that is, how do we help children and families rebuild and recover when they face serious trauma? As we have seen all too often in recent years, traumatic events can impact children at any time and in any part of our country. If children don't get the support they need in the wake of a hardship such as a natural disaster or violence at school or stress related to a family member's military deployment, those experiences can be even more difficult to recover from and they can leave our children with serious and long-lasting challenges such as depression, anxiety, and difficulty maintaining employment.

An estimated two-thirds of our children experience traumatic events before the age of 16. Their need for support and treatment after trauma is something that simply cannot go unmet. That is why I am very proud to introduce the Children's Recovery from Trauma Act. This bipartisan legislation would continue support for child trauma centers across the country which help make sure that as children in families face difficult times, our Nation's health care system is better prepared to provide support and help ease that burden.

Child trauma centers have played an important role in my home State of Washington. For example, when the State Route 530 mudslide caused unthinkable devastation in Oso and Darrington, the Washington State University CLEAR Center stepped in to help children and families who were impacted by that horrific tragedy. Staff at the CLEAR Center held parent nights at Darrington Elementary School and worked with the teachers there to help make sure students got the right kind of support they needed. They even helped teachers explain to students how the brain operates under stress and how that might influence their behavior. As a mom and former preschool teacher, a school board member, and a Senator from the great State of Washington, I believe this support can make a world of difference in this kind of scary and stressful time for our kids.

I am very proud that under the Children's Recovery from Trauma Act, the CLEAR Center would continue to receive critical Federal investment. In addition, I am very proud that other child trauma centers, such as those that mobilized after the 2001 terrorist attack and natural disasters such as Hurricane Katrina and Sandy and the shootings at Virginia Tech and in Newtown, would continue to get those investments as well.

As I have said before, I am inspired by the strength and resilience of communities in Washington State that were impacted by the tragedy of the State Route 530 mudslide and the shootings recently at Marysville-Pilchuck High School. Children in these communities and communities like them across the country face hardships that can't always be predicted or prevented, but they do need and deserve our support. The Children's Recovery from Trauma Act would take some critical steps forward in this effort, and I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting it.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1498. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that military working dogs be retired in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, since World War I, military working dogs have worked side-by-side with our men and women in uniform in various roles and operations. Today military working dogs routinely assist U.S. troops on dangerous front-line assignments, helping to detect roadside bombs and improvised explosive devices, saving hundreds of American lives and preventing countless injuries. Moreover, both on and off the battlefield, these dogs represent critical partners, invaluable team members, and cherished companions.

Unlike traditional soldiers, a canine's service does not necessarily end when it reaches retirement. Instead, military working dogs often continue to support our nation by acting as service dogs for veterans suffering from mental and physical disabilities. Because of the close bond forged by their shared experiences in the military, these dogs can play a unique and important role in for our veterans—quite literally saving lives even once they return to the home front.

Unfortunately, it is not always so easy for former dog handlers to be reunited with their four-legged comrades-in-arms. Because of the way the law is currently written, the Department of Defense is not required to bring military working dogs back to the United States upon retirement. As such, most military working dogs end up being retired overseas wherever they end their service. As a result, former handlers, veterans, and other members of the military community wishing to adopt a dog may be forced to cover the cost of transporting the dog halfway across the world.

Our Nation's veterans deserve to be reunited with their canine counterparts and they should not have to shoulder the official costs and fees associated with doing so. To correct this situation, I am introducing the Military Working Dog Retirement Act. By requiring the Department of Defense to arrange and pay for the transportation of retiring military working dogs to the United States, this bill is a key step to ensuring former military dog handlers may benefit from the continued partnership and service of these loyal canines. 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. 1498

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

SECTION 1. REQUIREMENT FOR RETIREMENT OF MILITARY WORKING DOGS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2583 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

''(f) RETIREMENT OF MILITARY WORKING DOGS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the retirement of a military working dog under this section shall occur at a location within the United States.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the retirement of a military working dog abroad if a United States citizen living abroad adopts the dog at the time of retirement.

''(3) Amounts available to the military department concerned shall be available for the costs of the transport of military working dogs to the United States for retirement in accordance with the requirement in paragraph (1).''; and

(3) in subsection (g), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''the Secretary of the military department concerned'' and all that follows through ''may'' and inserting ''a military working dog is to be retired in accordance with the requirement in subsection (f)(1) and no suitable adoption is available at the military facility where the dog is located at the time of retirement, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall''; and

(B) by inserting ''within the United States'' after ''another location''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to retirements of military working dogs pursuant to section 2583 of title 10, United States Code, that occur on or after that date.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1501. A bill to promote and reform foreign capital investment and job creation in American communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the bipartisan American Job Creation and Investment Promotion Reform Act of 2015, which will extend and significantly improve the EB–5 Regional Center program. Since its inception in 1993, the EB–5 Regional Center program has generated billions of dollars in capital investment and created tens of thousands of jobs across the country, much of which has occurred in areas that traditionally struggle to attract investment and jobs. The program's authorization is set to expire at the end of September. My legislation would reauthorize it for 5 years while enacting broad reforms to enhance the program's integrity. I am proud to be joined by Senator GRASSLEY in this effort.

The EB–5 Regional Center program faces significant challenges. I have always been supportive of its ability to create American jobs but the program has experienced some problems in recent years. There have been troubling reports of fraud and abuse, concerns regarding onerous processing delays for developers and investors, and questions over whether the program is truly benefiting those that Congress intended. These concerns can overshadow the many success stories, and have led some to understandably lose faith in the program.

I have not seen any flaw inherent to the EB–5 Regional Center program that could not be remedied, and I strongly believe that this is a program worth fixing. Over the last two decades this program has proven it can result in significant investment and jobs in communities that desperately need both, all at no cost to American taxpayers. While our immigration system as a whole is broken, and only comprehensive reform will remedy its many injustices, reforming and reauthorizing the EB–5 Regional Center program warrants our immediate attention because the program is set to expire in a matter of months.

In Vermont, this program revitalized rural communities during the worst of economic times. At the height of the recession, Country Home Products was able to speed up its engineering initiative to develop a new line of equipment in the power tool market. Sugarbush ski resort invested in new facilities and resources to increase visitors and keep its doors open. Without EB–5 capital, these manufacturing, construction, and hospitality jobs would likely not exist in Vermont. The state-run Vermont Regional Center continues to attract substantial capital investment and—with the Department of Financial Regulation now joining the Agency of Commerce and Community Development in overseeing the program—also provides unparalleled oversight of EB–5 projects.

I have long sought substantial reforms to the EB–5 Regional Center program at the Federal level. Last Congress, my EB–5 amendment to Comprehensive Immigration Reform provided the Department of Homeland Security the authority to revoke suspect regional center designations or immigrant petitions. This amendment, which was unanimously approved by Senate Judiciary Committee, also provided for increased regional center reporting, background checks, and oversight related to the offer and sale of securities. Sadly these improvements have all had to wait, as the House of Representatives failed to allow a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that passed the Senate last Congress.

Fortunately, however, the agency that administers EB–5 has not stood idly by waiting for Congress to strengthen the program. I credit Alejandro Mayorkas, the former Director of United States Citizenship and Services, with bringing many concerns to light. The agency has since transformed its review of EB–5 applications. Staff levels have increased nearly tenfold, in-house economists now analyze proposed business plans, and fraud detection and national security staff now sit side-by-side with adjudicators. These actions have all helped the agency to guard against abuses.

However, as Congress now faces reauthorizing this job-creating program, I have listened to concerns raised about how the program functions. I believe we must do more, which is why I have been working for over a year to further reform and modernize the Regional Center program. The bill I introduced today builds upon what the Senate passed last Congress as part of Comprehensive Immigration Reform.

This legislation, if enacted, would provide the Department of Homeland Security additional, much-needed authorities, including further expanding background checks, conducting a more thorough vetting of proposed investments earlier in the process, and providing for the ability to proactively investigate fraud, both in the United States and abroad, using a dedicated fund paid for by certain program participants. The bill would also provide investors with greater protections and more information about their investments. It would provide project developers clarity and shorter processing times in order to make the program more predictable and functional. It would raise minimum investment thresholds so more money goes to the communities that need it. It would help to restore the program to its original intent, by ensuring that much of the capital generated and jobs created occur in rural areas and areas with high unemployment.

Taken together, the oversight tools, security enhancements, and anti-fraud provisions included in this legislation provide the framework for a complete overhaul of the EB–5 Regional Center program. These reforms will instill both confidence and transparency in the program.

I look forward to continuing to work with all Senators and stakeholders to improve and reauthorize this important program. I am confident our work will result in a secure EB–5 program that will create American jobs and promote economic growth throughout our country, particularly in the rural and distressed communities that need it most.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 190—ENCOURAGING REUNIONS OF KOREAN AMERICANS WHO WERE DIVIDED BY THE KOREAN WAR FROM RELATIVES IN NORTH KOREA

Mr.KIRK (for himself and Mr.WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 190

Whereas the division of the Korean Peninsula into the Republic of Korea (referred to in this preamble as ''South Korea'') and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (referred to in this preamble as ''North Korea'') separated more than 10,000,000 Koreans from family members;

Whereas since the signing of the Korean War armistice agreement on July 27, 1953, there has been little to no contact between Korean Americans and family members who remain in North Korea;

Whereas North and South Korea first agreed to divided family reunions in 1985 and have since held 19 face-to-face reunions and 7 video link reunions;

Whereas those reunions have subsequently given approximately 22,000 Koreans the opportunity to briefly reunite with loved ones;

Whereas the most recent family reunions between North Korea and South Korea took place in February 2014 after a suspension of more than 3 years;

Whereas the United States and North Korea do not maintain diplomatic relations and certain limitations exist for Korean Americans to participate in inter-Korean family reunions;

Whereas more than 1,700,000 people of the United States are of Korean descent;

Whereas the number of first generation Korean and Korean American divided family members is rapidly diminishing given advanced age;

Whereas many Korean Americans with family members in North Korea have not seen or communicated with their relatives in more than 60 years;

Whereas Korean Americans and North Koreans both continue to suffer from the tragedy of being divided from loved ones;

Whereas the inclusion of Korean American families in the reunion process would constitute a positive humanitarian gesture by North Korea and contribute to the long-term goal of peace on the Korean Peninsula shared by the governments of North Korea, South Korea, and the United States;

Whereas the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 3) requires the President, every 180 days, to submit to Congress a report on ''efforts, if any, of the United States Government to facilitate family reunions between United States citizens and their relatives in North Korea''; and

Whereas in the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 111–242; 124 Stat. 2607), Congress urged ''the Special Representative on North Korea Policy, as the senior official handling North Korea issues, to prioritize

the issues involving Korean divided families and, if necessary, to appoint a coordinator for such families'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of the past willingness of North Korea to resume reunions of divided family members between North Korea and South Korea;

(2) encourages North Korea to permit reunions between Korean Americans and their relatives still living in North Korea;

(3) calls on the Secretary of State to further prioritize efforts to reunite Korean Americans with their divided family members;

(4) acknowledges the efforts of the American Red Cross to open channels of communication between Korean Americans and their family members who remain in North Korea;

(5) encourages the Government of South Korea to include United States citizens in future family reunions planned with North Korea; and

(6) praises humanitarian efforts to reunite all individuals of Korean descent with their relatives and engender a lasting peace on the Korean Peninsula.

SENATE RESOLUTION 191—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF JOSEPH ROBINETTE BIDEN, III

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 191

Whereas Joseph Robinette ''Beau'' Biden, III, born in Wilmington, Delaware and a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and Syracuse University law school, served our country as an attorney in the Department of Justice for seven years, including assisting the nation of Kosovo in rebuilding their criminal justice system;

Whereas Beau Biden served his beloved State of Delaware for eight years as Attorney General;

Whereas Beau Biden joined the Army in 2003 at the age of 34, rose to the rank of major in the Delaware Army National Guard's Judge Advocate General Corps, deployed to Iraq in 2008 and received the Bronze Star for his service;

Whereas Beau Biden leaves behind a beloved wife, Hallie, and two children, Natalie and Hunter; and

Whereas Beau Biden was the eldest son of the former Senator from Delaware and current Vice President of the United States and President of the United States Senate, Joseph Robinette Biden, Jr.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the untimely death of Joseph Robinette Biden, III.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the Vice President of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1476. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1477. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1478. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1479. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1480. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1481. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1482. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1483. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1484. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1485. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1486. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1487. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1488. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1489. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1490. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1491. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1492. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1493. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1494. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1495. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1496. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1497. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1498. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1499. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1500. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1501. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1502. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1503. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1504. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1505. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1506. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1507. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1508. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1509. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1510. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1511. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1512. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1513. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1514. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1515. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1516. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1517. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1518. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1519. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1520. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1521. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REID, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1522. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1523. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1524. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1525. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1526. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1527. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1528. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1529. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1530. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1531. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1532. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1533. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1534. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1535. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1536. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1537. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1538. Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1539. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1540. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra.

SA 1541. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1542. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1543. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1544. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1545. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1546. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1547. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1548. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1549. Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1550. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1551. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1552. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN

to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1553. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1554. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1555. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1556. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1557. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1558. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1559. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1560. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1561. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1562. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1563. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1564. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1565. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1566. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1567. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1568. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1569. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1570. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1571. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1572. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1573. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1574. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1575. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1576. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1577. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1578. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COONS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1579. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1580. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1581. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1582. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1583. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1584. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1585. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1586. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1587. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1588. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1589. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1590. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1591. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1592. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1593. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1594. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1595. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1596. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1597. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1598. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1599. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1600. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1601. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1602. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1603. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1604. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1486 submitted by Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. WARNER) to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1605. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1606. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1607. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1608. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1609. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1610. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1611. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1612. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1613. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1476. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. USE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD FOR SUPPORT OF CIVILIAN FIREFIGHTING ACTIVITIES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Modular Airborne Firefighting System Flexibility Act''.

(b) OPERATIONAL USE AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 116. Operational use: support for civilian firefighting activities

''(a) BASIS OF AUTHORITY.—The authority in this section is based on a recognition of the basic premises of the National Incident Management System and the National Response Framework that—

''(1) incidents are typically managed at the local level first; and

''(2) local jurisdictions retain command, control, and authority over response activities for their jurisdictional areas.

''(b) ASSISTANCE TO CIVILIAN FIREFIGHTING ORGANIZATIONS AUTHORIZED.—Members and units of the National Guard are authorized to support firefighting operations, missions, or activities, including aerial firefighting employment of the Modular Airborne Firefighting System (MAFFS), undertaken in support of a Federal or State agency or other civilian authority.

''(c) ROLE OF GOVERNOR AND STATE ADJUTANT GENERAL.—For the purposes of subsection (a)—

''(1) the Governor of a State shall be the principal civilian authority; and

''(2) the adjutant general of the State—

''(A) shall be the principal military authority, when acting in the adjutant general's State capacity; and

''(B) has the primary authority to mobilize members and units of the National Guard of the State in any duty status under this title the adjutant general considers appropriate to employ necessary forces when funds to perform such operations, missions, or activities are reimbursed.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''116. Operational use: support for civilian firefighting activities.''.

(c) ACTIVE GUARD AND RESERVE (AGR) SUPPORT.—Section 328(b) of such title is amended by inserting ''duty as specified in section 116(b) of this title or may perform'' after ''subsection (a) may perform''.

(d) FEDERAL TECHNICIAN SUPPORT.—Section 709(a)(3) of such is amended by inserting ''duty as specified in section 116(b) of this title or'' after ''the performance of'' the first place it appears.

SA 1477. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 344. REIMBURSEMENT OF STATES FOR LOSS OR DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY AS A RESULT OF FIRE CAUSED BY MILITARY TRAINING OR OTHER ACTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMED FORCES OR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REIMBURSEMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, upon application by a State, reimburse the State for the reasonable costs of the State for services provided in connection with loss or destruction of property, or mitigation of damage, loss, or destruction of property, whether or not property of the State, and all fire suppression costs, as a result of a fire caused by military training or other actions in the United States of units or members of the Armed Forces or employees of the Department of Defense.

(2) SERVICES COVERED.—Services reimbursable under this subsection shall be limited to services proximately related to the fire for which reimbursement is sought under this subsection.

(b) APPLICATION.—Each application of a State for reimbursement for costs under subsection (a) shall set forth an itemized request of the services covered by the application, including the costs of such services.

(c) FUNDS.—Reimbursements under subsection (a) shall be made from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance.

SA 1478. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 141. STATIONING OF C–130 H AIRCRAFT AVIONICS PREVIOUSLY MODIFIED BY THE AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP) IN SUPPORT OF DAILY TRAINING AND CONTINGENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR AIRBORNE AND SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall station aircraft previously modified by the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) to support United States Army Airborne and United States Army Special Operations Command daily training and contingency requirements by the end of fiscal year 2017, and such aircraft shall not be required to deploy in the normal rotation of C–130 H units. The Secretary shall provide such personnel as required to maintain and operate the aircraft.

SEC. ——. FIELDING OF AMP MODIFIED C–130 H AIRCRAFT

Section 134 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. 'Buck' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) prohibits the Air Force from canceling or modifying the C–130H AMP program of record. Elsewhere in this Act the committee states that it expect the Air Force to continue to execute AMP and field C–130H aircraft previously upgraded by the AMP program until the Air Force provides a concrete plan that describes the final modification configuration for a restructured AMP program, a service cost position, and a procurement and installation schedule that would realistically support a fleet viability requirement.

The Air Force has resisted fielding the five previously modified AMP aircraft or to install the previously purchased installation kits to modify an additional four aircraft because of the difficulties in training aircrews and establishing logistics support, thereby negating the ability to deploy these aircraft in the C–130 schedule rotation. However, in order to comply with 134 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. 'Buck' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) and stated committee desires, the Air Force must continue fielding these aircraft.

The five current AMP-modified C–130Hs, plus aircraft modified with the four previously purchased installation kits would be

ideal aircraft to support 18th Airborne Corps, 82nd Airborne Division, and U.S. Army Special Operations Command training and contingency requirements as they would primarily provide training support to these units and not be required to deploy in the normal rotation of C–130 units.

The committee believes the Air Force has expended significant funds on the AMP program of record and therefore should use due diligence to give the American taxpayer the best return on scarce funding to maximize military effectiveness.

SA 1479. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OF ULTRA LIGHT COMBAT VEHICLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, shall submit to Congress a report on the development of an Army Ultra Light Combat Vehicle (ULCV) for use with light infantry brigades and with Special Operations Forces.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An assessment whether the ULCV is a suitable candidate for militarized commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) purchase rather than purpose-built, defense-only platforms, leveraging existing global automotive supply chains to satisfy requirements and performance specifications for the program.

(2) An assessment whether fielding such a program meets the requirements of the Department of Defense's Better Buying Directive.

SA 1480. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 588 the following:

SEC. 588A. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE BEYOND THE YELLOW RIBBON PROGRAM.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) programs under the Beyond the Yellow Ribbon program provide community-based outreach services that coordinate state and local resources into a single network to offer critical support to members of the Armed Forces before, during, and after military service deployments;

(2) services under the Beyond Yellow Ribbon program include substance abuse treatment, mental health, suicide prevention, employment services, educational assistance, military sexual assault referrals, health care, marriage and financial counseling and other related services;

(3) programs under the Beyond Yellow Ribbon program have helped thousands of members of the Armed Forces, veterans and their family members cope with the challenges associated with deployments and military service;

(4) programs under the Beyond the Yellow Ribbon program have seen significant outcomes in areas including suicide prevention, access to mental health care, homelessness prevention, and access to employment for veterans; and

(5) the Beyond the Yellow Ribbon program has enduring value; and

(6) the Department of Defense should identify permanent funding and continue its support for the Beyond the Yellow Ribbon program as the needs of our men and women in the Armed Forces and their families for outreach and reintegration services continue to increase.

SA 1481. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the appropriate place please insert the following:

SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the accidental transfer of suspected *bacillus anthracis,* also known as anthrax, from an Army laboratory to 28 laboratories located in 12 states and three countries discovered in April 2015 represents a serious safety lapse and a potential threat to public health;

(2) the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, should continue to investigate the cause of this lapse and determine if protective protocols should be strengthened;

(3) the Department of Defense should reassess standards on a regular basis to ensure they are current and effective to prevent a reoccurrence; and

(4) the Department of Defense should keep the relevant defense committees apprised of the investigation, any potential public health or safety risk, remedial actions taken and plans to regularly reassess standards.

SA 1482. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. PROHIBITION ON CONDUCT OF CERTAIN MEDICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Defense and each Secretary of a military department shall not fund or conduct a medical research and development project unless the Secretary funding or conducting the project determines that the project is directly designed to protect, enhance, or restore the health and safety of members of the Armed Forces through the phases of deployment, combat, recovery, and rehabilitation.

SA 1483. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 186, line 9, insert before the period at the end the following: '', including the use of contractor facilities and equipment and qualified contract pilot trainers to increase near-term throughput''.

SA 1484. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In title XVI, after subtitle A, insert the following:

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-related Activities

SEC. 1621. REPORT ON AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RQ–4 GLOBAL HAWK MISSION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of using the Air National Guard in association with the active duty Air Force to operate and maintain the RQ–4 Global Hawk.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the costs, training requirements, and personnel required to create an association for the Global Hawk mission consisting of members of the Air Force serving on active duty and members of the Air National Guard.

(2) The capacity of the Air National Guard to support an association described in paragraph (1).

SA 1485. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1637. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE NUCLEAR FORCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM OF THE AIR FORCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senates makes the following findings:

(1) On February 6, 2014, Air Force Global Strike Command (AFGSC) initiated a force improvement program for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) force designed to improve mission effectiveness, strengthen culture and morale, and identify areas in need of investment by soliciting input from airmen performing ICBM operations.

(2) The ICBM force improvement program generated more than 300 recommendations to strengthen ICBM operations and served as a model for subsequent force improvement programs in other mission areas, such as bomber operations and sustainment.

(3) On May 28, 2014, as part of the nuclear force improvement program, the Air Force announced it would make immediate improvements in the nuclear mission of the Air Force, including enhancing career opportunities for airmen in the nuclear career field, ensuring training activities focused on performing the mission in the field, reforming the personnel reliability program, establishing special pay rates for positions in the nuclear career field, and creating a new service medal for nuclear deterrence operations.

(4) Chief of Staff of the Air Force Mark Welsh has said that, as part of the nuclear force improvement program, the Air Force will increase nuclear-manning levels and strengthen professional development for the members of the Air Force supporting the nuclear mission of the Air Force in order ''to address shortfalls and offer our airmen more stable work schedule and better quality of life''.

(5) Secretary of the Air Force Deborah Lee James, in recognition of the importance of the nuclear mission of the Air Force, proposed elevating the grade of the commander of the Air Force Global Strike Command from lieutenant general to general, and on March 30, 2015, the Senate confirmed a general as commander of that command.

(6) The Air Force redirected more than $160,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 to alleviate urgent, near-term shortfalls within the nuclear mission of the Air Force as part of the nuclear force improvement program.

(7) The Air Force plans to spend more than $200,000,000 on the nuclear force improvement program in fiscal year 2015, and requested more than $130,000,000 for the program for fiscal year 2016.

(8) Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel said on November 14, 2014, that ''[t]he nuclear mission plays a critical role in ensuring the Nation's safety. No other enterprise we have is more important''.

(9) Secretary Hagel also said that the budget for the nuclear mission of the Air Force should increase by 10 percent over a five-year period.

(10) Section 1652 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–201; 128 Stat. 3654; 10 U.S.C. 491 note) declares it the policy of the United States ''to ensure that the members of the Armed Forces who operate the nuclear deterrent of the United States have the training, resources, and national support required to execute the critical national security mission of the members''.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the nuclear mission of the Air Force should be a top priority for the Department of the Air Force and for Congress;

(2) the members of the Air Force who operate and maintain the Nation's nuclear deterrent perform work that is vital to the security of the United States;

(3) the nuclear force improvement program of the Air Force has made significant near-term improvements for the members of the Air Force in the nuclear career field of the Air Force;

(4) Congress should support long-term investments in the Air Force nuclear enterprise that sustain the progress made under the nuclear force improvement program;

(5) the Air Force should—

(A) regularly inform Congress on the progress being made under the nuclear force improvement program and its efforts to strengthen the nuclear enterprise; and

(B) make Congress aware of any additional actions that should be taken to optimize performance of the nuclear mission of the Air Force and maximize the strength of the United States strategic deterrent; and

(6) future budgets for the Air Force should reflect the importance of the nuclear mission of the Air Force and the need to provide members of the Air Force assigned to the nuclear mission the best possible support and quality of life.

SA 1486. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; as follows:

Purpose: To require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1257. REPORTING ON ENERGY SECURITY ISSUES INVOLVING EUROPE AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) ADDITIONAL MATTERS IN ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY AND SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS INVOLVING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—Section 1245(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3566) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (15) as paragraph (16); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

''(15) An assessment of Russia's ability to use energy supplies, particularly natural gas and oil, as tools of coercion or intimidation to undermine the security of NATO members or other neighboring countries.''.

(b) REPORT ON EUROPEAN ENERGY SECURITY AND RELATED VULNERABILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing the energy security of NATO members, other European nations who share a border with the Russian Federation, and Moldova.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include assessments of the following issues:

(A) The extent of reliance by these nations on the Russian Federation for supplies of oil and natural gas.

(B) Whether such reliance creates vulnerabilities that negatively affect the security of those nations.

(C) The magnitude of those vulnerabilities.

(D) The impacts of those vulnerabilities on the national security and economic interests of the United States.

(E) Any other aspect that the Director determines to be relevant to these issues.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON WAYS THE UNITED STATES COULD HELP VULNERABLE ALLIES AND PARTNERS WITH ENERGY SECURITY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (Public Law 94–163) gives the President discretion to allow crude oil and natural gas exports that the President determines to be consistent with the national interest;

(2) United States allies and partners in Europe and Asia have requested access to United States oil and natural gas exports to limit their vulnerability and to diversify their supplies, including in the face of Russian aggression and Middle East volatility; and

(3) the President should exercise existing authorities related to natural gas and crude oil exports to help aid vulnerable United States allies and partners, consistent with the national interest.

SA 1487. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO UNITED STATES ALLIES AND PARTNERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(c) For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(c) EXPEDITED APPROVAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes'';

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking ''nation with which there is in effect a free trade agreement requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas'' and inserting ''foreign country described in paragraph (2)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) FOREIGN COUNTRY DESCRIBED.—A foreign country referred to in paragraph (1) is—

''(A) a nation with which there is in effect a free trade agreement requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas;

''(B) a member country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; or

''(C) Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, Finland, India, or Japan.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to applications for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) that are pending on, or filed on or after, the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1488. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 608. SENSE OF SENATE ON MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PAY RAISES.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate finds that section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, specifies that the annual increase in pay for members of the uniformed services shall equal the employment cost index while section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, provides that the amount of the annual increase in pay for civilian employees of the Federal Government should be equal to one half of one percent less than the employment cost index.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the members of our uniformed services have earned a higher annual increase in pay to reward them for the unique challenges and hardships of their service to our country; and

(2) the annual increase in pay for members of the uniformed services should exceed that of the annual increase in pay for civilian employees of the Federal Government.

SA 1489. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 832. MODIFICATIONS TO THE JUSTIFICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS FOR CERTAIN SOLE-SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) REPEAL OF SIMPLIFIED JUSTIFICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—Section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2405) is repealed.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR JUSTIFICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

(1) DEFENSE PROCUREMENTS.—Section 2304(f)(2)(D)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''if such procurement is for property or services in an amount less than $20,000,000'' before the semicolon at the end.

(2) CIVILIAN PROCUREMENTS.—Section 3304(e)(4) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''or section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)).'' and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) the procurement is for property or services in an amount less than $20,000,000 and is conducted under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)).''.

SA 1490. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 403. MINIMUM NUMBER OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3062 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) Effective October 1, 2015, the Secretary of the Army shall maintain a total number of brigade combat teams for the regular and reserve components of the Army of not fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

''(2) In this subsection, the term ' brigade combat team' means any unit that consists of—

''(A) an arms branch maneuver brigade;

''(B) its assigned support units; and

''(C) its assigned fire teams''.

(b) LIMITATION ON ELIMINATION OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.—

(1) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Army may not proceed with any decision to reduce the number of brigade combat teams for the regular Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

(2) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT.—The Secretary may not eliminate any brigade combat team from the brigade combat teams of the regular Army as of the date of the enactment of this Act until the later of the following:

(A) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required under paragraph (3).

(B) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(i) the elimination of Army brigade combat teams will not increase the operational risk of meeting the National Defense Strategy; and

(ii) the reduction of such combat teams does not reduce the total number of brigade combat teams of the Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

(3) REPORT ON ELIMINATION OF BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(A) The rationale for any proposed reduction of the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a) of this section), and an operational analysis of the total strength of the Army that demonstrates performance of the designated mission at an equal or greater level of effectiveness as the personnel of the Army so reduced.

(B) An assessment of the implications for the Army, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve of the force mix ratio of Army troop strengths and combat units after such reduction.

(C) Such other matters relating to the reduction of the total strength of the Army as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At least 90 days before the date on which the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, is reduced below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a) of this section), the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with (where applicable) the Director of the Army National Guard or Chief of the Army Reserve, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the reduction.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A list of each major combat unit of the Army that will remain after the reduction, organized by division and enumerated down to the brigade combat team-level or its equivalent, including for each such brigade combat team—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(B) A list of each brigade combat team proposed for disestablishment, including for each such unit—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(C) A list of each unit affected by a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B) and a description of how such unit is affected.

(D) For each military installation and unit listed under subparagraph (B)(ii), a description of changes, if any, to the designed operational capability (DOC) statement of the unit as a result of a proposed disestablishment.

(E) A description of any anticipated changes in manpower authorizations as a result of a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B).

SA 1491. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1005. ECONOMICAL AND EFFICIENT OPERATION OF WORKING CAPITAL FUND ACTIVITIES.

Section 2208(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(e)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The accomplishment of the most economical and efficient organization and operation of working capital fund activities for purposes of paragraph (1) shall include actions toward the implementation of a workload plan that optimizes the efficiency of the workforce operating within a working capital fund activity and reduces the rate structure.''.

SA 1492. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. AUTHORIZATION OF EXPORTATION OF CRUDE OIL TO CERTAIN ALLIES AND PARTNERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 103(b) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) The President shall exempt from the rule promulgated under paragraph (1) exports of crude oil from the United States to countries that are allies and partners of the United States and the energy security of which would be enhanced by such exports, including members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Georgia, Ukraine, Finland, Japan, and India.

''(B) If the President receives a request for exports of crude oil produced in the United

States from the government of a country described in subparagraph (A), the President shall approve the export of such crude oil to that country not later than 60 days after receiving the request if the President determines that the export of such crude oil to that country is in the national interest.''.

SA 1493. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 342 the following:

SEC. 342A. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS TO FACILITATE PAYMENTS FOR HONORING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AT SPORTING EVENTS.

(a) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Army National Guard has paid professional sports organizations to honor members of the Armed Forces;

(2) any organization wishing to honor members of the Armed Forces should do so on a voluntary basis, and the Department of Defense should take action to ensure that no payments be made for such activities in the future; and

(3) any organization, including the National Football League, that has accepted taxpayer funds to honor members of the Armed Forces should consider directing an equivalent amount of funding in the form of a donation to a charitable organization that supports members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2241a the following new section:

''§ 2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces

''(a) PROHIBITION.—The Department of Defense may not enter into any contract or other agreement under which payments are to be made in exchange for activities by the contractor intended to honor, or giving the appearance of honoring, members of the armed forces (whether members of the regular components or the reserve components) at any form of sporting event.

''(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed as prohibiting the Department from taking actions to facilitate activities intended to honor members of the armed forces at sporting events that are provided on a pro bono basis if such activities are provided and received in accordance with applicable rules and regulations regarding the acceptance of gifts by the military departments, the armed forces, and members of the armed forces.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 134 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2241a the following new item:

''2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces at sporting events.''.

SA 1494. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DEFINITION OF SPOUSE FOR PURPOSES OF VETERANS BENEFITS TO REFLECT NEW STATE DEFINITIONS OF SPOUSE.

(a) SPOUSE DEFINED.—Section 101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''of the opposite sex''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (31) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(31)(A) An individual shall be considered a 'spouse' if—

''(i) the marriage of the individual is valid in the State in which the marriage was entered into; or

''(ii) in the case of a marriage entered into outside any State—

''(I) the marriage of the individual is valid in the place in which the marriage was entered into; and

''(II) the marriage could have been entered into in a State.

''(B) In this paragraph, the term 'State' has the meaning given that term in paragraph (20), except that the term also includes the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.''.

(b) MARRIAGE DETERMINATION.—Section 103(c) of such title is amended by striking ''according to'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''in accordance with section 101(31) of this title.''.

SA 1495. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1495

In the appropriate place please insert the following:

SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the accidental transfer of suspected bacillus anthracis, also known as anthrax, from an Army laboratory to more than 28 laboratories located in at least 12 states and three countries discovered in April 2015 represents a serious safety lapse and a potential threat to public health;

(2) the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, should continue to investigate the cause of this lapse and determine if protective protocols should be strengthened;

(3) the Department of Defense should reassess standards on a regular basis to ensure they are current and effective to prevent a reoccurrence; and

(4) the Department of Defense should keep Congress apprised of the investigation, any potential public health or safety risk, remedial actions taken and plans to regularly reassess standards.

SA 1496. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. AUTHORIZATION OF EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CERTAIN ALLIES AND PARTNERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 103(b) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) The President shall exempt from the rule promulgated under paragraph (1) exports of natural gas from the United States to countries that are allies and partners of the United States and the energy security of which would be enhanced by such exports, including members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Georgia, Ukraine, Finland, Japan, and India.

''(B) If the President receives a request for exports of natural gas produced in the United States from the government of a country described in subparagraph (A), the President shall approve the export of such natural gas to that country not later than 60 days after receiving the request if the President determines that the export of such natural gas to that country is in the national interest.''.

SA 1497. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1257. REPORT ON SECURITY CHALLENGES OF HYBRID WARFARE TACTICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of the security challenges posed by hybrid warfare tactics that combine conventional and unconventional means, such as those used by the Russian Federation in Crimea and eastern Ukraine, and their implications for United States military doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, and personnel and facilities.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The implications for mechanized and armored warfare.

(2) The implications of the use of information operations to gain information dominance.

(3) The implications of the use of sophisticated electronic warfare capabilities.

(4) The applicability of lessons learned from the conflict in Ukraine to security challenges faced by other United States combatant commands, including the United

States Pacific Command and the United States Central Command.

(5) Such other matters with respect to the security challenges posed by the tactics described in subsection (a) as the Secretary consider appropriate.

SA 1498. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMON AIRBORNE SENSE AND AVOID TECHNOLOGY ON UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) timely integration and first article delivery of Common Airborne Sense and Avoid technology on unmanned aircraft systems of the Department of Defense is a key requirement to ensuring greater access by the Department of Defense to the airspace of the United States and sustaining United States leadership in the unmanned aircraft systems industry;

(2) the technology described in paragraph (1) plays a crucial role in the development of civil standards by the Federal Aviation Administration, in coordination with the efforts of unmanned aircraft systems test centers and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

(3) the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force should fully support and fund continued research, development, testing, integration, and first article delivery of the technology described in paragraph (1) on unmanned aircraft systems of the Department.

SA 1499. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 316, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following:

(3) Recommendations on how best to implement mental health screenings for individuals enlisting or accessioning into the Armed Forces before enlistment or accession.

SA 1500. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following:

SEC. 141. BRIEFING ON RETIREMENT AND STORAGE OF AIR FORCE ONE (VC–25) AIRCRAFT.

Not later than April 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a briefing on the Air Force's plan to retire and subsequently place into storage the current fleet of Air Force One (VC–25) aircraft. The briefing shall include an overview on the plan to move one or both aircraft to a museum owned by the Department of the Air Force upon their retirement from active service.

SA 1501. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 808, line 4, insert after ''level'' the following: ''and an estimate of the costs of downblending that uranium''.

SA 1502. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1628. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REVIEWING AND CONSIDERING FINDINGS OF COUNCIL OF GOVERNORS ON CYBER CAPABILITIES OF ARMED FORCES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should, before reducing any cyber capabilities of an active or reserve component of the Armed Forces, review and consider findings from an assessment by the Council of Governors of the synchronization of cyber capabilities in the active and reserve components of the Armed Forces.

SA 1503. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN MILITARY RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF CONCURRENT RECEIPT AUTHORITY TO RETIREES WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT.—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2016, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 644. COORDINATION OF SERVICE ELIGIBILITY FOR COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION AND CONCURRENT RECEIPT.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO STANDARDIZE SIMILAR PROVISIONS.—

(1) QUALIFIED RETIREES.—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 626(a) of this Act, is further amended—

(A) by striking ''a member or'' and all that follows through ''retiree')'' and inserting ''a qualified retiree''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) QUALIFIED RETIREES.—For purposes of this section, a qualified retiree, with respect to any month, is a member or former member of the uniformed services who—

''(A) is entitled to retired pay (other than by reason of section 12731b of this title); and

''(B) is also entitled for that month to veterans' disability compensation.''.

(2) DISABILITY RETIREES.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 1414 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

''(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

''(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member's retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member's years of creditable service multiplied by the member's retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2016, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SA 1504. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR MILITARY RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

(a) RESTATEMENT OF CURRENT CONCURRENT PAYMENT AUTHORITY WITH EXTENSION OF PAYMENT AUTHORITY TO RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and subsection (b), a member or former member of the uniformed services who is entitled for any month to retired pay and who is also entitled for that month to veterans' disability compensation for a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is compensable under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (hereinafter in this section referred to as 'qualified retiree') is entitled to be paid both for that month without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38.

''(2) ONE-YEAR PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH TOTAL DISABILITIES.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2004, and ending on December 31, 2004, payment of retired pay to a qualified retiree is subject to subsection (c) if the qualified retiree is any of the following:

''(A) A qualified retiree receiving veterans' disability compensation for a disability rated as 100 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(B) A qualified retiree receiving veterans' disability compensation at the rate payable for a disability rated as 100 percent disabling by reason of a determination of individual unemployability.

''(3) 10-YEAR PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH DISABILITIES RATED 50 PERCENT DISABLING OR HIGHER.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2004, and ending on December 31, 2013, payment of retired pay to a qualified retiree is subject to subsection (c) if the qualified retiree is entitled to veterans' disability compensation for a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is rated not less than 50 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(4) 10-YEAR PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2025, payment of retired pay to a qualified retiree is subject to subsection (d) if the qualified retiree is entitled to veterans' disability compensation for a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is rated less than 50 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs but is compensable under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.''.

(b) PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) PHASE-IN OF FULL CONCURRENT RECEIPT FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2025, retired pay payable to a qualified retiree that pursuant to subsection (a)(4) is subject to this subsection shall be determined as follows:

''(1) CALENDAR YEAR 2016.—For a month during 2016, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the amount (if any) of retired pay in excess of the current baseline offset, plus $100.

''(2) CALENDAR YEAR 2017.—For a month during 2017, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

''(A) the amount specified in paragraph (1) for that qualified retiree; and

''(B) 10 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount specified in paragraph (1) for that member's disability.

''(3) CALENDAR YEAR 2018.—For a month during 2018, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2) for that qualified retiree; and

''(B) 20 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (2) for that qualified retiree.

''(4) CALENDARY YEAR 2018.—For a month during 2019, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (3) for that qualified retiree; and

''(B) 30 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (3) for that qualified retiree.

''(5) CALENDAR YEAR 2020.—For a month during 2020, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (4) for that qualified retiree; and

''(B) 40 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (4) for that qualified retiree.

''(6) CALENDAR YEAR 2021.—For a month during 2021, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (5) for that qualified retiree; and

''(B) 50 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (5) for that qualified retiree.

''(7) CALENDAR YEAR 2022.—For a month during 2022, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (6) for that qualified retiree; and

''(B) 60 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (6) for that qualified retiree.

''(8) CALENDAR YEAR 2023.—For a month during 2023, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (7) for that qualified retiree; and

''(B) 70 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (7) for that qualified retiree.

''(9) CALENDAR YEAR 2024.—For a month during 2024, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (8) for that qualified retiree; and

''(B) 80 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (8) for that qualified retiree.

''(10) CALENDAR YEAR 2025.—For a month during 2025, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

''(A) the amount determined under paragraph (9) for that qualified retiree; and

''(B) 90 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (9) for that qualified retiree.

''(11) GENERAL LIMITATION.—Retired pay determined under this subsection for a qualified retiree, if greater than the amount of retired pay otherwise applicable to that qualified retiree, shall be reduced to the amount of retired pay otherwise applicable to that qualified retiree.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH DISABILITIES RATED 50 PERCENT DISABLING OR HIGHER.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) in the subsection caption, by inserting ''FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH DISABILITIES RATED 50 PERCENT DISABLING OR HIGHER'' after ''FULL CONCURRENT RECEIPT''; and

(2) by striking ''the second sentence of subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(3)''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on December 31, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 644. COORDINATION OF SERVICE ELIGIBILITY FOR COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION AND CONCURRENT RECEIPT.

(a) AMENDMENT TO STANDARDIZE SIMILAR PROVISIONS.—Paragraph (2) of section 1414(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

''(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

''(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member's retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member's years of creditable service multiplied by the member's retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 1, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SA 1505. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR MILITARY RETIREES WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES RATED 40 PERCENT DISABLING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(2) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''means'' and all that follows and inserting ''means the following:

''(A) During the period beginning on January 1, 2004, and ending on June 30, 2015, a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is rated as not less than 50 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(B) After June 30, 2015, a service-connected disability or combination of service-

connected disabilities that is rated as not less than 40 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation rated 40 percent or higher: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation rated 40 percent or higher: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 644. COORDINATION OF SERVICE ELIGIBILITY FOR COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION AND CONCURRENT RECEIPT.

(a) AMENDMENT TO STANDARDIZE SIMILAR PROVISIONS.—Paragraph (2) of section 1414(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

''(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

''(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member's retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member's years of creditable service multiplied by the member's retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 1, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SA 1506. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 141. STATIONING OF C–130 H AIRCRAFT AVIONICS PREVIOUSLY MODIFIED BY THE AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP) IN SUPPORT OF DAILY TRAINING AND CONTINGENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR AIRBORNE AND SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall station aircraft previously modified by the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) to support United States Army Airborne and United States Army Special Operations Command daily training and contingency requirements by the end of fiscal year 2017, and such aircraft shall not be required to deploy in the normal rotation of C–130 H units. The Secretary shall provide such personnel as required to maintain and operate the aircraft.

SA 1507. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1258. APPROVAL OF EXPORT LICENCES AND LETTERS OF REQUEST TO ASSIST THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXPORT LICENSE APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary of State shall provide the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all export license applications, including requests for marketing licenses, for the sale of defense articles and defense services to Ukraine. The list shall include the date when the application or request was first submitted, the current status of each application or request, and the estimated timeline for adjudication of such applications or requests. The Secretary shall give priority to processing these applications and requests.

(2) LETTERS OF REQUEST.—The Secretary of State shall also provide the specified congressional committees a detailed list of all pending Letters of Request for Foreign Military Sales to Ukraine, including the date when the letter was first submitted, the current status, and the estimated timeline for adjudication of such letters.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report outlining the status of the applications, requests for marketing licenses and Letters of Request described under subsection (a). The report shall terminate upon certification by the President that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Government of Ukraine has been restored or 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs first.

(c) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''specified congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1508. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 515. PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS WHO ARE SEPARATING FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 1145 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS FOR MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall provide a physical examination pursuant to subsection (a)(5) to each member of a reserve component who—

''(A) will not otherwise receive such an examination under such subsection; and

''(B) elects to receive such a physical examination.

''(2) The Secretary concerned shall—

''(A) provide the physical examination under paragraph (1) to a member during the 90-day period before the date on which the member is scheduled to be separated from the armed forces; and

''(B) issue orders to such a member to receive such physical examination.

''(3) A member may not be entitled to health care benefits pursuant to subsection (a), (b), or (c) solely by reason of being provided a physical examination under paragraph (1).

''(4) In providing to a member a physical examination under paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall provide to the member a record of the physical examination.''.

SA 1509. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. INCREASED COOPERATION BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO IMPROVE PROCESSING OF CLAIMS FOR VETERANS BENEFITS.

(a) PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly develop and implement procedures to improve the timely provision to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of such information as the Secretary requires to process claims submitted to the Secretary for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary.

(2) TIMELY PROVISION.—The procedures developed and implemented under paragraph (1) shall ensure that the information provided to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is provided to the Secretary not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary requests the information.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not less frequently than once each year, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the requests for information made by the Secretary during the most recent one-year period for information from the Secretary of Defense required by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to process claims submitted to the Secretary for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary; and

(2) the timeliness of responses to such requests.

SA 1510. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON INTEROPERABILITY BETWEEN ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS SYSTEMS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report that sets forth a timeline with milestones for achieving interoperability between the electronic health records systems of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SA 1511. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 265, strike line 15 and insert the following:

result of the implementation of the plan;

(C) an assessment whether the privatized defense commissary system under the plan can sustain the current savings to patrons of the defense commissary system;

(D) an assessment of the impact that privatization of the defense commissary system under the plan would have on all eligible beneficiaries;

(E) an assessment whether the privatized defense commissary system under the plan can sustain the continued operation of existing commissaries; and

(F) an assessment whether privatization of the defense commissary system is feasible for overseas commissaries.

SA 1512. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DETERMINATION OF CERTAIN SERVICE IN PHILIPPINES DURING WORLD WAR II.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and such military historians as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate, shall establish a process to determine whether a covered individual served as described in subsection (a) or (b) of section 107 of title 38, United States Code, for purposes of determining whether such covered individual is eligible for benefits described in such subsections.

(b) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—For purposes of this section, a covered individual is any individual who—

(1) claims service described in subsection (a) or (b) of section 107 of title 38, United States Code; and

(2) is not included in the Approved Revised Reconstructed Guerilla Roster of 1948, known as the ''Missouri List''.

(c) PROHIBITION ON BENEFITS FOR DISQUALIFYING CONDUCT UNDER NEW PROCESS.—The process established under subsection (a) shall include a mechanism to ensure that a covered individual is not treated as an individual eligible for a benefit described in subsection (a) or (b) of section 107 of such title if such covered individual engaged in any disqualifying conduct during service described in such subsections, including collaboration with the enemy or criminal conduct.

SA 1513. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCESS BY WHICH MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES MAY CARRY A CONCEALED PERSONAL FIREARM ON A MILITARY INSTALLATION.

(a) PROCESS REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, taking into consideration the views of senior leadership of military installations in the United States, shall establish a process by which the commander of a military installation in the United States may authorize a member of the Armed Forces who is assigned to duty at the installation to carry a concealed personal firearm on the installation if the commander determines it to be necessary as a personal-protection or force-protection measure.

(b) RELATION TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW.—In establishing the process under subsection (a) for a military installation, the commander of the installation shall consult with elected officials of the State and local jurisdictions in which the installation is located and take into consideration the law of the State and such jurisdictions regarding carrying a concealed personal firearm.

(c) MEMBER QUALIFICATIONS.—To be eligible to be authorized to carry a concealed personal firearm on a military installation pursuant to the process established under subsection (a), a member of the Armed Forces—

(1) must complete any training and certification required by any State in which the installation is located that would permit the member to carry concealed in that State;

(2) must not be subject to disciplinary action under the Uniform Code of Military Justice for any offense that could result in incarceration or separation from the Armed Forces;

(3) must not be prohibited from possessing a firearm because of conviction of a crime of domestic violence; and

(4) must meet such service-related qualification requirements for the use of firearms, as established by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(d) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''State'' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

SA 1514. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT ON FUTURE MIX OF AIRCRAFT PLATFORMS FOR THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REPORT ON STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the results of a study, to be performed by an organization or entity independent of the Department of Defense selected by the Secretary for purposes of this section, that determines the following:

(1) An optimized future mix of shorter range fighter-class strike aircraft and long-range strike aircraft platforms for the Armed Forces.

(2) An appropriate future mix of manned aerial platforms and unmanned aerial platforms for the Armed Forces.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS IN DETERMINING MIX.—The mixes determined pursuant to the study shall be determined taking into account relevant portions of the defense strategy, critical assumptions, priorities, force-sizing construct, and cost.

(c) NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORT.—If any information required under subsection (a) has been included in another report or notification previously submitted to Congress by law, the Secretary may provide a list of such reports and notifications at the time of submitting the report required by subsection (a) in lieu of including such information in the report required by subsection (a).

SA 1515. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. ELIGIBILITY FOR INTERMENT IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2402(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) Any individual—

''(A) who—

''(i) was naturalized pursuant to section 2(1) of the Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–207; 8 U.S.C. 1423 note); and

''(ii) at the time of the individual's death resided in the United States; or

''(B) who—

''(i) the Secretary determines served with a special guerrilla unit or irregular forces operating from a base in Laos in support of the Armed Forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning February 28, 1961, and ending May 7, 1975; and

''(ii) at the time of the individual's death—

''(I) was a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States; and

''(II) resided in the United States.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an individual dying on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1516. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. CODIFICATION IN LAW OF ESTABLISHMENT AND DUTIES OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLEX ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is in the Office of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau the Office of Complex Administrative Investigations (in this section referred to as the ''Office'').

(b) DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION.—The Office shall be under the direction and supervision of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The duties of the Office shall be to undertake complex administrative investigations of matters relating to members of the National Guard when in State status, including investigations of sexual assault involving a member of the National Guard in such status, upon the request of any of the following:

(A) The Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(B) An adjutant general of a State or territory or the District of Columbia.

(C) The governor of a State or territory, or the Commanding General of the National Guard of the District of Columbia.

(2) COMPLEX ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, a complex administrative investigation is any investigation (as specified by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau for purposes of this section) involving factors giving rise to unusual complexity in investigation, including the following:

(A) Questions of jurisdiction between the United States and a State or territory.

(B) Matters requiring specialized training among investigating officers.

(C) Matters raising the need for an independent investigation in order to ensure fairness and impartiality in investigation.

(3) MATTERS RELATING TO MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD IN STATE STATUS.—The determination whether or not a matter relates to a member of the National Guard when in State status for purposes of this section shall be made by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau in accordance with criteria specified by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau for purposes of this section.

(d) CHIEF OF NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU TREATMENT OF FINAL REPORTS.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall treat any final report of the Office on a matter under this section as if such report were the report of an Inspector General of the Department of Defense or a military department on such matter.

(e) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) SUBMITTAL OF FINAL REPORTS TO CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATIONS.—Upon the adoption by the Office of a final report on an investigation undertaken by the Office pursuant to this section, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit such report (with any personally identifying information appropriately redacted) to the members of Congress from the State or territory concerned.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to Congress each year a report on the investigations undertaken by the Office pursuant to this section during the preceding year. Each report shall include, for the year covered by such report, the following:

(A) A summary description of the investigations undertaken during such year, including any trends in matters subject to investigation and in findings as a result of investigations.

(B) Information, set forth by State and territory, on the investigations undertaken during such year involving allegations of sexual assault involving a member of the National Guard.

(C) Such other information and matters on the investigations undertaken during such year as the Chief of the National Guard Bureau considers appropriate.

(f) PERSONNEL AND OTHER CAPABILITIES.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall ensure that the Office maintains the personnel and other capabilities necessary for the discharge of the duties of the Office under this section.

(g) PROCEDURES AND INSTRUCTIONS.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall issue, and may from time to time update, procedures and instructions necessary for the discharge of the duties of the Office under this section.

(h) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED INSTRUCTION.—Chief of the National Guard Bureau Instruction CNGBI 0400.01, dated July 30, 2012, shall have no further force or effect.

SEC. 1050. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON SERIOUS MISCONDUCT WITHIN THE NATIONAL GUARD.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the authorities of the Secretary of Defense and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to investigate and respond on their own initiative to allegations of serious misconduct, including but not limited to sexual assault, sexual harassment, violations of Federal law, retaliation, and waste, fraud, and abuse arising in operations of the National Guard in Federal status and in State status.

(2) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the mechanisms available to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Chief of the National Guard to receive, process, and monitor the disposition of allegations described in paragraph (1), whether first brought to the attention of the Federal government or the Adjutants General.

(3) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the process used to determine whether allegations described in paragraph (1) are investigated by the Department of Defense, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Inspector General of the National Guard Bureau, the Inspectors General of the military departments, the Office of Complex Administrative Investigations of the National Guard Bureau, Federal military or civilian law enforcement agencies, or other agencies in the first instance, and the coordination of investigations among such agencies

(4) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the monitoring of investigations into allegations described in paragraph (1) by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau which are undertaken by Federal agencies and those undertaken under the direction of the Adjutants General.

(5) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the process used for disposing of substantiated allegations described in paragraph (1), whether by prosecution or administrative action, and the consistency in the disposition of allegations of a similar nature across the National Guard.

(6) An evaluation of the effectiveness of State codes of military justice in prosecuting members of the National Guard for serious misconduct described in paragraph (1), and an assessment whether chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), should be extended to authorize prosecution of some or all offenses committed by members of the National Guard while in State status.

(7) An evaluation of the effectiveness of mechanisms to protect the confidentiality of members of the National Guard who report allegations described in paragraph (1) and to prevent retaliation against such members.

(8) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the National Guard Bureau in preventing and proactively identifying instances of serious misconduct described in paragraph (1), including the availability and effectiveness of hotlines through which members of the National Guard who are uncomfortable reporting their concerns through State channels may bring them to the attention of the National Guard Bureau and the use of command climate surveys in identifying serious misconduct.

SA 1517. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 1204 the following:

SEC. 1204A. REPORT ON EXPANSION OF NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM TO INCLUDE NATIONS IN THE ARCTIC REGION.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of expanding the National Guard State Partnership Program to include partnerships with nations in the Arctic region in order to further the strategy of the Department of Defense for the Arctic region.

SA 1518. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1005. ANNUAL REPORT ON MANNER IN WHICH THE BUDGET OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORTS THE STRATEGY OF THE DEPARTMENT FOR THE ARCTIC REGION.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the inclusion in the budget for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2016 that is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, a report on the manner in which amounts requested in the budget for the fiscal year concerned for the Department

of Defense support implementation of the strategy of the Department and the Armed Forces for the Arctic region, including the extent to which such amounts will address gaps in military infrastructure and capabilities in the Arctic region.

(b) FORM.—Each report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 1519. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1024. TREATMENT OF EACH VESSEL IN THE CVN–78 CLASS AIRCRAFT CARRIER PROGRAM AS A MAJOR SUBPROGRAM OF A MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

Each vessel in the CVN–78 class aircraft carrier program shall be treated as a separate major subprogram of a major defense acquisition program for purposes of chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code.

SA 1520. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in subtitle B of title XVI, insert the following:

SEC. _____. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO SUPPORT CIVIL AUTHORITIES IN RESPONSE TO CYBER ATTACKS BY FOREIGN POWERS.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a comprehensive plan for the United States Cyber Command to support civil authorities in responding to cyber attacks by foreign powers (as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801)) against the United States or a United States person.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A plan for internal Department of Defense collective training activities that are integrated with exercises conducted with other agencies and State and local governments.

(B) Plans for coordination with the heads of other Federal agencies and State and local governments pursuant to the exercises required under subparagraph (A).

(C) Note of any historical frameworks that are used, if any, in the formulation of the plan required by paragraph (1), such as Operation Noble Eagle.

(D) Descriptions of the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of Federal, State, and local authorities as the Secretary understands them.

(E) Descriptions of the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of the active components and reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(F) A description of such legislative and administrative action as may be necessary to carry out the plan required by paragraph (1).

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REVIEW OF PLAN.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan developed under subsection (a)(1).

SA 1521. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REID, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XV, add the following:

SEC. 1523. LIMITATION ON THE AVAILABILITY OF OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATION FUNDING SUBJECT TO RELIEF FROM THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.

(a) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, of the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this title for overseas contingency operations, not more than $50,950,000,000 may be available for obligation and expenditure unless—

(1) the discretionary spending limits imposed by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by section 302 of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), on appropriations for the revised security category and the revised nonsecurity category are eliminated or increased in proportionally equal amounts for fiscal year 2016 by any other Act enacted after December 26, 2013; and

(2) if the revised security and the revised nonsecurity category are increased as described in paragraph (1), the amount of the increase is equal to or greater than the amount in excess of the $50,950,000,000 that is authorized to be appropriated by this title for security category activities.

(b) USE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE UNDER SATISFACTION OF LIMITATION.—

(1) TRANSFER.—Any amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title in excess of $50,950,000,000 that are available for obligation and expenditure pursuant to subsection (a) shall be transferred to applicable accounts of the Department of Defense providing funds for programs, projects, and activities other than for overseas contingency operations. Any amounts so transferred to an account shall be merged with amounts in the account to which transferred and available subject to the same terms and conditions as otherwise apply to amounts in such account.

(2) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to transfer amounts under this subsection is in addition to any other transfer authority in this Act.

SA 1522. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle E—Army Programs

SEC. 161. STRYKER LETHALITY UPGRADES.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR PROCUREMENT, ARMY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 101 for procurement is hereby increased by $314,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for procurement for the Army for Wheeled and Tracked Combat Vehicles for Stryker (mod) Lethality Upgrades.

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for procurement for Stryker (mod) Lethality Upgrades is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for procurement for the Army for Stryker (mod) Lethality Upgrades.

(b) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RDT&E, ARMY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation is hereby increased by $57,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army for the Combat Vehicle Improvement Program for Stryker Lethality Upgrades.

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for Stryker Lethality Upgrades is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army for Stryker Lethality Upgrades.

(c) OFFSET.—The aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by division A is hereby reduced by $371,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be achieved through anticipated foreign currency gains in addition to any other anticipated foreign currency gains specified in the funding tables in division D.

SA 1523. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 120. UPDATE OF COST ESTIMATES FOR SSBN(X) SUBMARINE PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES.

(a) REPORT ON UPDATE REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Not later than March 31, 2016, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an update of the cost estimates prepared under subsection (a)(1) section 242 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1343) for each option considered under subsection (b) of that section for purposes of the report under that section on

the Ohio-class replacement ballistic missile submarine.

(B) The update shall specify how the cost updates account for differences in survivability, targeting responsiveness and flexibility, responsiveness to future threats, and other matters the Secretary considers important in comparing the options.

(2) FORM.—Each updated cost estimate in the report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in an unclassified form that may be made available to the public. Other information from the update may be submitted in classified form.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the submittal under subsection (a) of the report required by that subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment by the Comptroller General of the accuracy of the updated cost estimates in the report under subsection (a).

SA 1524. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1637. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REVIEW OF COST ESTIMATES FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

Section 1043(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1576), as most recently amended by section 1643 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3650), is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and the 25-year period'' after ''10-year period''; and

(2) in subparagraphs (B) and (C), by striking ''such period'' both places it appears and inserting ''such periods''.

SA 1525. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1637. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR NEW AIR LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy may be obligated or expended for the research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement of a new air-launched cruise missile or for the W80 warhead life extension program.

SA 1526. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XVI, add the following:

Subtitle F—Smarter Approach to Nuclear Expenditures

SEC. 1671. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Smarter Approach to Nuclear Expenditures Act''.

SEC. 1672. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Berlin Wall fell in 1989, the Soviet Union no longer exists, and the Cold War is over. The nature of threats to the national security and military interests of the United States has changed. However, the United States continues to maintain an enormous arsenal of nuclear weapons and delivery systems that were devised with the Cold War in mind.

(2) The current nuclear arsenal of the United States includes approximately 5,000 total nuclear warheads, of which approximately 2,000 are deployed with three delivery components: long-range strategic bomber aircraft, land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, and submarine-launched ballistic missiles. The bomber fleet of the United States comprises 93 B–52 and 20 B–2 aircraft. The United States maintains 450 intercontinental ballistic missiles. The United States also maintains 14 Ohio-class submarines, up to 12 of which are deployed at sea. Each of those submarines is armed with up to 96 independently targetable nuclear warheads.

(3) This Cold War-based approach to nuclear security comes at significant cost. Over the next 10 years, the United States will spend hundreds of billions of dollars maintaining its nuclear force. A substantial decrease in spending on the nuclear arsenal of the United States is prudent for both the budget and national security.

(4) The national security interests of the United States can be well served by reducing the total number of deployed nuclear warheads and their delivery systems, as stated by the Department of Defense's June 2013 nuclear policy guidance entitled, ''Report on Nuclear Employment Strategy of the United States''. This guidance found that force levels under the Treaty on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed on April 8, 2010, and entered into force on February 5, 2011, between the United States and the Russian Federation (commonly known as the ''New START Treaty'') ''are more than adequate for what the United States needs to fulfill its national security objectives'' and that the force can be reduced by up to ⅓ below levels under the New START Treaty to 1,000 to 1,100 warheads.

(5) Even without additional reductions in deployed strategic warheads, the United States can save tens of billions of dollars by deploying those warheads more efficiently on delivery systems and by deferring production of new delivery systems until they are needed.

(6) Economic security and national security are linked and both will be well served by smart defense spending. Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated on June 24, 2010, ''Our national debt is our biggest national security threat'' and on August 2, 2011, stated, ''I haven't changed my view that the continually increasing debt is the biggest threat we have to our national security.''.

(7) The Government Accountability Office has found that there is significant waste in the construction of the nuclear facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration of the Department of Energy.

SEC. 1673. REDUCTION IN NUCLEAR FORCES.

(a) PROHIBITION ON NEW LONG-RANGE PENETRATING BOMBER AIRCRAFT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement of a long-range penetrating bomber aircraft.

(b) PROHIBITION ON F–35 NUCLEAR MISSION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy may be used to make the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons.

(c) REDUCTION IN THE B61 LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy may be obligated or expended for the B61 life extension program until the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy jointly certify to Congress that the total cost of the B61 life extension program has been reduced to not more than $4,000,000,000.

(d) TERMINATION OF W78 LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy may be obligated or expended for the W78 life extension program.

(e) REDUCTION OF NUCLEAR-ARMED SUBMARINES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning in fiscal year 2021, the forces of the Navy shall include not more than eight ballistic-missile submarines available for deployment.

(f) LIMITATION ON SSBN–X SUBMARINES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the procurement of an SSBN–X submarine; and

(2) none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2025 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the procurement of more than eight such submarines.

(g) PROHIBITION ON NEW INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement of a new intercontinental ballistic missile.

(h) TERMINATION OF MIXED OXIDE FUEL FABRICATION FACILITY PROJECT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy may be obligated or expended for the

Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility project.

(i) TERMINATION OF URANIUM PROCESSING FACILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy may be obligated or expended for the Uranium Processing Facility located at the Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

(j) PROHIBITION ON NEW AIR LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy may be obligated or expended for the research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement of a new air-launched cruise missile or for the W80 warhead life extension program.

SEC. 1674. REPORTS REQUIRED.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report outlining the plan of each Secretary to carry out section 1673.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2016, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report outlining the plan of each Secretary to carry out section 1673, including any updates to previously submitted reports.

(c) ANNUAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS ACCOUNTING.—Not later than September 30, 2016, and annually thereafter, the President shall transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing a comprehensive accounting by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget of the amounts obligated and expended by the Federal Government for each nuclear weapon and related nuclear program during—

(1) the fiscal year covered by the report; and

(2) the life cycle of such weapon or program.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

SA 1527. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN TIME SPENT RECEIVING MEDICAL CARE FROM SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AS ACTIVE DUTY FOR PURPOSES OF ELIGIBILITY FOR POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3301(1)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''12301(h),'' after ''12301(g),''.

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply as if such amendment were enacted immediately after the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–252).

SA 1528. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF SUNSET RELATED TO COAST GUARD AVIATION CAPACITY.

Section 225(b)(2) of the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–281; 128 Stat. 3039) is repealed.

SA 1529. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 352 and insert the following:

SEC. 352. RETIREMENT OF MILITARY WORKING DOGS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2583(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''If the Secretary'';

(3) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

(A) by striking '', and no suitable adoption is available at the military facility where the dog is location, the Secretary may'' and inserting ''the Secretary shall''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''within the United States'' after ''to another location''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply if a United States citizen living abroad adopts the dog at the time of retirement.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to retirements of military working dogs pursuant to section 2583 of title 10, United States Code, that occur on or after that date.

SA 1530. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE TREATMENT FOR FATHERS OF CERTAIN PERMANENTLY DISABLED OR DECEASED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2108(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraphs (F) and (G) and inserting the following:

''(F) the parent of an individual who lost his or her life under honorable conditions while serving in the armed forces during a period named by paragraph (1)(A) of this section, if—

''(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

''(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse;

''(G) the parent of a service-connected permanently and totally disabled veteran, if—

''(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

''(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse; and''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1531. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 540. REQUIREMENT TO USE HUMAN-BASED METHODS FOR CERTAIN MEDICAL TRAINING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Defense has made impressive strides in the development and use of methods of medical training and troop protection, such as the use of tourniquets and improvements in body armor, that have led to decreased battlefield fatalities.

(2) The Department of Defense uses more than 8,500 live animals each year to train physicians, medics, corpsmen, and other personnel methods of responding to severe battlefield injuries.

(3) The civilian sector has almost exclusively phased in the use of superior human-based training methods for numerous medical procedures currently taught in military courses using animals.

(4) Human-based medical training methods such as simulators replicate human anatomy and can allow for repetitive practice and data collection.

(5) According to scientific, peer-reviewed literature, medical simulation increases patient safety and decreases errors by healthcare providers.

(6) The Army Research, Development and Engineering Command and other entities of the Department of Defense have taken significant steps to develop methods to replace live animal-based training.

(7) According to the report by the Department of Defense titled ''Final Report on the use of Live Animals in Medical Education and Training Joint Analysis Team'', published on July 12, 2009—

(A) validated, high-fidelity simulators were to have been available for nearly every high-volume or high-value battlefield medical procedure by the end of 2011, and many were available as of 2009; and

(B) validated, high-fidelity simulators were to have been available to teach all other procedures to respond to common battlefield injuries by 2014.

(8) The Center for Sustainment of Trauma and Readiness Skills of the Air Force exclusively uses human-based training methods in its courses and does not use animals.

(9) In 2013, the Army instituted a policy forbidding non-medical personnel from participating in training courses involving the use of animals.

(10) In 2013, the medical school of the Department of Defense, part of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, replaced animal use within its medical student curriculum.

(11) The Coast Guard announced in 2014 that it would reduce by half the number of animals it uses for combat trauma training courses but stated that animals would continue to be used in courses designed for Department of Defense personnel.

(12) Effective January 1, 2015, the Department of Defense replaced animal use in six areas of medical training, including Advanced Trauma Life Support courses and the development and maintenance of surgical and critical care skills for field operational surgery and field assessment and skills tests for international students offered at the Defense Institute of Medical Operations.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO USE HUMAN-BASED METHODS FOR CERTAIN MEDICAL TRAINING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2017. Use of human-based methods for certain medical training

''(a) COMBAT TRAUMA INJURIES.—(1) Not later than October 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall develop, test, and validate human-based training methods for the purpose of training members of the armed forces in the treatment of combat trauma injuries with the goal of replacing live animal-based training methods.

''(2) Not later than October 1, 2020, the Secretary—

''(A) shall only use human-based training methods for the purpose of training members of the armed forces in the treatment of combat trauma injuries; and

''(B) may not use animals for such purpose.

''(b) EXCEPTION FOR PARTICULAR COMMANDS AND TRAINING METHODS.—(1) The Secretary may exempt a particular command, particular training method, or both, from the requirement for human-based training methods under subsection (a)(2) if the Secretary determines that human-based training methods will not provide an educationally equivalent or superior substitute for live animal-based training methods for such command or training method, as the case may be.

''(2) Any exemption under this subsection shall be for such period, not more than one year, as the Secretary shall specify in granting the exemption. Any exemption may be renewed (subject to the preceding sentence).

''(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—(1) Not later than October 1, 2016, and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the development and implementation of human-based training methods for the purpose of training members of the armed forces in the treatment of combat trauma injuries under this section.

''(2) Each report under this subsection on or after October 1, 2020, shall include a description of any exemption under subsection (b) that is in force as the time of such report, and a current justification for such exemption.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'combat trauma injuries' means severe injuries likely to occur during combat, including—

''(A) hemorrhage;

''(B) tension pneumothorax;

''(C) amputation resulting from blast injury;

''(D) compromises to the airway; and

''(E) other injuries.

''(2) The term 'human-based training methods' means, with respect to training individuals in medical treatment, the use of systems and devices that do not use animals, including—

''(A) simulators;

''(B) partial task trainers;

''(C) moulage;

''(D) simulated combat environments;

''(E) human cadavers; and

''(F) rotations in civilian and military trauma centers.

''(3) The term 'partial task trainers' means training aids that allow individuals to learn or practice specific medical procedures.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 101 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2017. Use of human-based methods for certain medical training.''.

SA 1532. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 86, strike line 4 and all that follows through page 87, line 5, and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall direct the executive agent for printed circuit board technology appointed under section 256(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 10 U.S.C. 2501 note) to coordinate execution of the study required by subsection (a) using capabilities of the Department in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to conduct technical analysis on a sample of failed electronic parts in field systems.

(2) ELEMENTS.—(A) The technical analysis required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(i) Selection of a representative sample of electronic component types, including digital, mixed-signal, and analog integrated circuits.

(ii) An assessment of the presence of counterfeit parts, including causes and attributes of failures of any identified counterfeit part.

(iii) For components found to have counterfeit parts present, an assessment of the impact of the counterfeit part in the failure mechanism.

(iv) For cases with counterfeit parts contributing to the failure, a determination of the failure attributes, factors, and effects on subsystem and system level reliability, readiness, and performance.

(B) For any parts assessed under subparagraph (A) that demonstrate unusual or suspicious failure mechanisms, the federation established under section 937(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) shall—

(i) conduct a technical assessment for indications of malicious tampering; and

(ii) submit to the executive agent described in paragraph (1) a report on the findings of the federation with respect to the technical assessment conducted under clause (i).

SA 1533. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 478, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 492, line 20, and insert the following:

No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available for the Department of Defense may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after January 20, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SA 1534. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1034.

SA 1535. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FEDERAL PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.

Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''a number equivalent to'' before ''the total amount of electric energy'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term 'renewable energy' means electric or, if resulting from a thermal energy project placed in service after December 31, 2014, thermal energy generated from, or avoided by, solar,

wind, biomass, landfill gas, ocean (including tidal, wave, current, and thermal), geothermal, municipal solid waste, or new hydroelectric generation capacity achieved from increased efficiency or additions of new capacity at an existing hydroelectric project.''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking ''For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) SEPARATE CALCULATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of determining compliance with the requirements of this section, any energy consumption that is avoided through the use of renewable energy shall be considered to be renewable energy produced.

''(B) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Avoided energy consumption that is considered to be renewable energy produced under subparagraph (A) shall not also be counted for purposes of achieving compliance with a Federal energy efficiency goal required under any other provision of law.''.

SA 1536. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

(a) PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND REPORTING.—Section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) PLAN REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall develop a plan for the purpose of negotiating and entering into one or more free trade agreements with all eligible sub-Saharan African countries. The plan shall identify the 10 to 15 eligible sub-Saharan African countries or groups of such countries that are most ready for a free trade agreement with the United States.

''(2) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required by paragraph (1) shall include, for each eligible sub-Saharan African country, the following:

''(A) The steps each such country needs to be equipped and ready to enter into a free trade agreement with the United States, including the effective implementation of the WTO Agreements and the development of a bilateral investment treaty.

''(B) Milestones for accomplishing each step identified in subparagraph (A) for each such country, with the goal of establishing a free trade agreement with each such country not later than 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Trade Act of 2015.

''(C) A description of the resources required to assist each such country in accomplishing each milestone described in subparagraph (B).

''(D) The extent to which steps described in subparagraph (A), the milestones described in subparagraph (B), and resources described in subparagraph (C) may be accomplished through regional or subregional organizations in sub-Saharan Africa, including the East African Community, the Economic Community of West African States, the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa, and the Economic Community of Central African States.

''(E) Procedures to ensure the following:

''(i) Adequate consultation with Congress and the private sector during the negotiations.

''(ii) Consultation with Congress regarding all matters relating to implementation of the agreement or agreements.

''(iii) Approval by Congress of the agreement or agreements.

''(iv) Adequate consultations with the relevant African governments and African regional and subregional intergovernmental organizations during the negotiation of the agreement or agreements.

''(3) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Trade Act of 2015, and every 5 years thereafter, the President shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing the plan developed pursuant to paragraph (1).

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) ELIGIBLE SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term 'eligible sub-Saharan African country' means a country designated as an eligible sub-Saharan African country under section 104.

''(B) WTO.—The term 'WTO' means the World Trade Organization.

''(C) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term 'WTO Agreement' has the meaning given that term in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)).

''(D) WTO AGREEMENTS.—The term 'WTO Agreements' means the WTO Agreement and agreements annexed to that Agreement.''.

(b) COORDINATION OF USAID WITH FREE TRADE AGREEMENT POLICY.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to the United States Agency for International Development under section 496 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293) after the date of the enactment of this Act may be used, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative—

(A) to assist eligible countries, including by deploying resources to such countries, in addressing the steps and milestones identified in the plan developed under subsection (d) of section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723), as added by subsection (a); and

(B) to assist eligible countries in the implementation of the commitments of those countries under agreements with the United States and the WTO Agreements (as defined in subsection (d)(4) of such section 116).

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ELIGIBLE COUNTRY.—The term ''eligible country'' means a sub-Saharan African country that receives—

(i) benefits under for the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.); and

(ii) funding from the United States Agency for International Development.

(B) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''sub-Saharan African country'' has the meaning given that term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3706).

(c) COORDINATION WITH MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION.—After the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall consult and coordinate with the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation regarding countries that have entered into a Millennium Challenge Compact pursuant to section 609 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7708) that have been declared eligible to enter into such a Compact for the purpose of developing and carrying out the plan required by subsection (d) of section 116 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3723), as added by subsection (a).

(d) MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION CONCURRENT COMPACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 609 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7708) is amended—

(A) in subsection (k), by striking the first sentence; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(l) CONCURRENT COMPACTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), an eligible country and the United States may enter into and have in effect not more than 2 Compacts at any given time under this section.

''(2) PURPOSES OF COMPACTS.—An eligible country and the United States that have entered into and have in effect a Compact under this section may enter into and have in effect at the same time one additional Compact in accordance with the requirements of this title if—

''(A) one or both of the Compacts are or will be for purposes of regional economic integration, increased regional trade, or cross-border collaborations; and

''(B) the Board determines that the country is making considerable and demonstrable progress in implementing the terms of the existing Compact and supplementary agreements to that Compact.

''(m) LIMITATION OF USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available to carry out this title, including amounts made available to enter into a Compact under this section or to provide assistance under section 616 or any other form of assistance under this title to a country, may not be obligated or expended for the purpose of entering into such a Compact with or providing such assistance to a country that has not been selected by the Board as eligible.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 613(b)(2)(A) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7712(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''the Compact'' and inserting ''any Compact''.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this subsection apply with respect to Compacts entered into between the United States and an eligible country under the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1537. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. RECOVERY OF EXCESS FIREARMS, AMMUNITION, AND PARTS GRANTED TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND TRANSFER TO CERTAIN PERSONS.

(a) RECOVERY.—Subchapter II of chapter 407 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 40728A the following new section:

''§ 40728B. Recovery of excess firearms, ammunition, and parts granted to foreign countries and transfer to certain persons

''(a) AUTHORITY TO RECOVER.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (b), the Secretary of the Army may acquire from any person any firearm, ammunition, repair parts, or other supplies described in section 40731(a) of this title which were—

''(A) provided to any country on a grant basis under the conditions imposed by section 505 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2314) that became excess to the needs of such country; and

''(B) lawfully acquired by such person.

''(2) The Secretary of the Army may not acquire anything under paragraph (1) except for transfer to a person in the United States under subsection (c).

''(3) The Secretary of the Army may accept firearms, ammunition, repair parts, or other supplies under paragraph (1) notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31.

''(b) COST OF RECOVERY.—The Secretary of the Army may not acquire anything under subsection (a) if the United States would incur any cost for such acquisition.

''(c) AVAILABILITY FOR TRANSFER.—Any firearms, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies acquired under subsection (a) shall be available for transfer in the United States to the person from whom acquired if such person—

''(1) is licensed as a manufacturer, importer, or dealer pursuant to section 923(a) of title 18; and

''(2) uses an ammunition depot of the Army that is an eligible facility for receipt of any firearms, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies under this paragraph.

''(d) CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (k) of section 2304 of title 10, the Secretary may enter into such contracts or cooperative agreements on a sole source basis pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (c) of such section to carry out this section.

''(e) FIREARM DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'firearm' has the meaning given such term in section 921 of title 18.''.

(b) SALE.—Section 40732 of such title is amended—

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

''(d) SALES BY OTHER PERSONS.—A person who receives a firearm or any ammunition, repair parts, or supplies under section 40728B(c) of this title may sell, at fair market value, such firearm, ammunition, repair parts, or supplies.''; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the heading, by inserting ''BY THE CORPORATION'' after ''LIMITATION ON SALES''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 407 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 40728A the following new item:

''40728B. Recovery of excess firearms, ammunition, and parts granted to foreign countries and transfer to certain persons.''.

SA 1538. Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. MELVILLE HALL OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.

(a) GIFT TO THE MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.—The Maritime Administrator may accept a gift of money from the Foundation under section 51315 of title 46, United States Code, for the purpose of renovating Melville Hall on the campus of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(b) COVERED GIFTS.—A gift described in this subsection is a gift under subsection (a) that the Maritime Administrator determines exceeds the sum of—

(1) the minimum amount that is sufficient to ensure the renovation of Melville Hall in accordance with the capital improvement plan of the United States Merchant Marine Academy that was in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) 25 percent of the amount described in paragraph (1).

(c) OPERATION CONTRACTS.—Subject to subsection (d), in the case that the Maritime Administrator accepts a gift of money described in subsection (b), the Maritime Administrator may enter into a contract with the Foundation for the operation of Melville Hall to make available facilities for, among other possible uses, official academy functions, third-party catering functions, and industry events and conferences.

(d) CONTRACT TERMS.—The contract described in subsection (c) shall be for such period and on such terms as the Maritime Administrator considers appropriate, including a provision, mutually agreeable to the Maritime Administrator and the Foundation, that—

(1) requires the Foundation—

(A) at the expense solely of the Foundation through the term of the contract to maintain Melville Hall in a condition that is as good as or better than the condition Melville Hall was in on the later of—

(i) the date that the renovation of Melville Hall was completed; or

(ii) the date that the Foundation accepted Melville Hall after it was tendered to the Foundation by the Maritime Administrator; and

(B) to deposit all proceeds from the operation of Melville Hall, after expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of Melville Hall, into the account of the Regimental Affairs Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality or successor entity, to be used solely for the morale and welfare of the cadets of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

(2) prohibits the use of Melville Hall as lodging or an office by any person for more than 4 days in any calendar year other than—

(A) by the United States; or

(B) for the administration and operation of Melville Hall.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term ''contract'' includes any modification, extension, or renewal of the contract.

(2) FOUNDATION.—In this section, the term ''Foundation'' means the United States Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association and Foundation, Inc.

(f) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed under section 3105 of title 41, United States Code, as requiring the Maritime Administrator to award a contract for the operation of Melville Hall to the Foundation.

SA 1539. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 342 the following:

SEC. 342A. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS TO FACILITATE PAYMENTS FOR HONORING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AT SPORTING EVENTS.

(a) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Army National Guard has paid professional sports organizations to honor members of the Armed Forces;

(2) any organization wishing to honor members of the Armed Forces should do so on a voluntary basis, and the Department of Defense should take action to ensure that no payments be made for such activities in the future; and

(3) any organization, including the National Football League, that has accepted taxpayer funds to honor members of the Armed Forces should consider directing an equivalent amount of funding in the form of a donation to a charitable organization that supports members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2241a the following new section:

''§ 2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces

''(a) PROHIBITION.—The Department of Defense may not enter into any contract or other agreement under which payments are to be made in exchange for activities by the contractor intended to honor, or giving the appearance of honoring, members of the armed forces (whether members of the regular components or the reserve components) at any form of sporting event.

''(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed as prohibiting the Department from taking actions to facilitate activities intended to honor members of the armed forces at sporting events that are provided on a pro bono basis or otherwise funded with non-Federal funds if such activities are provided and received in accordance with applicable rules and regulations regarding the acceptance of gifts by the military departments, the armed forces, and members of the armed forces.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 134 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2241a the following new item:

''2241b. Prohibition on contracts providing payments for activities to honor members of the armed forces at sporting events.''.

SA 1540. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. COMPTROLLER GENERAL BRIEFING AND REPORT ON MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) BRIEFING.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States

shall provide to the appropriate committees of Congress a briefing on the administration and oversight by the Department of Veterans Affairs of contracts for the design and construction of major medical facility projects, as defined in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the administration and oversight described in subsection (a).

(c) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required by subsection (a) and the report required by subsection (b) shall each include an examination of the following:

(1) The processes used by the Department for overseeing and assuring the performance of construction design and construction contracts for major medical facility projects, as so defined.

(2) Any actions taken by the Department to improve the administration of such contracts.

(3) Such opportunities for further improvement of the administration of such contracts as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1541. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—VESSEL INCIDENTAL DISCHARGE ACT

SEC. ____1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Vessel Incidental Discharge Act''.

SEC. ____2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Beginning with enactment of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships in 1980 (22 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.), the United States Coast Guard has been the principal Federal authority charged with administering, enforcing, and prescribing regulations relating to the discharge of pollutants from vessels engaged in maritime commerce and transportation.

(2) The Coast Guard estimates there are approximately 21,560,000 State-registered recreational vessels, 75,000 commercial fishing vessels, and 33,000 freight and tank barges operating in United States waters.

(3) From 1973 to 2005, certain discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel were exempted by regulation from otherwise applicable permitting requirements.

(4) Over the 32 years during which this regulatory exemption was in effect, Congress enacted statutes on a number of occasions dealing with the regulation of discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including—

(A) the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) in 1980;

(B) the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.);

(C) the National Invasive Species Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 4073);

(D) section 415 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 3434) and section 623 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (33 U.S.C. 1901 note), which established interim and permanent requirements, respectively, for the regulation of vessel discharges of certain bulk cargo residue;

(E) title XIV of division B of Appendix D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001 (114 Stat. 2763), which prohibited or limited certain vessel discharges in certain areas of Alaska;

(F) section 204 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (33 U.S.C. 1902a), which established requirements for the regulation of vessel discharges of agricultural cargo residue material in the form of hold washings; and

(G) title X of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (33 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.), which provided for the implementation of the International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-Fouling Systems on Ships, 2001.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards and requirements for the management of discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

SEC. ____3. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term Administrator means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES.—The term aquatic nuisance species means a nonindigenous species (including a pathogen) that threatens the diversity or abundance of native species or the ecological stability of navigable waters or commercial, agricultural, aquacultural, or recreational activities dependent on such waters.

(3) BALLAST WATER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ballast water means any water, including any sediment suspended in such water, taken aboard a vessel—

(i) to control trim, list, draught, stability, or stresses of the vessel; or

(ii) during the cleaning, maintenance, or other operation of a ballast water treatment technology of the vessel.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ballast water does not include any pollutant that is added to water described in subparagraph (A) that is not directly related to the operation of a properly functioning ballast water treatment technology under this title.

(4) BALLAST WATER PERFORMANCE STANDARD.—The term ballast water performance standard means the numerical ballast water discharge standard set forth in section 151.2030 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations or section 151.1511 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, as applicable, or a revised numerical ballast water performance standard established under subsection (a)(1)(B), (b), or (c) of section ____5 of this title.

(5) BALLAST WATER TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY OR TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY.—The term ballast water treatment technology or treatment technology means any mechanical, physical, chemical, or biological process used, alone or in combination, to remove, render harmless, or avoid the uptake or discharge of aquatic nuisance species within ballast water.

(6) BIOCIDE.—The term biocide means a substance or organism, including a virus or fungus, that is introduced into or produced by a ballast water treatment technology to reduce or eliminate aquatic nuisance species as part of the process used to comply with a ballast water performance standard under this title.

(7) DISCHARGE INCIDENTAL TO THE NORMAL OPERATION OF A VESSEL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel means—

(i) a discharge into navigable waters from a vessel of—

(I)(aa) ballast water, graywater, bilge water, cooling water, oil water separator effluent, anti-fouling hull coating leachate, boiler or economizer blowdown, byproducts from cathodic protection, controllable pitch propeller and thruster hydraulic fluid, distillation and reverse osmosis brine, elevator pit effluent, firemain system effluent, freshwater layup effluent, gas turbine wash water, motor gasoline and compensating effluent, refrigeration and air condensate effluent, seawater pumping biofouling prevention substances, boat engine wet exhaust, sonar dome effluent, exhaust gas scrubber washwater, or stern tube packing gland effluent; or

(bb) any other pollutant associated with the operation of a marine propulsion system, shipboard maneuvering system, habitability system, or installed major equipment, or from a protective, preservative, or absorptive application to the hull of a vessel;

(II) weather deck runoff, deck wash, aqueous film forming foam effluent, chain locker effluent, non-oily machinery wastewater, underwater ship husbandry effluent, welldeck effluent, or fish hold and fish hold cleaning effluent; or

(III) any effluent from a properly functioning marine engine; or

(ii) a discharge of a pollutant into navigable waters in connection with the testing, maintenance, or repair of a system, equipment, or engine described in subclause (I)(bb) or (III) of clause (i) whenever the vessel is waterborne.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel does not include—

(i) a discharge into navigable waters from a vessel of—

(I) rubbish, trash, garbage, incinerator ash, or other such material discharged overboard;

(II) oil or a hazardous substance as those terms are defined in section 311 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321);

(III) sewage as defined in section 312(a)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1322(a)(6)); or

(IV) graywater referred to in section 312(a)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1322(a)(6));

(ii) an emission of an air pollutant resulting from the operation onboard a vessel of a vessel propulsion system, motor driven equipment, or incinerator; or

(iii) a discharge into navigable waters from a vessel when the vessel is operating in a capacity other than as a means of transportation on water.

(8) GEOGRAPHICALLY LIMITED AREA.—The term geographically limited area means an area—

(A) with a physical limitation, including limitation by physical size and limitation by authorized route such as the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River, that prevents a vessel from operating outside the area, as determined by the Secretary; or

(B) that is ecologically homogeneous, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other Federal departments or agencies as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(9) MANUFACTURER.—The term manufacturer means a person engaged in the manufacture, assemblage, or importation of ballast water treatment technology.

(10) SECRETARY.—The term Secretary means the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

(11) VESSEL.—The term vessel means every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or practically or otherwise capable of being used, as a means of transportation on water.

SEC. ___4. REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall establish and implement enforceable uniform national standards and requirements for the regulation of discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel. The standards and requirements shall—

(1) be based upon the best available technology economically achievable; and

(2) supersede any permitting requirement or prohibition on discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel under any other provision of law.

(b) ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary shall administer and enforce the uniform national standards and requirements under this title. Each State may enforce the uniform national standards and requirements under this title.

SEC. ___5. UNIFORM NATIONAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE REGULATION OF DISCHARGES INCIDENTAL TO THE NORMAL OPERATION OF A VESSEL.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) BALLAST WATER MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the requirements set forth in the final rule, Standards for Living Organisms in Ships' Ballast Water Discharged in U.S. Waters (77 Fed. Reg. 17254 (March 23, 2012), as corrected at 77 Fed. Reg. 33969 (June 8, 2012)), shall be the management requirements for a ballast water discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel until the Secretary revises the ballast water performance standard under subsection (b) or adopts a more stringent State standard under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

(B) ADOPTION OF MORE STRINGENT STATE STANDARD.—If the Secretary makes a determination in favor of a State petition under section ___10, the Secretary shall adopt the more stringent ballast water performance standard specified in the statute or regulation that is the subject of that State petition in lieu of the ballast water performance standard in the final rule described under subparagraph (A).

(2) INITIAL MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCHARGES OTHER THAN BALLAST WATER.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall issue a final rule establishing best management practices for discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel other than ballast water.

(b) REVISED BALLAST WATER PERFORMANCE STANDARD; 8-YEAR REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the feasibility review under paragraph (2), not later than January 1, 2022, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall issue a final rule revising the ballast water performance standard under subsection (a)(1) so that a ballast water discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel will contain—

(A) less than 1 organism that is living or has not been rendered harmless per 10 cubic meters that is 50 or more micrometers in minimum dimension;

(B) less than 1 organism that is living or has not been rendered harmless per 10 milliliters that is less than 50 micrometers in minimum dimension and more than 10 micrometers in minimum dimension;

(C) concentrations of indicator microbes that are less than—

(i) 1 colony-forming unit of toxicogenic Vibrio cholera (serotypes O1 and O139) per 100 milliliters or less than 1 colony-forming unit of that microbe per gram of wet weight of zoological samples;

(ii) 126 colony-forming units of Escherichia coli per 100 milliliters; and

(iii) 33 colony-forming units of intestinal enterococci per 100 milliliters; and

(D) concentrations of such additional indicator microbes and of viruses as may be specified in regulations issued by the Secretary in consultation with the Administrator and such other Federal agencies as the Secretary and the Administrator consider appropriate.

(2) FEASIBILITY REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 2 years before January 1, 2022, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall complete a review to determine the feasibility of achieving the revised ballast water performance standard under paragraph (1).

(B) CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF BALLAST WATER PERFORMANCE STANDARD.—In conducting a review under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider whether revising the ballast water performance standard will result in a scientifically demonstrable and substantial reduction in the risk of introduction or establishment of aquatic nuisance species, taking into account—

(i) improvements in the scientific understanding of biological and ecological processes that lead to the introduction or establishment of aquatic nuisance species;

(ii) improvements in ballast water treatment technology, including—

(I) the capability of such treatment technology to achieve a revised ballast water performance standard;

(II) the effectiveness and reliability of such treatment technology in the shipboard environment;

(III) the compatibility of such treatment technology with the design and operation of a vessel by class, type, and size;

(IV) the commercial availability of such treatment technology; and

(V) the safety of such treatment technology;

(iii) improvements in the capabilities to detect, quantify, and assess the viability of aquatic nuisance species at the concentrations under consideration;

(iv) the impact of ballast water treatment technology on water quality; and

(v) the costs, cost-effectiveness, and impacts of—

(I) a revised ballast water performance standard, including the potential impacts on shipping, trade, and other uses of the aquatic environment; and

(II) maintaining the existing ballast water performance standard, including the potential impacts on water-related infrastructure, recreation, propagation of native fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and other uses of navigable waters.

(C) LOWER REVISED PERFORMANCE STANDARD.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, determines on the basis of the feasibility review and after an opportunity for a public hearing that no ballast water treatment technology can be certified under section ___6 to comply with the revised ballast water performance standard under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall require the use of the treatment technology that achieves the performance levels of the best treatment technology available.

(ii) IMPLEMENTATION DEADLINE.—If the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, determines that the treatment technology under clause (i) cannot be implemented before the implementation deadline under paragraph (3) with respect to a class of vessels, the Secretary shall extend the implementation deadline for that class of vessels for not more than 36 months.

(iii) COMPLIANCE.—If the implementation deadline under paragraph (3) is extended, the Secretary shall recommend action to ensure compliance with the extended implementation deadline under clause (ii).

(D) HIGHER REVISED PERFORMANCE STANDARD.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, determines that ballast water treatment technology exists that exceeds the revised ballast water performance standard under paragraph (1) with respect to a class of vessels, the Secretary shall revise the ballast water performance standard for that class of vessels to incorporate the higher performance standard.

(ii) IMPLEMENTATION DEADLINE.—If the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, determines that the treatment technology under clause (i) can be implemented before the implementation deadline under paragraph (3) with respect to a class of vessels, the Secretary shall accelerate the implementation deadline for that class of vessels. If the implementation deadline under paragraph (3) is accelerated, the Secretary shall provide not less than 24 months notice before the accelerated deadline takes effect.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION DEADLINE.—The revised ballast water performance standard under paragraph (1) shall apply to a vessel beginning on the date of the first drydocking of the vessel on or after January 1, 2022, but not later than December 31, 2024.

(4) REVISED PERFORMANCE STANDARD COMPLIANCE DEADLINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a compliance deadline for compliance by a vessel (or a class, type, or size of vessel) with a revised ballast water performance standard under this subsection.

(B) PROCESS FOR GRANTING EXTENSIONS.—In issuing regulations under this subsection, the Secretary shall establish a process for an owner or operator to submit a petition to the Secretary for an extension of a compliance deadline with respect to the vessel of the owner or operator.

(C) PERIOD OF EXTENSIONS.—An extension issued under subparagraph (B) may—

(i) apply for a period of not to exceed 18 months from the date of the applicable deadline under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) be renewable for an additional period of not to exceed 18 months.

(D) FACTORS.—In issuing a compliance deadline or reviewing a petition under this paragraph, the Secretary shall consider, with respect to the ability of an owner or operator to meet a compliance deadline, the following factors:

(i) Whether the treatment technology to be installed is available in sufficient quantities to meet the compliance deadline.

(ii) Whether there is sufficient shipyard or other installation facility capacity.

(iii) Whether there is sufficient availability of engineering and design resources.

(iv) Vessel characteristics, such as engine room size, layout, or a lack of installed piping.

(v) Electric power generating capacity aboard the vessel.

(vi) Safety of the vessel and crew.

(E) CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS.—

(i) DETERMINATIONS.—The Secretary shall approve or deny a petition for an extension of a compliance deadline submitted by an owner or operator under this paragraph.

(ii) DEADLINE.—If the Secretary does not approve or deny a petition referred to in clause (i) on or before the last day of the 90-day period beginning on the date of submission of the petition, the petition shall be deemed approved.

(c) FUTURE REVISIONS OF VESSEL INCIDENTAL DISCHARGE STANDARDS; DECENNIAL REVIEWS.—

(1) REVISED BALLAST WATER PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall complete a review, 10 years after the issuance of a final rule under subsection (b) and every 10 years thereafter, to determine whether further revision of the ballast water performance standard would result in a scientifically demonstrable and substantial reduction in the risk of the introduction or establishment of aquatic nuisance species.

(2) REVISED STANDARDS FOR DISCHARGES OTHER THAN BALLAST WATER.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, may include in a decennial review under this subsection best management practices for discharges covered by subsection (a)(2). The Secretary shall initiate a rulemaking to revise 1 or more best management practices for such discharges after a decennial review if the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, determines that revising 1 or more of such practices would substantially reduce the impacts on navigable waters of discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel other than ballast water.

(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting a review under paragraph (1), the Secretary, the Administrator, and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies as determined by the Secretary, shall consider the criteria under section ___5(b)(2)(B).

(4) REVISION AFTER DECENNIAL REVIEW.—The Secretary shall initiate a rulemaking to revise the current ballast water performance standard after a decennial review if the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, determines that revising the current ballast water performance standard would result in a scientifically demonstrable and substantial reduction in the risk of the introduction or establishment of aquatic nuisance species.

(d) GREAT LAKES REQUIREMENTS.—In addition to the other standards and requirements imposed by this section, in the case of a vessel that enters the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence River after operating outside the exclusive economic zone of the United States the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall establish a requirement that the vessel conduct saltwater flushing of all ballast water tanks onboard prior to entry.

SEC. ___6. TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY CERTIFICATION.

(a) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Beginning 1 year after the date that the requirements for testing protocols are issued under subsection (i), no manufacturer of a ballast water treatment technology shall sell, offer for sale, or introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce, or import into the United States for sale or resale, a ballast water treatment technology for a vessel unless the treatment technology has been certified under this section.

(b) CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—

(1) EVALUATION.—Upon application of a manufacturer, the Secretary shall evaluate a ballast water treatment technology with respect to—

(A) the effectiveness of the treatment technology in achieving the current ballast water performance standard when installed on a vessel (or a class, type, or size of vessel);

(B) the compatibility with vessel design and operations;

(C) the effect of the treatment technology on vessel safety;

(D) the impact on the environment;

(E) the cost effectiveness; and

(F) any other criteria the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) APPROVAL.—If after an evaluation under paragraph (1) the Secretary determines that the treatment technology meets the criteria, the Secretary may certify the treatment technology for use on a vessel (or a class, type, or size of vessel).

(3) SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION.—The Secretary shall establish, by regulation, a process to suspend or revoke a certification issued under this section.

(c) CERTIFICATION CONDITIONS.—

(1) IMPOSITION OF CONDITIONS.—In certifying a ballast water treatment technology under this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, may impose any condition on the subsequent installation, use, or maintenance of the treatment technology onboard a vessel as is necessary for—

(A) the safety of the vessel, the crew of the vessel, and any passengers aboard the vessel;

(B) the protection of the environment; or

(C) the effective operation of the treatment technology.

(2) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—The failure of an owner or operator to comply with a condition imposed under paragraph (1) shall be considered a violation of this section.

(d) PERIOD FOR USE OF INSTALLED TREATMENT EQUIPMENT.—Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this title or any other provision of law, the Secretary shall allow a vessel on which a system is installed and operated to meet a ballast water performance standard under this title to continue to use that system, notwithstanding any revision of a ballast water performance standard occurring after the system is ordered or installed until the expiration of the service life of the system, as determined by the Secretary, so long as the system—

(1) is maintained in proper working condition; and

(2) is maintained and used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications and any treatment technology certification conditions imposed by the Secretary under this section.

(e) CERTIFICATES OF TYPE APPROVAL FOR THE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—If the Secretary approves a ballast water treatment technology for certification under subsection (b), the Secretary shall issue a certificate of type approval for the treatment technology to the manufacturer in such form and manner as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(2) CERTIFICATION CONDITIONS.—A certificate of type approval issued under paragraph (1) shall specify each condition imposed by the Secretary under subsection (c).

(3) OWNERS AND OPERATORS.—A manufacturer that receives a certificate of type approval for the treatment technology under this subsection shall provide a copy of the certificate to each owner and operator of a vessel on which the treatment technology is installed.

(f) INSPECTIONS.—An owner or operator who receives a copy of a certificate under subsection (e)(3) shall retain a copy of the certificate onboard the vessel and make the copy of the certificate available for inspection at all times while the owner or operator is utilizing the treatment technology.

(g) BIOCIDES.—The Secretary may not approve a ballast water treatment technology under subsection (b) if—

(1) it uses a biocide or generates a biocide that is a pesticide, as defined in section 2 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136), unless the biocide is registered under that Act or the Secretary, in consultation with Administrator, has approved the use of the biocide in such treatment technology; or

(2) it uses or generates a biocide the discharge of which causes or contributes to a violation of a water quality standard under section 303 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313).

(h) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the use of a ballast water treatment technology by an owner or operator of a vessel shall not satisfy the requirements of this title unless it has been approved by the Secretary under subsection (b).

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

(A) COAST GUARD SHIPBOARD TECHNOLOGY EVALUATION PROGRAM.—An owner or operator may use a ballast water treatment technology that has not been certified by the Secretary to comply with the requirements of this section if the technology is being evaluated under the Coast Guard Shipboard Technology Evaluation Program.

(B) BALLAST WATER TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES CERTIFIED BY FOREIGN ENTITIES.—An owner or operator may use a ballast water treatment technology that has not been certified by the Secretary to comply with the requirements of this section if the technology has been certified by a foreign entity and the certification demonstrates performance and safety of the treatment technology equivalent to the requirements of this section, as determined by the Secretary.

(i) TESTING PROTOCOLS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, shall issue requirements for land-based and shipboard testing protocols or criteria for—

(1) certifying the performance of each ballast water treatment technology under this section; and

(2) certifying laboratories to evaluate such treatment technologies.

SEC. ___7. EXEMPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No permit shall be required or prohibition enforced under any other provision of law for, nor shall any standards regarding a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel under this title apply to—

(1) a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel if the vessel is less than 79 feet in length and engaged in commercial service (as defined in section 2101(5) of title 46, United States Code);

(2) a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel if the vessel is a fishing vessel, including a fish processing vessel and a fish tender vessel, (as defined in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code);

(3) a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel if the vessel is a recreational vessel (as defined in section 2101(25) of title 46, United States Code);

(4) the placement, release, or discharge of equipment, devices, or other material from a vessel for the sole purpose of conducting research on the aquatic environment or its natural resources in accordance with generally recognized scientific methods, principles, or techniques;

(5) any discharge into navigable waters from a vessel authorized by an on-scene coordinator in accordance with part 300 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, or part 153 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations;

(6) any discharge into navigable waters from a vessel that is necessary to secure the safety of the vessel or human life, or to suppress a fire onboard the vessel or at a shoreside facility; or

(7) a vessel of the armed forces of a foreign nation when engaged in noncommercial service.

(b) BALLAST WATER DISCHARGES.—No permit shall be required or prohibition enforced under any other provision of law for, nor shall any ballast water performance standards under this title apply to—

(1) a ballast water discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel determined by the Secretary to—

(A) operate exclusively within a geographically limited area;

(B) take up and discharge ballast water exclusively within 1 Captain of the Port Zone established by the Coast Guard unless the Secretary determines such discharge poses a substantial risk of introduction or establishment of an aquatic nuisance species;

(C) operate pursuant to a geographic restriction issued as a condition under section 3309 of title 46, United States Code, or an equivalent restriction issued by the country of registration of the vessel; or

(D) continuously take on and discharge ballast water in a flow-through system that does not introduce aquatic nuisance species into navigable waters;

(2) a ballast water discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel consisting entirely of water suitable for human consumption; or

(3) a ballast water discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel in an alternative compliance program established pursuant to section ___8.

(c) VESSELS WITH PERMANENT BALLAST WATER.—No permit shall be required or prohibition enforced under any other provision of law for, nor shall any ballast water performance standard under this title apply to, a vessel that carries all of its permanent ballast water in sealed tanks that are not subject to discharge.

(d) VESSELS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to apply to a vessel as follows:

(1) A vessel owned or operated by the Department of Defense (other than a time-chartered or voyage-chartered vessel).

(2) A vessel of the Coast Guard, as designated by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

SEC. ___8. ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, may promulgate regulations establishing 1 or more compliance programs as an alternative to ballast water management regulations issued under section ___5 for a vessel that—

(1) has a maximum ballast water capacity of less than 8 cubic meters;

(2) is less than 3 years from the end of the useful life of the vessel, as determined by the Secretary; or

(3) discharges ballast water into a facility for the reception of ballast water that meets standards promulgated by the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary.

(b) PROMULGATION OF FACILITY STANDARDS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary, shall promulgate standards for—

(1) the reception of ballast water from a vessel into a reception facility; and

(2) the disposal or treatment of the ballast water under paragraph (1).

SEC. ___9. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An interested person may file a petition for review of a final regulation promulgated under this title in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(b) DEADLINE.—A petition shall be filed not later than 120 days after the date that notice of the promulgation appears in the Federal Register.

(c) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), a petition that is based solely on grounds that arise after the deadline to file a petition under subsection (b) has passed may be filed not later than 120 days after the date that the grounds first arise.

SEC. ___10. EFFECT ON STATE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce any statute or regulation of the State or political subdivision with respect to a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce a statute or regulation of the State or political subdivision with respect to ballast water discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel that specifies a ballast water performance standard that is more stringent than the ballast water performance standard under section ___5(a)(1)(A) if the Secretary, after consultation with the Administrator and any other Federal department or agency the Secretary considers appropriate, makes a determination that—

(1) compliance with any performance standard specified in the statute or regulation can in fact be achieved and detected;

(2) the technology and systems necessary to comply with the statute or regulation are commercially available; and

(3) the statute or regulation is consistent with obligations under relevant international treaties or agreements to which the United States is a party.

(c) PETITION PROCESS.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—The Governor of a State seeking to adopt or enforce a statute or regulation under subsection (b) shall submit a petition to the Secretary requesting the Secretary to review the statute or regulation.

(2) CONTENTS; TIMING.—A petition shall be accompanied by the scientific and technical information on which the petition is based, and may be submitted within 1 year of the date of enactment of this Act and every 10 years thereafter.

(3) DETERMINATIONS.—The Secretary shall make a determination on a petition under this subsection not later than 90 days after the date that the petition is received.

SEC. ___11. APPLICATION WITH OTHER STATUTES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, this title shall be the exclusive statutory authority for regulation by the Federal Government of discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel to which this title applies. Except as provided under section ___5(a)(1)(A), any regulation in effect on the date immediately preceding the effective date of this title relating to any permitting requirement for or prohibition on discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel to which this title applies shall be deemed to be a regulation issued pursuant to the authority of this title and shall remain in full force and effect unless or until superseded by new regulations issued hereunder.

SA 1542. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1099. BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) AUDIT REFORM AND TRANSPARENCY FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 714 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks under subsection (b) of such section 714 shall be completed not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A report on the audit required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted by the Comptroller General of the United States to Congress before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the audit is completed and made available to the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee and each subcommittee of jurisdiction in the Senate and the House of Representatives, and any other Member of Congress who requests the report.

(B) CONTENTS.—The report under subparagraph (A) shall include a detailed description of the findings and conclusion of the Comptroller General of the United States with respect to the audit that is the subject of the report, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General of the United States may determine to be appropriate.

(3) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Section 714(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking all after ''in writing.''.

(4) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f).

(b) AUDIT OF LOAN FILE REVIEWS REQUIRED BY ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of the review of loan files of homeowners in foreclosure in 2009 or 2010, required as part of the enforcement actions taken by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System against supervised financial institutions.

(2) CONTENT OF AUDIT.—The audit carried out pursuant to paragraph (1) shall consider, at a minimum—

(A) the guidance given by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to independent consultants retained by the supervised financial institutions regarding the procedures to be followed in conducting the file reviews;

(B) the factors considered by independent consultants when evaluating loan files;

(C) the results obtained by the independent consultants pursuant to those reviews;

(D) the determinations made by the independent consultants regarding the nature and extent of financial injury sustained by each homeowner as well as the level and type of remediation offered to each homeowner; and

(E) the specific measures taken by the independent consultants to verify, confirm, or rebut the assertions and representations made by supervised financial institutions regarding the contents of loan files and the extent of financial injury to homeowners.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report to Congress containing

all findings and determinations made in carrying out the audit required under paragraph (1).

SA 1543. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1116. COST SAVINGS ENHANCEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or identification of surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority'' after ''mismanagement'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(C) in the matter following paragraph (2), by inserting ''or identification'' after ''disclosure''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) The Inspector General of an agency or other agency employee designated under subsection (b) shall refer to the Chief Financial Officer of the agency any potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee, along with any recommendations of the Inspector General or other agency employee.

''(d)(1) If the Chief Financial Officer of an agency determines that rescission of potential surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority identified by an employee would not hinder the effectiveness of the agency, except as provided in subsection (e), the head of the agency shall transfer the amount of the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority from the applicable appropriations account to the general fund of the Treasury.

''(2) Title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.) shall not apply to transfers under paragraph (1).

''(3) Any amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction, except that in the case of a fiscal year for which there is no Federal budget deficit, such amounts shall be used to reduce the Federal debt (in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

''(e)(1) The head of an agency may retain not more than 10 percent of amounts to be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury under subsection (d).

''(2) Amounts retained by the head of an agency under paragraph (1) may be—

''(A) used for the purpose of paying a cash award under subsection (a) to 1 or more employees who identified the surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority; and

''(B) to the extent amounts remain after paying cash awards under subsection (a), transferred or reprogrammed for use by the agency, in accordance with any limitation on such a transfer or reprogramming under any other provision of law.

''(f)(1) The head of each agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management an annual report regarding—

''(A) each disclosure of possible fraud, waste, or mismanagement or identification of potentially surplus funds or unnecessary budget authority by an employee of the agency determined by the agency to have merit;

''(B) the total savings achieved through disclosures and identifications described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) the number and amount of cash awards by the agency under subsection (a).

''(2)(A) The head of each agency shall include the information described in paragraph (1) in each budget request of the agency submitted to the Office of Management and Budget as part of the preparation of the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

''(B) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Government Accountability Office an annual report on Federal cost saving and awards based on the reports submitted under subparagraph (A).

''(g) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

''(1) ensure that the cash award program of each agency complies with this section; and

''(2) submit to Congress an annual certification indicating whether the cash award program of each agency complies with this section.

''(h) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the operation of the cost savings and awards program under this section, including any recommendations for legislative changes.''.

(b) OFFICERS ELIGIBLE FOR CASH AWARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4509 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term 'agency'—

''(1) has the meaning given that term under section 551(1); and

''(2) includes an entity described in section 4501(1).

''(b) PROHIBITION.—An officer may not receive a cash award under this subchapter if the officer—

''(1) serves in a position at level I of the Executive Schedule;

''(2) is the head of an agency; or

''(3) is a commissioner, board member, or other voting member of an independent establishment.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 4509 and inserting the following:

''4509. Prohibition of cash award to certain officers.''.

SA 1544. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR USE OF ENTITLEMENT TO POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER OR TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) EXTENDED PERIOD.—Section 3312 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''in subsections (b) and (c)'' and inserting ''in subsections (b), (c), and (d)''; and

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

''(d) EXTENDED PERIOD FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER OR TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.—Subject to section 3695 of this title and except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter who has a service-connected disability consisting of post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury is entitled to a number of months of educational assistance under section 3313 of this title equal to 54 months.''.

(b) REDUCED AMOUNT.—Section 3313 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) REDUCED AMOUNT FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH EXTENDED PERIOD OF ASSISTANCE.—The amount of educational assistance payable under this section to an individual described in section 3312(d) of this title shall be 67 percent of the amount otherwise payable to such individual under this section.''.

SA 1545. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING PROGRAMS THAT HAVE BEEN EXPIRED FOR MORE THAN 5 YEARS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that appropriates amounts for a program for which the authorizing authority has been expired for more than 5 fiscal years.

(b) POINT OF ORDER; WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, a point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)). A point of order under subsection (a) may be waived in accordance with the procedures under section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)) upon an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn.

SA 1546. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TRANSFER AUTHORITY FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS TO MITIGATE THE EFFECTS ON THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF A SEQUESTRATION OF FUNDS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense for a fiscal year between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions

thereof) if the Secretary determines that the transfer—

(A) is necessary to mitigate the effects on the Department of Defense of a reduction in the discretionary spending limit or the sequestration of direct spending under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) or a sequestration under section 251(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 901(a)(1)); and

(B) is necessary in the national interest.

(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this section in a fiscal year may not exceed $50,000,000,000.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR TRANSFERS BETWEEN MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS.—A transfer of funds between military personnel authorizations shall not be counted toward the dollar limitation in paragraph (2).

(4) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED.—Amounts of authorizations transferred pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) to transfer authorizations—

(1) may only be used to provide authority for items that have a higher priority than the items from which authority is transferred;

(2) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress; and

(3) may not reduce the amount authorized for the fiscal year concerned for an item by an amount in excess of the amount equal to 50 percent of the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for that fiscal year for that item.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress of each proposed use of the transfer authority in subsection (a).

(d) CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL.—A transfer may not occur under the authority in subsection (a) if Congress enacts a joint resolution disapproving the transfer within the 30-day period beginning on the notice to Congress of the transfer pursuant to subsection (c).

(e) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—A transfer made from one account to another under the authority of this section shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for the account to which the amount is transferred by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(f) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to transfer funds under this section in addition to any other authority available to the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds for the Department of Defense under any other provision of law.

(g) SUNSET.—The authority to transfer funds under this section shall expire on September 30, 2023.

SA 1547. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle ____—Bonuses for Cost-cutting Contracting

SEC. ____. PREFERENCE FOR COST-CUTTING DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised to establish a preference for the use by the Department of Defense of contractors with an established record of completing contracts under budget. The regulations as so revised shall provide that, in the evaluation of bids for a contract, the bid from a contractor that has achieved an average cost savings for its last three completed Department of Defense contracts within a contract cost category described under subsection (b) shall be discounted as provided under subsection (c) for purposes of price comparison.

(b) CONTRACT COST CATEGORIES.—For purposes of this section, contract cost categories for total contract awards are as follows:

(1) Under $1,000,000.

(2) Greater than or equal to $1,000,000 and less than $5,000,000.

(3) Greater than or equal to $5,000,000 and less than $10,000,000.

(4) Greater than or equal to $10,000,000 and less than $25,000,000.

(5) Greater than or equal to $25,000,000 and less than $50,000,000.

(6) Greater than or equal to $50,000,000 and less than $100,000,000

(7) Greater than or equal to $100,000,000.

(c) CALCULATION OF DISCOUNT.—

(1) CONTRACT SAVINGS WITHIN SAME OR HIGHER CONTRACT COST CATEGORY.—A bid for a contract shall be discounted pursuant to subsection (a) by an amount equal to the average percentage cost savings of the last three completed Department of Defense contracts within a contract cost category if such contract cost category is the same as or higher than the contract cost category of the contract that is being bid upon.

(2) CONTRACT SAVINGS WITHIN LOWER CONTRACT COST CATEGORY.—A bid for a contract shall be discounted pursuant to subsection (a) by an amount equal to the average cost savings of the last three completed Department of Defense contracts within a contract cost category if such contract cost category is lower than the contract cost category of the contract that is being bid upon.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR CONTRACTS EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN $100,000,000.—In the case of a bid for a contract in the contract cost category set forth in subsection (b)(7), the bid shall be discounted pursuant to subsection (a)—

(A) by an amount equal to the average cost savings of the last three completed Department of Defense contracts if—

(i) the contract cost category for such contracts is lower than such contract cost category; or

(ii) the contract cost category for such contracts is the same as the contract being bid upon, but the average value of such contracts is less than the lower of—

(I) 75 percent of the value of the contract being bid upon; or

(II) the amount equal to the value of such contract minus $50,000,000; or

(B) by an amount equal to the average percentage cost savings of the last three completed Department of Defense contracts within the same contract cost category if the average value of such contracts is equal to or greater than—

(i) 75 percent of the value of the contract being bid upon; or

(ii) the amount equal to the value of such contract minus $50,000,000.

SEC. ____. USE OF FUNDS SAVED THROUGH CONTRACT SAVINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that, of the total amount saved by the Department of Defense on a contract completed after the date of the enactment of this Act as a result of the contract costing less than the amount bid by the contractor—

(1) 50 percent shall be awarded to the contractor; and

(2) 50 percent shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of the agency awarding a contract described under subsection (a) shall certify that the savings achieved under the contract were not the result of any degradation in the quality of the goods or services provided under the contract before any funds are distributed under such subsection.

(2) HEAD OF AN AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''head of an agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 2302(1) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 1548. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE AND OVERLAPPING AGENCIES, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government—

(1) use available administrative authority to eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government agencies, programs, and activities with duplicative and overlapping missions as identified in Government Accountability Office reports on duplication and overlap in Government programs;

(2) identify and submit to Congress a report setting the legislative action required to further eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government agencies, programs, and activities with duplicative and overlapping missions as identified in the reports referred to in paragraph (1); and

(3) determine the total cost savings that—

(A) will accrue to each department, agency, and office effected by an action under paragraph (1) as a result of the actions taken under that paragraph; and

(B) could accrue to each department, agency, and office effected by an action under paragraph (2) as a result of the actions proposed to be taken under that paragraph using the legislative authority set forth under that paragraph.

SA 1549. Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1229, add the following:

(c) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to promote a stable and unified Iraq, including by directly providing the Kurdistan Regional Government military and security forces associated with the Government of Iraq with defense articles, defense services, and related training, on an emergency and temporary basis, to more effectively partner with the United States and other international coalition members to defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(d) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) MILITARY ASSISTANCE.—The President, in consultation with the Government of Iraq, is authorized to provide defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to Kurdistan Regional Government military and security forces associated with the Government of Iraq for the purpose of supporting international coalition efforts against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and any successor group or associated forces.

(2) DEFENSE EXPORTS.—The President is authorized to issue licenses authorizing United States exporters to export defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government military and security forces described in paragraph (1). For purposes of processing applications for such export licenses, the President is authorized to accept End Use Certificates approved by the Kurdistan Regional Government.

(3) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance authorized under paragraph (1) and exports authorized under paragraph (2) may include anti-tank and anti-armor weapons, armored vehicles, long-range artillery, crew-served weapons and ammunition, secure command and communications equipment, body armor, helmets, logistics equipment, excess defense articles and other military assistance that the President determines to be appropriate.

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—

(1) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Assistance authorized under subsection (b)(1) and licenses for exports authorized under subsection (d)(2) shall be provided pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), notwithstanding any requirement in such applicable provisions of law that a recipient of assistance of the type authorized under subsection (d)(1) shall be a country or international organization. In addition, any requirement in such provisions of law applicable to such countries or international organizations concerning the provision of end use retransfers and other assurance required for transfers of such assistance should be secured from the Kurdistan Regional Government.

(2) CONSTRUCTION AS PRECEDENT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as establishing a precedent for the future provision of assistance described in subsection (d) to organizations other than a country or international organization.

(f) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(A) A timeline for the provision of defense articles, defense services, and related training under the authority of subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2).

(B) A description of mechanisms and procedures for end-use monitoring of such defense articles, defense services, and related training.

(C) How such defense articles, defense services, and related training would contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States, as well as impact security in the region.

(2) UPDATES.—Not later than 180 days after the submittal of the report required by paragraph (1), and every 180 days thereafter through the termination pursuant to subsection (i) of the authority in subsection (d), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report updating the previous report submitted under this subsection. In addition to any matters so updated, each report shall include a description of any delays, and the circumstances surrounding such delays, in the delivery of defense articles, defense services, and related training to the Kurdistan Regional Government pursuant to the authority in subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2).

(3) FORM.—Any report under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(g) NOTIFICATION.—The President should provide notification to the Government of Iraq, when practicable, not later than 15 days before providing defense articles, defense services, or related training to the Kurdistan Regional Government under the authority of subsection (d)(1) or (d)(2).

(h) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''defense article'', ''defense service'', and ''training'' have the meanings given those terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(i) TERMINATION.—The authority to provide defense articles, defense services, and related training under subsection (d)(1) and the authority to issue licenses for exports authorized under subsection (d)(2) shall terminate on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1550. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES TO PERFORM ABORTIONS.

Section 1093 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—''.

SA 1551. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. STUDY AND REPORT ON POLICY CHANGES TO THE JOINT TRAVEL REGULATIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the impact of the policy changes to the Joint Travel Regulations for the Uniformed Service Members and Department of Defense Civilian Employees related to flat rate per diem for long term temporary duty travel that took effect on November 1, 2014. The study shall assess the following:

(1) The impact of such changes on shipyard workers who travel on long-term temporary duty assignments.

(2) Whether such changes have discouraged employees of the Department of Defense, including civilian employees at shipyards and depots, from volunteering for important temporary duty travel assignments.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the study required by subsection (a).

SA 1552. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 603 the following:

SEC. 603A. ADJUSTMENTS OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING IN AREAS NOT ACCURATELY ASSESSED BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HOUSING MARKET SURVEYS.

Section 403(b)(7)(A) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) is located in an area in which the most recent determination of costs of adequate housing for purposes of this subsection does not accurately reflect the actual costs of adequate housing in such area.''.

SA 1553. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. _____. DESIGNATION OF MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AS HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS.

(a) PHSA.—Section 332(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254e(a)(1)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting ''and medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs (including State homes, as defined in section 101(19) of title 38, United States Code)'' after ''(42 U.S.C. 1395x(aa)),''.

(b) CONCURRENT BENEFITS.—

(1) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 338A(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254l(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'';

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) not be participating in the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Professionals Educational Assistance Program under chapter 76 of title 38, United States Code.''.

(2) DEBT REDUCTION PROGRAM.—Section 338B(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254l-1(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) not be participating in the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Professionals Educational Assistance Program under chapter 76 of title 38, United States Code.''.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the National Health Service Corps Program under subpart II of part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254d et seq.), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall consult with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to health professional shortage areas that are medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs (including State homes, as defined in section 101(19) of title 38, United States Code).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1554. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XXVIII, add the following:

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 2831. ELIMINATION OF STATE MATCHING REQUIREMENT FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADES AND RENEWABLE ENERGY AT NATIONAL GUARD READINESS CENTERS.

Section 18236(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) by striking ''A contribution'' and inserting ''(1) Subject to paragraph (2), a contribution''; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following new paragraph:

''(2) If a readiness center or armory project for which a contribution is made under paragraph (4) or (5) of section 18233(a) of this title consists of or includes an energy efficiency upgrade, the Secretary of Defense shall cover—

''(A) 100 percent of the cost of architectural, engineering, and design services related to the upgrade or renewable energy (including advance architectural, engineering, and design services under section 18233(e) of this title), as provided in paragraph (1)(A); and

''(B) 100 percent of the cost of construction related to the upgrade or renewable energy, notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), and payment of such cost shall not be considered in applying the limitation in such subparagraph.''.

SA 1555. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

TITLE XVII—METAL THEFT

SEC. 1701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Metal Theft Prevention Act of 2015''.

SEC. 1702. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term ''critical infrastructure'' has the meaning given the term in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e));

(2) the term ''recycling agent'' means any person engaged in the business of purchasing specified metal for reuse or recycling, without regard to whether that person is engaged in the business of recycling or otherwise processing the purchased specified metal for reuse; and

(3) the term ''specified metal'' means metal that—

(A)(i) is marked with the name, logo, or initials of a city, county, State, or Federal government entity, a railroad, an electric, gas, or water company, a telephone company, a cable company, a retail establishment, a beer supplier or distributor, or a public utility; or

(ii) has been altered for the purpose of removing, concealing, or obliterating a name, logo, or initials described in clause (i) through burning or cutting of wire sheathing or other means; or

(B) is part of—

(i) a street light pole or street light fixture;

(ii) a road or bridge guard rail;

(iii) a highway or street sign;

(iv) a water meter cover;

(v) a storm water grate;

(vi) unused or undamaged building construction or utility material;

(vii) a historical marker;

(viii) a grave marker or cemetery urn;

(ix) a utility access cover; or

(x) a container used to transport or store beer with a capacity of 5 gallons or more;

(C) is a wire or cable commonly used by communications and electrical utilities; or

(D) is copper, aluminum, and other metal (including any metal combined with other materials) that is valuable for recycling or reuse as raw metal, except for—

(i) aluminum cans; and

(ii) motor vehicles, the purchases of which are reported to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (established under section 30502 of title 49, United States Code).

SEC. 1703. THEFT OF SPECIFIED METAL.

(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful to knowingly steal specified metal—

(1) being used in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce; and

(2) the theft of which is from and harms critical infrastructure.

(b) PENALTY.—Any person who commits an offense described in subsection (a) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

SEC. 1704. DOCUMENTATION OF OWNERSHIP OR AUTHORITY TO SELL.

(a) OFFENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall be unlawful for a recycling agent to purchase specified metal described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 1702(3), unless—

(A) the seller, at the time of the transaction, provides documentation of ownership of, or other proof of the authority of the seller to sell, the specified metal; and

(B) there is a reasonable basis to believe that the documentation or other proof of authority provided under subparagraph (A) is valid.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth a requirement on recycling agents to obtain documentation of ownership or proof of authority to sell specified metal before purchasing specified metal.

(3) RESPONSIBILITY OF RECYCLING AGENT.—A recycling agent is not required to independently verify the validity of the documentation or other proof of authority described in paragraph (1).

(4) PURCHASE OF STOLEN METAL.—It shall be unlawful for a recycling agent to purchase any specified metal that the recycling agent—

(A) knows to be stolen; or

(B) should know or believe, based upon commercial experience and practice, to be stolen.

(b) CIVIL PENALTY.—A person who knowingly violates subsection (a) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 for each violation.

SEC. 1705. TRANSACTION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) RECORDING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a recycling agent shall maintain a written or electronic record of each purchase of specified metal.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth recording requirements that are substantially similar to the requirements described in paragraph (3) for the purchase of specified metal.

(3) CONTENTS.—A record under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the name and address of the recycling agent; and

(B) for each purchase of specified metal—

(i) the date of the transaction;

(ii) a description of the specified metal purchased using widely used and accepted industry terminology;

(iii) the amount paid by the recycling agent;

(iv) the name and address of the person to which the payment was made;

(v) the name of the person delivering the specified metal to the recycling agent, including a distinctive number from a Federal or State government-issued photo identification card and a description of the type of the identification; and

(vi) the license plate number and State-of-issue, make, and model, if available, of the vehicle used to deliver the specified metal to the recycling agent.

(4) REPEAT SELLERS.—A recycling agent may comply with the requirements of this

subsection with respect to a purchase of specified metal from a person from which the recycling agent has previously purchased specified metal by—

(A) reference to the existing record relating to the seller; and

(B) recording any information for the transaction that is different from the record relating to the previous purchase from that person.

(5) RECORD RETENTION PERIOD.—A recycling agent shall maintain any record required under this subsection for not less than 2 years after the date of the transaction to which the record relates.

(6) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Any information collected or retained under this section may be disclosed to any Federal, State, or local law enforcement authority or as otherwise directed by a court of law.

(b) PURCHASES IN EXCESS OF $100.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a recycling agent may not pay cash for a single purchase of specified metal of more than $100. For purposes of this paragraph, more than 1 purchase in any 48-hour period from the same seller shall be considered to be a single purchase.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth a maximum amount for cash payments for the purchase of specified metal.

(3) PAYMENT METHOD.—

(A) OCCASIONAL SELLERS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), for any purchase of specified metal of more than $100 a recycling agent shall make payment by check that—

(i) is payable to the seller; and

(ii) includes the name and address of the seller.

(B) ESTABLISHED COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS.—A recycling agent may make payments for a purchase of specified metal of more than $100 from a governmental or commercial supplier of specified metal with which the recycling agent has an established commercial relationship by electronic funds transfer or other established commercial transaction payment method through a commercial bank if the recycling agent maintains a written record of the payment that identifies the seller, the amount paid, and the date of the purchase.

(c) CIVIL PENALTY.—A person who knowingly violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation, except that a person who commits a minor violation shall be subject to a penalty of not more than $1,000.

SEC. 1706. ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

The Attorney General may bring an enforcement action in an appropriate United States district court against any person that engages in conduct that violates this title.

SEC. 1707. ENFORCEMENT BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An attorney general or equivalent regulator of a State may bring a civil action in the name of the State, as parens patriae on behalf of natural persons residing in the State, in any district court of the United States or other competent court having jurisdiction over the defendant, to secure monetary or equitable relief for a violation of this title.

(b) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days before the date on which an action under subsection (a) is filed, the attorney general or equivalent regulator of the State involved shall provide to the Attorney General—

(1) written notice of the action; and

(2) a copy of the complaint for the action.

(c) ATTORNEY GENERAL ACTION.—Upon receiving notice under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall have the right—

(1) to intervene in the action;

(2) upon so intervening, to be heard on all matters arising therein;

(3) to remove the action to an appropriate district court of the United States; and

(4) to file petitions for appeal.

(d) PENDING FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS.—If a civil action has been instituted by the Attorney General for a violation of this title, no State may, during the pendency of the action instituted by the Attorney General, institute a civil action under this title against any defendant named in the complaint in the civil action for any violation alleged in the complaint.

(e) CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of bringing a civil action under subsection (a), nothing in this section regarding notification shall be construed to prevent the attorney general or equivalent regulator of the State from exercising any powers conferred under the laws of that State to—

(1) conduct investigations;

(2) administer oaths or affirmations; or

(3) compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

SEC. 1708. DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and policy statements applicable to a person convicted of a criminal violation of section 1703 or any other Federal criminal law based on the theft of specified metal by such person.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Sentencing Commission shall—

(1) ensure that the sentencing guidelines and policy statements reflect the—

(A) serious nature of the theft of specified metal; and

(B) need for an effective deterrent and appropriate punishment to prevent such theft;

(2) consider the extent to which the guidelines and policy statements appropriately account for—

(A) the potential and actual harm to the public from the offense, including any damage to critical infrastructure;

(B) the amount of loss, or the costs associated with replacement or repair, attributable to the offense;

(C) the level of sophistication and planning involved in the offense; and

(D) whether the offense was intended to or had the effect of creating a threat to public health or safety, injury to another person, or death;

(3) account for any additional aggravating or mitigating circumstances that may justify exceptions to the generally applicable sentencing ranges;

(4) assure reasonable consistency with other relevant directives and with other sentencing guidelines and policy statements; and

(5) assure that the sentencing guidelines and policy statements adequately meet the purposes of sentencing as set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 1709. STATE AND LOCAL LAW NOT PREEMPTED.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to preempt any State or local law regulating the sale or purchase of specified metal, the reporting of such transactions, or any other aspect of the metal recycling industry.

SEC. 1710. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1556. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBT ENTERED INTO DURING MILITARY SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 527) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''ON DEBT INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE'' after ''LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT ON DEBT INCURRED DURING SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE.—An obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year that is incurred by a servicemember, or the servicemember and the servicemember's spouse jointly, during military service to consolidate or refinance one or more student loans incurred by the servicemember before such military service shall not bear an interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent during the period of military service.'';

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by inserting ''or (2)'' after ''paragraph (1)''; and

(5) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)''.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the interest rate limitation in subsection (a)'' and inserting ''an interest rate limitation in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''AS OF DATE OF ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''in the case of an obligation or liability covered by subsection (a)(1), or as of the date the servicemember (or servicemember and spouse jointly) incurs the obligation or liability concerned under subsection (a)(2)''.

(c) STUDENT LOAN DEFINED.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) STUDENT LOAN.—The term 'student loan' means the following:

''(A) A Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

''(B) A private student loan as that term is defined in section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)).''.

SA 1557. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. ARSENAL AND ORGANIC INDUSTRIAL BASE SKILLS SUSTAINMENT AND DOMESTIC PRODUCTION INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the budget of the President for a fiscal year is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, Unites States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the equipment, weapons, weapons systems, components, subcomponents, and end-items purchased from foreign entities and identify those items which could be manufactured in the military arsenals of the United States or the military depots of the United States to meet the goals of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, as well as a plan for moving that workload into the military arsenals or depots.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) Identification of items purchased by foreign manufacturers meeting the definition of—

(A) section 8302(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code, with an exception granted under subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 8302(a)(2) of such title;

(B) section 2533b(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, with an exception granted under section 2533(b) of such title; and

(C) section 2534(a) of title 10, United States Code, with a waiver exercised under paragraph (1), (2), (4), or (5) of section 2534(d) of such title.

(2) Assessment of the skills required to manufacture the items identified in paragraph (1) and comparison of those skills with skills required to meet the critical capabilities identified by the Army Report to Congress on Critical Manufacturing Capabilities and Capacities, dated August 2013, and the core logistics capabilities identified by each military service pursuant to section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, as of the date of enactment of this bill.

(3) Identification of the tooling, equipment and facilities upgrades necessary for a military arsenal or depot to perform the manufacturing workload identified under paragraph (1).

(4) Identification of workload identified in paragraph (1) most appropriate for transfer to military arsenals or depots to meet the goals of subsection (a) or requirements of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) A plan to transfer manufacturing workload identified in paragraph (4) to the military arsenals or depots within a stated timeframe.

(6) Such other information the Secretary considers necessary for adherence to paragraphs (4) and (5).

(7) An explanation of the rationale for continuing to sole-source manufacturing workload identified in paragraph (1) from a foreign source rather than a military arsenal, depot, or other organic facility.

SA 1558. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. ____. ARSENAL INSTALLATION REUTILIZATION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (h), (i), and (j) as subsections (i), (j), and (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

''(h) ARSENAL INSTALLATION REUTILIZATION AUTHORITY.—(1) In the case of a military manufacturing arsenal, the Secretary concerned may authorize leases and contracts for a term of up to 25 years, notwithstanding subsection (b)(1), if the Secretary determines that a lease or contract of that duration will promote the national defense or be in the public interest for the purpose of—

''(A) helping to maintain the viability of the military manufacturing arsenal and any military installations on which it is located;

''(B) eliminating, or at least reducing, the cost of Government ownership of the military manufacturing arsenal, including the costs of operations and maintenance, the costs of environmental remediation, and other costs; and

''(C) leveraging private investment at the military manufacturing arsenal through long-term facility use contracts, property management contracts, leases, or other agreements that support and advance the preceding purposes.

''(2)(A) The Secretary concerned may delegate the authority provided by this subsection to the commander of the military manufacturing arsenal or, if part of a larger military installation, the installation commander.

''(B) The delegated authority does not include the authority to enter into a lease or contract under this section to carry out any activity covered by section 4544(b) of this title related to—

''(i) the sale of articles manufactured by a military manufacturing arsenal;

''(ii) the sale of services performed by a military manufacturing arsenal; or

''(iii) the performance of manufacturing work at the military manufacturing arsenal.

''(3) In this subsection, the term 'military manufacturing arsenal' means a Government-owned, Government-operated defense plant of the Department of the Defense that manufactures weapons, weapon components, or both.''.

SA 1559. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 832. PROHIBITION ON AWARDING OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

''(a) PROHIBITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

''(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

''(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is owned by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

''(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of $10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

''(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

''(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

''(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

''(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

''(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

''(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes before, on, or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

''(B) after the acquisition, either—

''(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

''(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

''(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations

for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on May 8, 2014.

''(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

''(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

''(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

''(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

''(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

''(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

''(c) WAIVER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security or is necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or Federally-funded programs that provide health benefits to individuals.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

''(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

''(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'expanded affiliated group', 'foreign incorporated entity', 'person', 'domestic', and 'foreign' have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

''(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

''2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.''

(b) REGULATIONS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall, for purposes of section 2338(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(2) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

SA 1560. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. MONITORING OF ADVERSE EVENT DATA ON DIETARY SUPPLEMENT USE BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall modify the electronic health record system of the military health system to include data regarding the use by members of the Armed Forces of dietary supplements and adverse events with respect to dietary supplements.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The modifications required by subsection (a) shall ensure that the electronic health record system of the military health system—

(1) records adverse event report data regarding dietary supplement use by members of the Armed Forces;

(2) generates standard reports on adverse event data that can be aggregated for analysis;

(3) issues automated alerts to signal a significant change in adverse event reporting or to signal a risk of interaction with a medication or other treatment; and

(4) is interoperable with the MedWatch form of the Food and Drug Administration (as described in section 760(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379aa(d))).

(c) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall conduct outreach to health care providers in the military health system to educate such providers on the importance of entering adverse event report data regarding dietary supplement use by members of the Armed Forces into the electronic health record system of the military health system and the MedWatch form described in subsection (b)(4).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADVERSE EVENT.—The term ''adverse event'' has the meaning given such term in section 761(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379aa–1(a)).

(2) DIETARY SUPPLEMENT.—The term ''dietary supplement'' has the meaning given such term in section 201(ff) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(ff)).

SA 1561. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 721. REPORTING OF DIETARY SUPPLEMENT USE BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a minimum requirement for the Department of Defense for the reporting by each member of the Armed Forces of the use by such member of dietary supplements.

(b) OTHER POLICIES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—Each Secretary of a military department may establish a different policy, or continue an existing policy, relating to the reporting of the use of dietary supplements by members of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of such Secretary only if such policy meets at least the minimum requirement established under subsection (a), as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) INFORMATION IN HEALTH RECORD SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the electronic health record system of the military health system—

(1) records dietary supplement use by members of the Armed Forces;

(2) generates standard reports on dietary supplement use that can be aggregated for analysis; and

(3) issues automated alerts to signal a significant change in dietary supplement use.

(d) DIETARY SUPPLEMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''dietary supplement'' has the meaning given such term in section 201(ff) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(ff)).

SA 1562. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 654. LIMITATION ON SALE OF DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS IN COMMISSARY AND EXCHANGE STORES.

(a) LIMITATION.—Section 2484(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4)(A) A dietary supplement may be sold by a commissary store or exchange store, or a retail establishment operating on a military installation, only if—

''(i) the dietary supplement has been verified by an independent third party for recognized public standards of identity, purity, strength, and composition, and adherence to related process standards; or

''(ii) the dietary supplement complies with Defense Commissary Agency policy on inventory carried by commissaries.

''(B) The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, identify the third parties that may provide verification under this paragraph.

''(C) In this paragraph, the term 'dietary supplement' has the meaning given that term in section 201(ff) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(ff)).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to sales that occur on or after such effective date.

SA 1563. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF DATA SECURITY AND TRANSMISSION STANDARDS FOR ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the standards for security and transmission of data to be implemented by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs in deploying the new or updated, as the case may be, electronic health record system of each such Department (required to be deployed by each such Department under section 713 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note)) at military installations and in field environments.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF DATA.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include information on standards for transmission of data between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs and standards for transmission of data between each such Department and private sector entities.

SA 1564. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. INCREASE IN CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 801(b)(3) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 597(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$55,000'' and inserting ''$110,000''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''$110,000'' and inserting ''$220,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) that occur on or after such date.

SA 1565. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 31, strike line 1 and all that follows through ''assessment'' on line 5 and insert the following: ''A Capabilities Based Assessment or equivalent report to assess capability gaps and associated capability requirements and risks for the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship, which is proposed to commence with LCS 33. This assessment or equivalent report''.

SA 1566. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 645, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(4) At the 2006 North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit in Riga, North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries agreed to commit a minimum of two per cent of their national income or Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to spending on defense.

(5) At the 2014 North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit in Wales, North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries agreed that ''allies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defense will aim to continue to do so'' and that ''allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defense is below this level will: halt any decline in defense expenditure; aim to increase defense expenditure in real terms as GDP grows; aim to move towards the two percent guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO's capability shortfalls''.

(6) In 2015, four out of the 28 North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries, including the United States, meet the two percent target.

On page 646, strike line 16 and insert the following:

spending; and

(5) the North Atlantic Treaty Organization member countries are strongly urged to meet their commitment to spend two percent of their Gross Domestic Product on defense.

SA 1567. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 728, strike line 12 and all that follows through page 729, line 8, and insert the following:

SEC. 1643. AIR DEFENSE CAPABILITY AT NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION MISSILE DEFENSE SITES.

(a) DETERMINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) determine whether the Aegis Ashore site in Romania and the site to be deployed in the Republic of Poland are capable of defending United States and allied personnel deployed at such sites from air warfare threats, including cruise missiles; and

(2) submit to the congressional defense committees notice of such determination.

(b) PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if the Secretary determines pursuant to subsection (a)(1) that the Aegis Ashore sites described in such subsection are not capable of defending as described in such subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) submit to the congressional defense committees, along with the annual budget request submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2017, a plan to ensure that such sites have, by not later than December 31, 2018, anti-air warfare capability that is capable of defending as described in such subsection; and

(B) ensure that, not later than December 31, 2018, both sites described in such subsection have the capability described in such subsection.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan submitted under paragraph (1)(A) shall include a descriptions of the contributions that the Secretary anticipates from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and members of such organization to ensure the sites described in subsection (a)(1) have anti-air warfare capability that is capable of defending as described in such subsection.

(3) DELAY OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary may delay the requirement in paragraph (1)(B) if the Director of the Missile Defense Agency submits to the congressional defense committees a certification in writing that such delay is necessary to ensure initial operational capability of the ballistic missile defense system at such sites in accordance with the timeline in the 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review.

SA 1568. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. UNAUTHORIZED DEALINGS IN SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL.

Section 57b.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2077(b)(2)) is amended in the first sentence in the proviso by inserting ''the Director of National Intelligence,'' after ''Commerce,''.

SA 1569. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 565. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE MILITARY CHILD CARE SYSTEM AND PROVIDERS OF CHILD CARE SERVICES AND YOUTH PROGRAM SERVICES FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS.

(a) EMPLOYEES OF MILITARY CHILD CARE SYSTEM.—Section 1792 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—The criminal background check of child care employees under this section that is required pursuant to section 231 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13041) shall be conducted pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in accordance with the provisions of section 658H of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858f).''.

(b) PROVIDERS OF CHILD CARE SERVICES AND YOUTH PROGRAM SERVICES.—Section 1798 of such title is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—A provider of child care services or youth program services may not provide such services under this section unless such provider complies with the requirements for criminal background checks under section 658H of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858f) for the State in which such services are provided.''.

SA 1570. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1283. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DEFENSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States has an upgraded, strategic-plus relationship with India based on regional cooperation, space science cooperation, and defense cooperation.

(2) The defense relationship between the United States and the Republic of India is strengthened by the common commitment of both countries to democracy.

(3) The United States and the Republic of India share a common and long-standing commitment to civilian control of the military.

(4) The United States and the Republic of India have increasingly worked together on defense cooperation across a range of activities, exercises, initiatives, and research.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to expand defense cooperation with the Republic of India;

(2) welcome the role of the Republic of India in providing security and stability in the Indo-Pacific region and beyond;

(3) work cooperatively with the Republic of India on matters relating to our common defense;

(4) vigorously support the implementation of the United States-India Defense Framework Agreement; and

(5) support the India Defense Trade and Technology Initiative.

SA 1571. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE DIVERSITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States military includes individuals with a variety of national, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds that have roots all over the world.

(2) In addition to diverse backgrounds, members of the Armed Forces come from numerous religious traditions, including Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh, non-denominational, nonpracticing, and many more.

(3) Members of the Armed Forces from diverse backgrounds and religious traditions have lost their lives or been injured defending the national security of the United States.

(4) Diversity contributes to the strength of the Armed Forces, and service members from different backgrounds and religious traditions share the same goal of defending the United States.

(5) The unity of the Armed Forces reflects the strength in diversity that makes the United States a great Nation.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to recognize and promote diversity in the Armed Forces; and

(2) honor those from all diverse backgrounds and religious traditions who have made sacrifices in serving the United States through the Armed Forces.

SA 1572. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCE WITH THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea has served as an anchor for stability, security, and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula, in the Asia-Pacific region, and around the world;

(2) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to strengthen and adapt the bilateral, regional, and global scope of the comprehensive strategic alliance between the two nations, to serve as a linchpin of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, recognizing the shared values of democracy, human rights, free and open marketS, and the rule of law, as reaffirmed in the May 2013 ''Joint Declaration in Commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Alliance between the Republic of Korea and the United States of America'';

(3) the United States and the Republic of Korea continue to broaden and deepen the alliance by strengthening the combined defense posture on the Korean Peninsula, enhancing mutual security based on the Republic of Korea-United States Mutual Defense Treaty, and promoting cooperation for regional and global security in the 21st century;

(4) the United States and the Republic of Korea share deep concerns that the nuclear, cyber, and ballistic missiles programs of North Korea and its repeated provocations pose grave threats to peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia and recognize that both nations are determined to achieve the peaceful denuclearization of North Korea and remain fully committed to continuing close cooperation on the full range of issues related to North Korea;

(5) the United States and the Republic of Korea are particularly concerned that the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of North Korea, including North Korean efforts to miniaturize their nuclear technology and improve the mobility of their ballistic missiles, have gathered significant momentum and are poised to expand in the coming years;

(6) the Republic of Korea has made progress in enhancing future warfighting and interoperability capabilities by taking steps toward procuring Patriot Advanced Capability missiles, F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft, and RQ–4 Global Hawk Surveillance Aircraft;

(7) the United States supports the vision of a Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons, free from the fear of war, and peacefully reunited on the basis of democratic and free market principles, as articulated in President Park's address in Dresden, Germany; and

(8) the United States and the Republic of Korea share the future interests of both nations in securing peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia.

SA 1573. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10___. REPORT ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind, of the United States Government to the United Nations and its affiliated agencies and related bodies during the previous fiscal year.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) The total amount of all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind, of the United States Government to the United Nations and United Nations affiliated agencies and related bodies.

(2) The approximate percentage of United States Government contributions to each United Nations affiliated agency or body in such fiscal year when compared with all contributions to such agency or body from any source in such fiscal year.

(3) For each such contribution—

(A) the amount of the contribution;

(B) a description of the contribution (including whether assessed or voluntary);

(C) the department or agency of the United States Government responsible for the contribution;

(D) the purpose of the contribution; and

(E) the United Nations or United Nations affiliated agency or related body receiving the contribution.

(c) SCOPE OF INITIAL REPORT.—The first report required under subsection (a) shall include the information required under this section for the previous five fiscal years.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 14 days after submitting a report required under subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall post a public version of the report on a text-based, searchable, and publicly available Internet website.

SA 1574. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 515. PILOT PROGRAM ON JOB PLACEMENT AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND THE RESERVES.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to enhance the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members of the National Guard and the Reserves.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(b) ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.—The members of the National Guard and the Reserves eligible for job placement assistance and related employment services under the pilot program are such categories of members as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of the pilot program.

(c) ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES.—The mechanisms assessed under the pilot program shall include mechanisms as follows:

(1) To identify unemployed and underemployed members of the National Guard and the Reserves.

(2) To provide job placement assistance and related employment services to members of the National Guard and the Reserves on an individualized basis, including—

(A) resume writing and interview preparation assistance and services;

(B) cost-effective job placement services;

(C) post-employment follow up services; and

(D) such other assistance and services as the Secretary shall specify for purposes of the pilot program.

(d) DISCHARGE.—

(1) DISCHARGE THROUGH ADJUTANTS GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for the carrying out of the pilot program through the Adjutants General of the States.

(2) OUTREACH.—The Adjutants General shall take appropriate actions to facilitate participation in the pilot program by eligible members of the National Guard and the Reserves, including through outreach to unit commanders.

(e) STATE MATCHING SHARE OF FUNDS.—In order for the pilot program to be carried out in a State, the State shall agree to contribute to the carrying out of the pilot program an amount, derived from non-Federal sources, equal to at least 30 percent of the funds provided by the Secretary for carrying out the pilot program in the State.

(f) EVALUATION METRICS.—The Secretary shall establish metrics for purposes of evaluating the success of the pilot program.

(g) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis a report on the activities, if any, under the pilot program during the preceding fiscal year.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) A description of the activities under the pilot program during the fiscal year covered by such report, set forth by State in which the pilot program was carried out, including—

(i) the number of members of the National Guard and the Reserves who participated in the pilot program;

(ii) the job placement assistance and related employment services provided to such members under the pilot program; and

(iii) the number of members of the National Guard and Reserves who obtained employment through participation in the pilot program.

(B) A comparison of the pilot program with other programs conducted by the Department of Defense during such fiscal year to provide job placement assistance and related employment services to unemployed and underemployed members of the National Guard and the Reserves, including the costs of services per individual under such programs.

(C) An assessment of the impact of the pilot program, and increased employment among members of the National Guard and the Reserves as a result of the pilot program, on the readiness of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(D) Such recommendations for improvement or extension of the pilot program as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(E) Such other matters relating to the pilot program as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(h) LIMITATION ON FUNDING.—The amount obligated by the Secretary in any fiscal year to carry out the pilot program may not exceed $20,000,000.

(i) SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the authority to carry out the pilot program shall expire on September 30, 2019.

(2) TWO-YEAR EXTENSION.—The Secretary may continue to carry out the pilot program for a period, not in excess of two years, after September 30, 2019, if the Secretary considers continuation of the pilot program for such period to be advisable.

SA 1575. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. PILOT PROGRAM ON PROVISION OF FURNITURE, HOUSEHOLD ITEMS, AND OTHER ASSISTANCE TO HOMELESS VETERANS MOVING INTO PERMANENT HOUSING.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall commence a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of awarding grants to eligible entities to provide furniture, household items, and other assistance to covered veterans moving into permanent housing to facilitate the settlement of such covered veterans in such housing.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—For purposes of the pilot program, an eligible entity is any of the following:

(A) A veterans service agency.

(B) A veterans service organization.

(C) A nongovernmental organization that—

(i) is described in paragraph (3), (4), or (19) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such code; and

(ii) has an established history of providing assistance to veterans or the homeless.

(3) COVERED VETERANS.—For purposes of the pilot program, a covered veteran is any of the following:

(A) A formerly homeless veteran who is receiving housing, clinical services, and case management assistance under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)).

(B) A veteran who is receiving—

(i) assistance from, or is the beneficiary of a service furnished by, a program that is in receipt of a grant under section 2011 of title 38, United States Code; or

(ii) services for which per diem payment is received under section 2012 of such title.

(C) A veteran who is—

(i) a beneficiary of the outreach program carried out under section 2022(e) of such title; or

(ii) in receipt of referral or counseling services from the program carried out under section 2023 of such title.

(D) A veteran who is receiving a service or assistance under section 2031 of such title.

(E) A veteran who is residing in therapeutic housing operated under section 2032 of such title.

(F) A veteran who is receiving domiciliary services under section 2043 of such title or domiciliary care under section 1710(b) of such title.

(G) A veteran who is receiving supportive services under section 2044 of such title.

(4) DURATION.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program during the three-year period beginning on the date of the commencement of the pilot program.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program through the award of grants to eligible entities for the provision of furniture and other household items as described in subsection (a)(1).

(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant awarded under the pilot program shall not exceed $500,000.

(c) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—

(1) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under the pilot program shall submit to the Secretary an application therefor in such form and in such manner as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) SELECTION PRIORITY.—

(A) COMMUNITIES WITH GREATEST NEED.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, the Secretary shall give priority in the awarding of grants under the pilot program to eligible entities who serve communities which the Secretary determines have the greatest need of homeless services.

(B) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary may give priority in the awarding of grants under the pilot program to achieve a fair distribution, as determined by the Secretary, among eligible entities serving covered veterans in different geographic regions, including in rural communities and tribal lands.

(d) USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each eligible entity receiving a grant under the pilot program shall use the grant—

(A) to coordinate with the Secretary to facilitate distribution of furniture and other household items to covered veterans moving into permanent housing;

(B) to purchase, or otherwise obtain via donation, furniture and household items for use by such covered veterans;

(C) to distribute such furniture and household items to such covered veterans; and

(D) to pay for background checks, provide security deposits, provide funds for utilities, and provide moving expenses for such covered veterans that are necessary for the settlement of such covered veterans in such housing.

(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.—A recipient of a grant awarded under the pilot program may not expend more than $2,500 of the amount of the grant awarded for the provision to a single covered veteran of assistance under the pilot program.

(3) MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING.—In the case of an eligible entity receiving a grant under the pilot program that entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary before the date of the enactment of this Act that provides for the provision of furniture and other household items to covered veterans as described in subsection (a) without Federal compensation, the eligible entity may use the grant in accordance with the provisions of such memorandum of understanding in lieu of paragraph (1).

(4) FULL USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A recipient of a grant awarded under the pilot program shall use the full amount of the grant by not later than one year after the date on which the Secretary awards such grant.

(B) RECOVERY.—The Secretary may recover from a recipient of a grant awarded under this section all of the unused amounts of the grant if all of the amounts of the grant are not used—

(i) pursuant to paragraph (1) and subparagraph (A) of this paragraph; or

(ii) in a case described in paragraph (3), pursuant to an applicable memorandum of understanding.

(e) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall conduct outreach, including under chapter 63 of title 38, United States Code, to inform covered veterans about their eligibility to receive household items, furniture, and other assistance under the pilot program.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for—

(1) evaluating an application by an eligible entity for a grant under the pilot program; and

(2) otherwise administering the pilot program.

(g) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 90 days after the last day of the pilot program, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot program.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the pilot program.

(B) The findings of the Secretary with respect to the feasibility and advisability of awarding grants to eligible entities as described in subsection (a)(1).

(C) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for legislative or administrative action to facilitate the settlement of covered veterans into permanent housing.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each year of the pilot program.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) OUTREACH.—The term ''outreach'' has the meaning given such term in section 6301(b)(1) of title 38, United States Code.

(2) VETERANS SERVICE AGENCY.—The term ''veterans service agency'' means a unit of a State government, or a political subdivision thereof, that has primary responsibility for programs and activities of such government or subdivision related to veterans benefits.

(3) VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION.—The term ''veterans service organization'' means any organization recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

SA 1576. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 355. USE OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR FORCE RESERVE FOR INITIAL AIRBORNE RESPONSE TO FIGHTING WILDFIRES.

(a) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.—Subject to subsection (b), in order to prevent the loss of life and reduce property losses from wildfires, section 1535(a)(4) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply to limit the use of interagency agreements with the Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve to procure the services of a unit of the Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve to conduct Defense Support to Civil Authority (DSCA) missions utilizing military fixed-wing aerial firefighting aircraft, including Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System (MAFFS) units, in the airborne response to fighting wildfires.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Section 1535(a)(4) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply to interagency agreements described in subsection (a) only when a requesting agency determines that—

(1) privately contracted fixed-wing aerial firefighting aircraft are unavailable;

(2) there is an unfilled request for fixed-wing aerial firefighting aircraft, including MAFFS units, to perform an initial airborne response; or

(3) fixed-wing aerial firefighting aircraft, including MAFFS units, are needed to supplement privately contracted fixed-wing aerial firefighting aircraft.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as diminishing the role of contractor owned and operated fixed-wing aircraft as the primary source of aerial firefighting assets for the Federal wildland firefighting agencies.

SA 1577. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SECTION 1085. TRANSNATIONAL DRUG TRAFFICKING ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Transnational Drug Trafficking Act of 2015''.

(b) POSSESSION, MANUFACTURE OR DISTRIBUTION FOR PURPOSES OF UNLAWFUL IMPORTATIONS.—Section 1009 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 959) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''It shall'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture or distribute a controlled substance in schedule I or II or flunitrazepam or a listed chemical intending, knowing, or having reasonable cause to believe that such substance or chemical will be unlawfully imported into the United States or into waters within a distance of 12 miles of the coast of the United States.

''(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture or distribute a listed chemical—

''(1) intending or knowing that the listed chemical will be used to manufacture a controlled substance; and

''(2) intending, knowing, or having reasonable cause to believe that the controlled substance will be unlawfully imported into the United States.''.

(c) TRAFFICKING IN COUNTERFEIT GOODS OR SERVICES.—Chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2318(b)(2), by striking ''section 2320(e)'' and inserting ''section 2320(f)''; and

(2) in section 2320—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) traffics in a drug and knowingly uses a counterfeit mark on or in connection with such drug,'';

(B) in subsection (b)(3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''counterfeit drug'' and inserting ''drug that uses a counterfeit mark on or in connection with the drug''; and

(C) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(6) the term 'drug' means a drug, as defined in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).''.

SA 1578. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COONS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

Subtitle I—Uniform Code of Military Justice Reform

SEC. 596. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Military Justice Improvement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 597. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE TO PROCEED TO TRIAL BY COURT-MARTIAL ON CHARGES ON CERTAIN OFFENSES WITH AUTHORIZED MAXIMUM SENTENCE OF CONFINEMENT OF MORE THAN ONE YEAR.

(a) MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in paragraph (2) and not excluded under paragraph (3), the Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the determination under section 830(b) of such chapter (article 30(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on whether to try such charges by court-martial as provided in paragraph (4).

(B) HOMELAND SECURITY.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in paragraph (2) and not excluded under paragraph (3) against a member of the Coast Guard (when it is not operating as a service in the Navy), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide for the determination under section 830(b) of such chapter (article 30(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on whether to try such charges by court-martial as provided in paragraph (4).

(2) COVERED OFFENSES.—An offense specified in this paragraph is an offense as follows:

(A) An offense under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that is triable by court-martial under that chapter for which the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter includes confinement for more than one year.

(B) An offense of retaliation for reporting a crime under section 893 of title 10, United States Code (article 93 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 599B of this Act, regardless of the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter for such offense.

(C) An offense under section 907a of title 10, United States Code (article 107a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 599C of this Act, regardless of the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter for such offense.

(D) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (C) as punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(E) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (C) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(F) An attempt to commit an offense specified in subparagraphs (A) through (E) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(3) EXCLUDED OFFENSES.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to an offense as follows:

(A) An offense under sections 883 through 917 of title 10, United States Code (articles 83 through 117 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under section 933 or 934 of title 10, United States Code (articles 133 and 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(C) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) as punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(D) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(E) An attempt to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (D) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(4) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—The disposition of charges pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following:

(A) The determination whether to try such charges by court-martial shall be made by a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces designated in accordance with regulations prescribed for purposes of this subsection from among commissioned officers of the Armed Forces in grade O–6 or higher who—

(i) are available for detail as trial counsel under section 827 of title 10, United States Code (article 27 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice);

(ii) have significant experience in trials by general or special court-martial; and

(iii) are outside the chain of command of the member subject to such charges.

(B) Upon a determination under subparagraph (A) to try such charges by court-martial, the officer making that determination shall determine whether to try such charges by a general court-martial convened under section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or a special court-martial convened under section 823 of title 10, United States Code (article 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(C) A determination under subparagraph (A) to try charges by court-martial shall include a determination to try all known offenses, including lesser included offenses.

(D) The determination to try such charges by court-martial under subparagraph (A), and by type of court-martial under subparagraph (B), shall be binding on any applicable convening authority for a trial by court-martial on such charges.

(E) The actions of an officer described in subparagraph (A) in determining under that subparagraph whether or not to try charges by court-martial shall be free of unlawful or unauthorized influence or coercion.

(F) The determination under subparagraph (A) not to proceed to trial of such charges by general or special court-martial shall not operate to terminate or otherwise alter the authority of commanding officers to refer such charges for trial by summary court-martial convened under section 824 of title 10, United States Code (article 24 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or to impose non-judicial punishment in connection with the conduct covered by such charges as authorized by section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(5) CONSTRUCTION WITH CHARGES ON OTHER OFFENSES.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter or affect the disposition of charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense triable by court-martial under that chapter for which the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter includes confinement for one year or less.

(6) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall revise policies and procedures as necessary to comply with this subsection.

(B) UNIFORMITY.—The General Counsel of the Department of Defense and the General Counsel of the Department of Homeland Security shall jointly review the policies and procedures revised under this paragraph in order to ensure that any lack of uniformity in policies and procedures, as so revised, among the military departments and the Department of Homeland Security does not render unconstitutional any policy or procedure, as so revised.

(7) MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall recommend such changes to the Manual for Courts-Martial as are necessary to ensure compliance with this subsection.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a), and the revisions required by that subsection, shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to charges preferred under section 830 of title 10, United States Code (article 30 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), on or after such effective date.

SEC. 598. MODIFICATION OF OFFICERS AUTHORIZED TO CONVENE GENERAL AND SPECIAL COURTS-MARTIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph (8):

''(8) the officers in the offices established pursuant to section 598(c) of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2015 or officers in the grade of O–6 or higher who are assigned such responsibility by the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, but only with respect to offenses to which section 597(a)(1) of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2015 applies;''.

(b) NO EXERCISE BY OFFICERS IN CHAIN OF COMMAND OF ACCUSED OR VICTIM.—Such section (article) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) An officer specified in subsection (a)(8) may not convene a court-martial under this section if the officer is in the chain of command of the accused or the victim.''.

(c) OFFICES OF CHIEFS OF STAFF ON COURTS-MARTIAL.—

(1) OFFICES REQUIRED.—Each Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces or Commandant specified in paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by subsection (a), shall establish an office to do the following:

(A) To convene general and special courts-martial under sections 822 and 823 of title 10, United States Code (articles 22 and 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), pursuant to paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as so amended, with respect to offenses to which section 597(a)(1) applies.

(B) To detail under section 825 of title 10, United States Code (article 25 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), members of courts-martial convened as described in subparagraph (A).

(2) PERSONNEL.—The personnel of each office established under paragraph (1) shall consist of such members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, or such members of the Coast Guard or civilian personnel of the Department of Homeland Security, as may be detailed or assigned to the office by the Chief of Staff or Commandant concerned. The members and personnel so detailed or assigned, as the case may be, shall be detailed or assigned from personnel billets in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 599. DISCHARGE USING OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall carry out sections 597 and 598 (and the amendments made by section 598) using personnel, funds, and resources otherwise authorized by law.

(b) NO AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL OR RESOURCES.—Sections 597 and 598 (and the amendments made by section 598) shall not be construed as authorizations for personnel, personnel billets, or funds for the discharge of the requirements in such sections.

SEC. 599A. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES ON COURTS-MARTIAL BY INDEPENDENT PANEL ON REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

Section 576(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1762) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraph (J):

''(J) Monitor and assess the implementation and efficacy of sections 597 through 599 of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2015, and the amendments made by such sections.''.

SEC. 599B. EXPLICIT CODIFICATION OF RETALIATION FOR REPORTING A CRIME AS AN OFFENSE UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 893 of title 10, United States Code (article 93 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a)'' before ''Any person'';

(2) in subsection (a), as so designated, by inserting '', or retaliating against any person subject to his orders for reporting a criminal offense,'' after ''any person subject to his orders''; and

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

''(b) This section (article) is the sole section of this chapter under which the offense of retaliating against any person subject to a person's orders for reporting a criminal offense as described in subsection (a) is punishable.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION (ARTICLE) HEADING.—The heading of such section (article) is amended to read as follows:

''§ 893. Art. 93. Cruelty and maltreatment; retaliation for reporting a crime''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS (ARTICLES).—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter X of chapter 47 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 893 (article 93) and inserting the following new item:

''893. Art. 93. Cruelty and maltreatment; retaliation for reporting a crime.''.

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROHIBITION.—Section 1709 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 962; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is repealed.

SEC. 599C. ESTABLISHMENT OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AS A SEPARATE OFFENCE UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) PUNITIVE ARTICLE.—Subchapter X of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by inserting after section 907 (article 107) the following new section (article):

''§ 907a. Art. 107a. Obstruction of justice

''(a) Any person subject to this chapter who wrongfully does a certain act with the intent to influence, impede, or otherwise obstruct the due administration of justice shall be punished as a court-martial may direct, except that the maximum punishment authorized for such offense may not exceed dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for not more than five years.

''(b) This section (article) is the sole section of this chapter under which an offense described in subsection (a) is punishable.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter X of chapter 47 of such title, as amended by section 599B(b)(2) of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 907 (article 107) the following new item:

''907a. Art. 107a. Obstruction of justice.''.

SA 1579. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1664. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING MILITARY INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO FORCE PROTECTION FOR INSTALLATIONS, FACILITIES, AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Maintaining appropriate force protection for deployed personnel of the Department of Defense and their families is a priority for Congress.

(2) Installations, facilities, and personnel of the Department in Europe face a rising threat from international terrorist groups operating in Europe, from individuals inspired by such groups, and from those traversing through Europe to join or return from fighting the terrorist organization known as the ''Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant'' (ISIL) in Iraq and Syria.

(3) Robust military intelligence support to force protection is necessary to detect and thwart potential terrorist plots that, if successful, would have strategic consequences for the United States and the allies of the United States in Europe.

(4) Military intelligence support is also important for detecting and addressing early indicators and warnings of aggression and assertive military action by Russia, particularly action by Russia to destabilize Europe with hybrid or asymmetric warfare.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should maintain and enhance robust military intelligence support to force protection for installations, facilities, and personnel of the Department of Defense and the family members of such personnel, in Europe and worldwide.

SA 1580. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 684, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''unless the Secretary'' and inserting the following: ''unless—

''(A) the Secretary'';

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of the Russian Federation is no longer—

''(i) violating the territorial integrity of Ukraine; or

''(ii) supporting entities that have illegally seized property of the Government of Ukraine or territory of Ukraine.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.''; and

---

SA 1581. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DESIGNATION OF AMERICAN WORLD WAR II CITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall designate at least one city in the United States each year as an ''American World War II City''.

(b) CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION.—After the designation made under subsection (c), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall make each designation under subsection (a) based on the following criteria:

(1) Contributions by a city to the war effort during World War II, including those related to defense manufacturing, bond drives, service in the Armed Forces, and the presence of military facilities within the city.

(2) Efforts by a city to preserve the history of the city's contributions during World War II, including through the establishment of preservation organizations or museums, restoration of World War II facilities, and recognition of World War II veterans.

(c) FIRST AMERICAN WORLD WAR II CITY.—The city of Wilmington, North Carolina, is designated as an ''American World War II City''.

SA 1582. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. ACTION ON APPLICATIONS; PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LNG EXPORT DESTINATIONS.

(a) DECISION DEADLINE.—For proposals that must also obtain authorization from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or the United States Maritime Administration to site, construct, expand, or operate liquefied natural gas export facilities, the Secretary of Energy (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') shall issue a final decision on any application for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(a)) not later than 45 days after the later of—

(1) the conclusion of the review to site, construct, expand, or operate the liquefied natural gas export facilities required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(2) the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONCLUSION OF REVIEW.—For purposes of subsection (a), review required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall be considered concluded when the lead agency—

(1) for a project requiring an Environmental Impact Statement, publishes a Final Environmental Impact Statement;

(2) for a project for which an Environmental Assessment has been prepared, publishes a Finding of No Significant Impact; or

(3) determines that an application is eligible for a categorical exclusion pursuant to National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) implementing regulations.

(c) JUDICIAL ACTION.—

(1) JURISDICTION.—The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or the circuit in which the liquefied natural gas export facility will be located pursuant to an application described in subsection (a) shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of—

(A) an order issued by the Secretary with respect to such application; or

(B) the failure of the Secretary to issue a final decision on such application.

(2) ORDER TO ISSUE DECISION.—If the Court in a civil action described in paragraph (1) finds that the Secretary has failed to issue a decision on the application as required under subsection (a), the Court shall order the Secretary to issue the decision not later than 30 days after the Court's order.

(3) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—The Court shall set any civil action brought under this subsection for expedited consideration and shall set the matter on the docket as soon as practical after the filing date of the initial pleading.

(4) APPEALS.—In the case of an application described in subsection (a) for which a petition for review has been filed—

(A) upon motion by an applicant, the matter shall be transferred to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or the circuit in which a liquefied natural gas export facility will be located pursuant to an application described in section 3(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(a)); and

(B) the provisions of this Act shall apply.

(d) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF EXPORT DESTINATIONS.—Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LNG EXPORT DESTINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any authorization to export liquefied natural gas, the Secretary of Energy shall require the applicant to report to the Secretary of Energy the names of the 1 or more countries of destination to which the exported liquefied natural gas is delivered.

''(2) TIMING.—The applicant shall file the report required under paragraph (1) not later than—

''(A) in the case of the first export, the last day of the month following the month of the first export; and

''(B) in the case of subsequent exports, the date that is 30 days after the last day of the applicable month concerning the activity of the previous month.

''(3) DISCLOSURE.—The Secretary of Energy shall publish the information reported under this subsection on the website of the Department of Energy and otherwise make the information available to the public.''.

SA 1583. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. FINANCING OF EXPORTATION OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES BY EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 2(b)(6)(I)(i)(I) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(6)(I)(i)(I)) is amended to read as follows:

''(I)(aa) the Bank determines that the end use of the defense articles or services includes civilian purposes; or

''(bb) the President determines that the transaction is in the national security interests of the United States; and''.

SA 1584. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. MODIFICATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE 1350.2 TO ESTABLISH SEXUAL ORIENTATION AS A PROTECTED CATEGORY UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.

The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness shall modify Department of Defense Directive 1350.2, relating to the Department of Defense Military Equal Opportunity (MEO) Program, in order to establish sexual orientation as a protected category under that Program.

SA 1585. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. METHODS FOR VALIDATING CERTAIN SERVICE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTIVE SERVICE BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Merchant Marine Act, 1936 established the United States Maritime Commission, and stated as a matter of policy that the United States should have a merchant marine that is ''capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency''.

(2) The Social Security Act Amendments of 1939 (Public Law 76–379) expanded the definition of employment to include service ''on or in connection with an American vessel under contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States, if the employee is employed on and in connection with such vessel''.

(3) The Joint Resolution to repeal sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes (Public Law 77–294; 55 Stat. 764) repealed section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (related to the arming of United States vessels) and authorized the President during the national emergency to arm or permit to arm any United States vessel.

(4) On February 7, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, through Executive Order Number 9054, established the War Shipping Administration that was charged with building or purchasing, and operating the civilian shipping vessels needed for the war effort.

(5) During World War II, United States merchant mariners transported goods and materials through ''contested waters'' to the various combat theaters.

(6) At the conclusion of World War II, United States merchant mariners were responsible for transporting several million members of the United States Armed Forces back to the United States.

(7) The GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977 (Public Law 95–202) provided that the Secretary of Defense could determine that service for the Armed Forces by organized groups of civilians, or contractors, be considered ''active service'' for benefits administered by the Veterans Administration.

(8) Department of Defense Directive 1000.20 directed that the determination be made by the Secretary of the Air Force, and established the Civilian/Military Service Review Board and Advisory Panel.

(9) In 1987, three merchant mariners along with the AFL–CIO sued Edward C. Aldridge, Secretary of the Air Force, challenging the denial of their application for veterans status. In Schumacher v. Aldridge (665 F. Supp. 41 (D.D.C. 1987)), the Court determined that Secretary Aldridge had failed to ''articulate clear and intelligible criteria for the administration'' of the application approval process.

(10) During World War II, women were repeatedly denied issuance of official documentation affirming their merchant marine seamen status by the War Shipping Administration.

(11) Coast Guard Information Sheet #77 (April 1992) identifies the following acceptable forms of documentation for eligibility meeting the requirements set forth in GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977 (Public Law 95–202) and Veterans Programs Enhancement Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–368):

(A) Certificate of shipping and discharge forms.

(B) Continuous discharge books (ship's deck or engine logbooks).

(C) Company letters showing vessel names and dates of voyages.

(12) Coast Guard Commandant Order of 20 March, 1944, relieved masters of tugs, towboats, and seagoing barges of the responsibility of submitting reports of seamen shipped or discharged on forms, meaning certificates of shipping and discharge forms are not available to all eligible individuals seeking to document their eligibility.

(13) Coast Guard Information Sheet #77 (April, 1992) states that ''deck logs were traditionally considered to be the property of the owners of the ships. After World War II, however, the deck and engine logbooks of vessels operated by the War Shipping Administration were turned over to that agency by the ship owners, and were destroyed during the 1970s'', meaning that continuous discharge books are not available to all eligible individuals seeking to document their eligibility.

(14) Coast Guard Information Sheet #77 (April, 1992) states ''some World War II period log books do not name ports visited during the voyage due to wartime security restrictions'', meaning that company letters showing vessel names and dates of voyages are not available to all eligible individuals seeking to document their eligibility.

(b) METHODS.—For the purposes of verifying that an individual performed service under honorable conditions that satisfies the requirements of a coastwise merchant seaman who is recognized pursuant to section 401 of the GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977 (Public Law 95–202; 38 U.S.C. 106 note) as having performed active duty service for the purposes described in subsection (d)(1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall accept the following:

(1) In the case of an individual who served on a coastwise merchant vessel seeking such recognition for whom no applicable Coast Guard shipping or discharge form, ship logbook, merchant mariner's document or Z-card, or other official employment record is available, the Secretary shall provide such recognition on the basis of applicable Social Security Administration records submitted for or by the individual, together with validated testimony given by the individual or the primary next of kin of the individual that the individual performed such service during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(2) In the case of an individual who served on a coastwise merchant vessel seeking such recognition for whom the applicable Coast Guard shipping or discharge form, ship logbook, merchant mariner's document or Z-card, or other official employment record has been destroyed or otherwise become unavailable by reason of any action committed by a person responsible for the control and maintenance of such form, logbook, or record, the Secretary shall accept other official documentation demonstrating that the individual performed such service during period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(3) For the purpose of determining whether to recognize service allegedly performed during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946, the Secretary shall recognize masters of seagoing vessels or other officers in command of similarly organized groups as agents of the United States who were authorized to document any individual for purposes of hiring the individual to perform service in the merchant marine or discharging an individual from such service.

(c) TREATMENT OF OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—Other documentation accepted by the Secretary of Homeland Security pursuant to subsection (b)(2) shall satisfy all requirements for eligibility of service during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(d) BENEFITS ALLOWED.—

(1) BURIAL BENEFITS ELIGIBILITY.—Service of an individual that is considered active duty pursuant to subsection (b) shall be considered as active duty service with respect to providing burial benefits under chapters 23 and 24 of title 38, United States Code, to the individual.

(2) MEDALS, RIBBONS, AND DECORATIONS.—An individual whose service is recognized as active duty pursuant to subsection (b) may be awarded an appropriate medal, ribbon, or other military decoration based on such service.

(3) STATUS OF VETERAN.—An individual whose service is recognized as active duty pursuant to subsection (b) shall be honored as a veteran but shall not be entitled by reason of such recognized service to any benefit that is not described in this subsection.

(e) DETERMINATION OF COASTWISE MERCHANT SEAMAN.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall verify that an individual performed service under honorable conditions that satisfies the requirements of a coastwise merchant seaman pursuant to this section without regard to the sex, age, or disability of the individual during the period in which the individual served as such a coastwise merchant seaman.

(f) PRIMARY NEXT OF KIN DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''primary next of kin'' with respect to an individual seeking recognition for service under this section means the closest living relative of the individual who was alive during the period of such service.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1586. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 832. MODIFICATION OF BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENTS FOR ITEMS FOR USE OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 8302(a)(2)(A) of title 41, United States Code, is amended, by inserting ''that are needed for national security reasons on an urgent basis'' after ''use outside the United States''.

SA 1587. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN ITEMS OF THE OMAR BRADLEY FOUNDATION, PENNSYLVANIA, TO A DESCENDANT OF GENERAL OMAR BRADLEY.

(a) TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—The Omar Bradley Foundation, Pennsylvania, may transfer, without consideration, to the child of General of the Army Omar Nelson Bradley and his first wife Mary Elizabeth Quayle Bradley, namely Elizabeth Bradley, such items of the Omar Bradley estate under the control of the Foundation as the Secretary of the Army determines to be without historic value to the Army.

(b) TIME OF SUBMITTAL OF CLAIM FOR TRANSFER.—No item may be transferred under subsection (a) unless a claim for the transfer of such item is submitted to the Omar Bradley Foundation during the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1588. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. INAPPLICABILITY OF REGULATIONS LIMITING THE SALE OR DONATION OF EXCESS PROPERTY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES UNLESS ENACTED BY CONGRESS.

No regulation, rule, guidance, or policy issued on or after May 15, 2015, that limits the sale or donation of excess property of the Federal Government, including excess property of the Department of Defense, to State and local agencies for law enforcement activities (whether pursuant to section 2576a of

title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law, or as a condition on the use of Federal funds) shall have any force or effect unless enacted into law by Congress.

SA 1589. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE THREAT POSED BY VIOLENT ISLAMIC EXTREMISM.

It is the sense of Congress that one of the greatest threats to the safety of the American people is the threat of violent Islamist extremism.

SA 1590. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. STUDY ON RADIATION EXPOSURE FROM ATOMIC TESTING CLEANUP ON THE ENEWETAK ATOLL.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall conduct a study on radiation exposure from the atomic testing cleanup that occurred on the Enewetak Atoll during the period of years beginning with 1977 and ending with 1980.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A determination of the amount of radiation that members of the Armed Forces and civilians were exposed to as a result of the atomic testing cleanup that described in subsection (a), especially with respect to those who were located on Runit Island during such cleanup.

(2) Identification of the effects of the exposure described in paragraph (1).

(3) An estimate of the number of surviving veterans and other civilians who were exposed as described in paragraph (1).

SA 1591. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. IMPROVEMENTS TO ADMINISTRATION OF POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

In any case in which an individual encounters a difficulty in obtaining Department of Defense form DD–214 from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall accept from such individual, for purposes of confirming such individual's entitlement to educational assistance under section 3311 of title 38, United States Code, pay stubs and copies of military orders as indication of such individual's service on active duty in the Armed Forces.

SEC. 1086. CONSIDERATION OF MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF ARMED FORCES AS VETERANS FOR PURPOSES OF EMPLOYMENT EMPHASIS UNDER FEDERAL CONTRACTS.

Section 4212(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(v) Members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.''.

SEC. 1087. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF VETERAN FOR PURPOSES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2108(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''a period of more than 180 consecutive days'' and inserting ''more than a total of 180 days''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''a period of more than 180 consecutive days'' and inserting ''more than a total of 180 days''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to—

(1) examinations for entrance into the competitive service held after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) certificates furnished under section 3317 of title 5, United States Code, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1592. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 417. CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AUTHORITY RELATING TO ALLOCATIONS TO STATES OF AUTHORIZED NUMBERS OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) MANDATORY REVIEW AND AUTHORIZED REDUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau—

(A) shall review each fiscal year the number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States serving in each State; and

(B) if the Chief of the National Guard Bureau makes the determination described in paragraph (2) with respect to a State in a fiscal year, may reduce the number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States, as applicable, to be allocated to serve in such State during the succeeding fiscal year.

(2) DETERMINATION.—A determination described in this paragraph is a determination with respect to a State that, during any three of the five fiscal years ending in the fiscal year in which such determination is made, the number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States serving in such State is or was fewer than the number authorized for the applicable fiscal year

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF REDUCTIONS.—In administering reductions under subsection (a)(1)(B), the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall seek to ensure that—

(1) the number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States serving in each State each fiscal year is commensurate with the National Guard force structure in such State during such fiscal year; and

(2) the number of members of the National Guard serving on full-time duty for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the National Guard serving in each State during each fiscal year is commensurate with the National Guard force structure in such State during such fiscal year.

(c) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that whenever the Chief of the National Guard Bureau considers changes to force structure or unit location for the National Guard, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau should focus solely on readiness, capability, efficiencies, and costs, rather than attempting to ensure equality among the States.

SA 1593. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. IMPROVEMENTS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FORM DD 214, THE CERTIFICATE OF RELEASE OR DISCHARGE FROM ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and in consultation with the Governors of the States, make improvements to Department of Defense Form DD 214, the Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty, in order to ensure that the Form better provides correct and useful contact information for individuals undergoing release or discharge from the Armed Forces.

(b) SCOPE OF IMPROVEMENTS.—The improvements made pursuant to subsection (a) may include the inclusion in Department of Defense Form DD 214 of the following:

(1) A non-military electronic mail address.

(2) A personal cellular phone number.

(3) Applicable diagnostic codes in connection with receipt of disability severance pay.

(4) Such other information as the Secretary considers appropriate to ensure that the Department of Veterans Affairs and State and local veterans agencies can contact and assist individuals undergoing release or discharge from the Armed Forces, while also protecting the privacy of such individuals.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a description of the improvements made to Department of Defense Form DD 214 pursuant to this section.

SA 1594. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr.

MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. CRUDE OIL AND CONDENSATE REPORT REQUIRED.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the appropriate committees and leadership of Congress an unclassified report assessing—

(1) the ability of crude oil and condensate produced in Iran and the United States to access and supply the global crude oil and condensate market; and

(2) the extent to which future action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States will result in greater exports of Iranian petroleum to the global market than permitted as of the date of the report.

(b) REMOVAL OF EXPORT RESTRICTIONS.—Beginning on the date that is 30 calendar days after the date of submission of the report required under subsection (a), notwithstanding any provision of law, any domestic United States crude oil and condensate may be exported on the same basis that petroleum products may be exported on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall limit the authority of the President under the Constitution, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), or part B of title II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6271 et seq.) to prohibit exports.

SA 1595. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO ALLOW SALE OF DOMESTIC CRUDE OIL TO UNITED STATES ALLIES AND TRADING PARTNERS.

It is the sense of Congress that the President may lawfully exercise statutory authorities to allow the sale of domestically produced crude oil to allies and trading partners of the United States, consistent with the call of the National Security Strategy of the President to ''promote diversification of energy fuels, sources, and routes''.

SA 1596. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. CREDITABLE SERVICE FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''annuity'' includes a survivor annuity; and

(2) the terms ''survivor'', ''survivor annuitant'', and ''unfunded liability'' have the meanings given those terms under section 8331 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8332(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (16), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'';

(C) by inserting after paragraph (17) the following:

''(18) any period of service performed—

''(A) not later than December 31, 1977;

''(B) while a citizen of the United States;

''(C) in the employ of—

''(i) Air America, Inc.; or

''(ii) any entity associated with, predecessor to, or subsidiary to Air America, Inc., including Air Asia Company Limited, CAT Incorporated, Civil Air Transport Company Limited, and the Pacific Division of Southern Air Transport; and

''(D) during the period that Air America, Inc. or such other entity described in subparagraph (C) was owned and controlled by the United States Government.''; and

(D) in the second undesignated paragraph following paragraph (18) (as added by subparagraph (C)), by adding at the end the following: ''For purposes of this subchapter, service of the type described in paragraph (18) of this subsection shall be considered to have been service as an employee.''.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM DEPOSIT REQUIREMENT.—Section 8334(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting '' ; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) any period of service for which credit is allowed under section 8332(b)(18) of this title.''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to annuities commencing on or after the effective date of this section.

(2) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CURRENT ANNUITANTS.—

(A) ELECTION.—Any individual who is entitled to an annuity for the month in which this section becomes effective may elect to have the amount of such annuity recomputed as if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is or may be based.

(B) SUBMISSION OF ELECTION.—An individual shall make an election under subparagraph (A) by submitting an appropriate application to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the effective date of this section.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE OF RECOMPUTATION; RETROACTIVE PAY AS LUMP-SUM PAYMENT.—

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A recomputation under subparagraph (A) shall be effective as of the commencement date of the annuity.

(ii) RETROACTIVE PAY AS LUMP-SUM PAYMENT.—Any additional amounts becoming payable, due to a recomputation under subparagraph (A), for periods before the first month for which the recomputation is reflected in the regular monthly annuity payments of an individual shall be payable to the individual in the form of a lump-sum payment.

(3) PROVISIONS RELATING TO INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR (BUT NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING) AN ANNUITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) ELECTION.—An individual not described in paragraph (2) who becomes eligible for an annuity or an increased annuity as a result of the enactment of this section may elect to have the rights of the individual under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, determined as if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is or would be based.

(ii) SUBMISSION OF ELECTION.—An individual shall make an election under clause (i) by submitting an appropriate application to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the later of—

(I) the effective date of this section; or

(II) the date on which the individual separates from service.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ENTITLEMENT; RETROACTIVITY.—

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), any entitlement to an annuity or an increased annuity resulting from an election under subparagraph (A) shall be effective as of the commencement date of the annuity.

(II) RETROACTIVE PAY AS LUMP-SUM PAYMENT.—Any amounts becoming payable for periods before the first month for which regular monthly annuity payments begin to be made in accordance with the amendments made by this section shall be payable to the individual in the form of a lump-sum payment.

(ii) RETROACTIVITY.—Any determination of the amount, or of the commencement date, of any annuity, all the requirements for entitlement to which (including separation, but not including any application requirement) would have been satisfied before the effective date of this section if this section had been in effect (but would not then otherwise have been satisfied absent this section) shall be made as if application for the annuity had been submitted as of the earliest date that would have been allowable, after the date on which the individual separated from service, if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout the periods of service referred to in subparagraph (A)(i).

(4) RIGHT TO FILE ON BEHALF OF A DECEDENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (e)(1) shall include provisions, in accordance with the order of precedence under section 8342(c) of title 5, United States Code, under which a survivor of an individual who performed service described in section 8332(b)(18) of such title (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)) shall be allowed to submit an application on behalf of and to receive any lump-sum payment that would otherwise have been payable to the decedent under paragraph (2)(C)(ii) or (3)(B)(i)(II) of this subsection.

(B) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—An application under this paragraph shall not be valid unless it is filed not later than the later of—

(i) 2 years after the effective date of this section; or

(ii) 1 year after the date of the decedent's death.

(d) FUNDING.—

(1) LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS.—Any lump-sum payment under paragraph (2)(C)(ii) or (3)(B)(i)(II) of subsection (c) shall be payable

out of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

(2) UNFUNDED LIABILITY.—Any increase in the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System attributable to the enactment of this section shall be financed in accordance with section 8348(f) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) REGULATIONS AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall promulgate any regulations necessary to carry out this section, which shall include provisions under which rules similar to those established under the amendments made by section 201 of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–335; 100 Stat. 588) shall be applied with respect to any service described in section 8332(b)(18) of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)) that was subject to title II of the Social Security Act.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of any application for any benefit which is computed or recomputed taking into account any service described in section 8332(b)(18) of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)), section 8345(i)(2) of such title shall be applied by deeming the reference to the date of the ''other event which gives rise to title to the benefit'' to refer to the effective date of this section, if later than the date of the event that would otherwise apply.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1597. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following:

SEC. 141. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR THE DIVESTMENT OR TRANSFER OF KC–10 AIRCRAFT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended during such fiscal year to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, KC–10 aircraft.

SA 1598. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. CLARIFICATION REGARDING THE CHILDREN TO WHOM ENTITLEMENT TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE MAY BE TRANSFERRED UNDER POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 3319 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS.—

''(1) TRANSFER.—An individual approved to transfer an entitlement to educational assistance under this section may transfer the individual's entitlement as follows:

''(A) To the individual's spouse.

''(B) To one or more of the individual's children.

''(C) To a combination of the individuals referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

''(2) DEFINITION OF CHILDREN.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'children' includes dependents described in section 1072(2)(I) of title 10.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to educational assistance payable under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1599. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. ORTHOTICS AND PROSTHETICS EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT.

(a) GRANTS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall award grants to eligible institutions to enable the eligible institutions—

(A) to establish a master's degree program in orthotics and prosthetics; or

(B) to expand upon an existing master's degree program in orthotics and prosthetics, including by admitting more students, further training faculty, expanding facilities, or increasing cooperation with the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

(2) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority in the award of grants under this section to eligible institutions that have entered into a partnership with a medical center or clinic administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs or a facility administered by the Department of Defense, including by providing clinical rotations at such medical center, clinic, or facility.

(3) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Grants awarded under this section shall be in amounts of not less than $1,000,000 and not more than $1,500,000.

(b) REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter for two years, the Secretary shall issue a request for proposals from eligible institutions for grants under this section.

(2) PROPOSALS.—An eligible institution that seeks the award of a grant under this section shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require, including—

(A) demonstration of a willingness and ability to participate in a partnership described in subsection (a)(2); and

(B) a commitment, and demonstration of an ability, to maintain an accredited orthotics and prosthetics education program after the end of the grant period.

(c) GRANT USES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible institution awarded a grant under this section shall use grant amounts to carry out any of the following:

(A) Building new or expanding existing orthotics and prosthetics master's degree programs.

(B) Training doctoral candidates in fields related to orthotics and prosthetics to prepare them to instruct in orthotics and prosthetics programs.

(C) Training faculty in orthotics and prosthetics education or related fields for the purpose of instruction in orthotics and prosthetics programs.

(D) Salary supplementation for faculty in orthotics and prosthetics education.

(E) Financial aid that allows eligible institutions to admit additional students to study orthotics and prosthetics.

(F) Funding faculty research projects or faculty time to undertake research in the areas of orthotics and prosthetics for the purpose of furthering their teaching abilities.

(G) Renovation of buildings or minor construction to house orthotics and prosthetics education programs.

(H) Purchasing equipment for orthotics and prosthetics education.

(2) LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION.—An eligible institution awarded a grant under this section may use not more than 50 percent of the grant amount to carry out paragraph (1)(G).

(3) ADMISSIONS PREFERENCE.—An eligible institution awarded a grant under this section shall give preference in admission to the orthotics and prosthetics master's degree programs to veterans, to the extent practicable.

(4) PERIOD OF USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible institution awarded a grant under this section may use the grant funds for a period of three years after the award of the grant.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''eligible institution'' means an educational institution that offers an orthotics and prosthetics education program that—

(A) is accredited by the National Commission on Orthotic and Prosthetic Education in cooperation with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs; or

(B) demonstrates an ability to meet the accreditation requirements for orthotic and prosthetic education from the National Commission on Orthotic and Prosthetic Education in cooperation with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs if the institution receives a grant under this section.

(2) The term ''veteran'' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, $15,000,000 to carry out this section. The amount so authorized to be appropriated shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

(2) UNOBLIGATED AMOUNTS TO BE RETURNED TO THE TREASURY.—Any amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1) that are not obligated by the Secretary as of September 30, 2018, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 1086. CENTER OF EXCELLENCE IN ORTHOTIC AND PROSTHETIC EDUCATION.

(a) GRANT FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall award a grant to an eligible institution to enable the eligible institution—

(A) to establish the Center of Excellence in Orthotic and Prosthetic Education (in this section referred to as the ''Center''); and

(B) to enable the eligible institution to improve orthotic and prosthetic outcomes for veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and civilians by conducting evidence-based research on—

(i) the knowledge, skills, and training most needed by clinical professionals in the field of orthotics and prosthetics; and

(ii) how to most effectively prepare clinical professionals to provide effective, high-quality orthotic and prosthetic care.

(2) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority in the award of a grant under this section to an eligible institution that has in force, or demonstrates the willingness and ability to enter into, a memoranda of understanding with the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Defense, or other appropriate Government agency, or a cooperative agreement with an appropriate private sector entity, which memorandum of understanding or cooperative agreement provides for either, or both, of the following:

(A) The provision of resources, whether in cash or in kind, to the Center.

(B) Assistance to the Center in conducting research and disseminating the results of such research.

(3) GRANT AMOUNT.—The grant awarded under this section shall be in the amount of $5,000,000.

(b) REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a request for proposals from eligible institutions for the grant under this section.

(2) PROPOSALS.—An eligible institution that seeks the award of the grant under this section shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require.

(c) GRANT USES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The eligible institution awarded the grant under this section shall use the grant amount as follows:

(A) To develop an agenda for orthotics and prosthetics education research.

(B) To fund research in the area of orthotics and prosthetics education.

(C) To publish or otherwise disseminate research findings relating to orthotics and prosthetics education.

(2) PERIOD OF USE OF FUNDS.—The eligible institution awarded the grant under this section may use the grant amount for a period of five years after the award of the grant.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''eligible institution'' means an educational institution that—

(A) has a robust research program;

(B) offers an orthotics and prosthetics education program that is accredited by the National Commission on Orthotic and Prosthetic Education in cooperation with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs;

(C) is well recognized in the field of orthotics and prosthetics education; and

(D) has an established association with—

(i) a medical center or clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(ii) a local rehabilitation hospital.

(2) The term ''veteran'' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, $5,000,000 to carry out this section.

SA 1600. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. MAKING PERMANENT EXTENDED PERIOD OF PROTECTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES RELATING TO MORTGAGES, MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE, AND EVICTION.

Section 710(d) of the Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–154) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (3).

SA 1601. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 706. PROVISION OF CARE PLANNING SESSIONS FOR ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND RELATED DEMENTIAS UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide to eligible individuals described in subsection (b) a care planning session with respect to a diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia that includes the following:

(1) A comprehensive care plan.

(2) Information on the particular diagnosis of the eligible individual diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia.

(3) Information on possible treatment options and how to access those options.

(4) Information on relevant medical and community services that are available.

(5) Such other information as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—An eligible individual described in this subsection is one of the following:

(1) A covered beneficiary (as defined in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code) who was first diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) A family member of a covered beneficiary described in paragraph (1).

(3) A caregiver of a covered beneficiary described in paragraph (1).

(c) LIMITATION.—The care planning session provided under subsection (a) may by provided only once with respect to each eligible individual.

(d) FOLLOW-UP.—The Secretary may provide a follow-up appointment or appointments to an eligible individual described in subsection (b) relating to the care planning session provided under subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that the provision of such appointment or appointments is appropriate to maintain a proper level of care for the eligible individual diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia and the family members and caregivers of that individual in order to improve the provision of health care by the Department of Defense and reduce health care costs.

SA 1602. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. REPORT ON PLANS FOR THE USE OF DOMESTIC AIRFIELDS FOR HOMELAND DEFENSE AND DISASTER RESPONSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Transportation, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the plans for airfields in the United States that are required to support homeland defense and local disaster response missions.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The report shall include the following items:

(1) The criteria used to determine the capabilities and locations of airfields in the United States needed to support safe operations of military aircraft in the execution of homeland defense and local disaster response missions.

(2) A description of the processes and procedures in place to ensure that contingency plans for the use of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations are coordinated among the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies with jurisdiction over those airfields.

(3) An assessment of the impact to logistics and resource planning as a result of the reduction of certain capabilities of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations.

(4) A review of the existing agreements and authorities between the Commander of the United States Northern Command and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration that allow for consultation on decisions that impact the capabilities of airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations.

(c) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(2) CAPABILITIES OF AIRFIELDS.—The term ''capabilities of airfields'' means the length and width of runways, taxiways, and aprons, the operation of navigation aids and lighting, the operation of fuel storage, distribution, and refueling system, and the availability of air operations facilities.

(3) AIRFIELDS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT SUPPORT BOTH MILITARY AND CIVILIAN AIR OPERATIONS.—The term ''airfields in the United States that support both military and civilian air operations'' means the following:

(A) Airports that are designated as joint use facilities pursuant to section 47175 of

title 49, United States Code, in which both the military and civil aviation have shared use of the airfield.

(B) Airports used by the military that have a permanent military aviation presence at the airport pursuant to a memorandum of agreement or tenant lease with the airport owner that is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1603. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EXPORTS OF CRUDE OIL.

It is the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to allies and partners of the United States shall not be determined to be consistent with the national interest and the purposes of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

SA 1604. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1486 submitted by Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. WARNER) to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, strike lines 15 and 16 and insert the following:

(3) exports of crude oil to allies and partners of the United States shall not be determined to be consistent with the national interest and the purposes of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil; and

(4) the President should exercise existing au-

SA 1605. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3124. LIMITATION ON ACCELERATION OF DISMANTLEMENT OF RETIRED NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 for the National Nuclear Security Administration may be obligated or expended to accelerate the dismantlement of the nuclear weapons of the United States to a rate faster than the rate mandated by the total projected dismantlement schedule included in table 2-7 of the annex to the stockpile stewardship and management plan for fiscal year 2016 submitted to Congress in March 2015 under section 4203 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523).

(b) EXCEPTION FOR COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN COMMITMENTS.—

(1) CERTIFICATION.—The limitation under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to a fiscal year if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the President has—

(A) requested, in the budget of the President for that fiscal year submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, sufficient amounts to fulfill for that fiscal year all commitments related to nuclear modernization funding, capabilities, and schedules that the President made to the Senate during the consideration by the Senate of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the New START Treaty, as described in—

(i) the document entitled, ''Message from the President on the New START Treaty'', dated February 2, 2011; and

(ii) the fiscal year 2012 update to the report required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2549), submitted to Congress in February 2011; and

(B) except as provided in paragraph (2), fulfilled all such commitments.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If, for any fiscal year covered by the limitation under subsection (a), an appropriations Act is enacted that appropriates amounts that are insufficient for the President to fulfill the commitments described in paragraph (1)(A), the President may certify under paragraph (1)(B) that the President has fulfilled such commitments to the extent possible with available funds.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—The limitation under subsection (a) shall not apply to activities necessary to conduct maintenance or surveillance of the nuclear weapons stockpile or activities to ensure the safety or reliability of the stockpile.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) NEW START TREATY.—The term ''New START Treaty'' means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed on April 8, 2010, and entered into force on February 5, 2011.

SA 1606. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 643. BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO LOSE THEIR RIGHT TO RETIRED PAY FOR REASONS OTHER THAN DEPENDENT ABUSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Families Serve, Too, Military Justice Reform Act of 2015''.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 1408 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (j), (k), and (l), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection (i):

''(i) BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS LOSING RIGHT TO RETIRED PAY FOR MISCONDUCT OTHER THAN DEPENDENT ABUSE.—(1)(A) If, in the case of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A), a court order provides (in the manner applicable to a division of property) for the payment of an amount from the disposable retired pay of that member or former member (as certified under paragraph (4)) to an eligible spouse or former spouse of that member or former member, the Secretary concerned, beginning upon effective service of such court order, shall pay that amount in accordance with this subsection to such spouse or former spouse.

''(B) If, in the case of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A), a court order provides for the payment as child support of an amount from the disposable retired pay of that member or former member (as certified under paragraph (4)) to an eligible dependent child of the member or former member, the Secretary concerned, beginning upon effective service of such court order, shall pay that amount in accordance with this subsection to such dependent child.

''(2) A spouse or former spouse, or a dependent child, of a member or former member of the armed forces is eligible to receive payment under this subsection if—

''(A) the member or former member, while a member of the armed forces and after becoming eligible to be retired from the armed forces on the basis of years of service, has eligibility to receive retired pay terminated as a result of misconduct while a member (other than misconduct described in subsection (h)(2)(A));

''(B) in the case of eligibility of a spouse or former spouse under paragraph (1)(A), the spouse or former spouse—

''(i) either—

''(I) was married to the member or former member at the time of the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

''(II) was is receipt of marital support, alimony, or child support from the member or former member as of the time of the misconduct pursuant to a court order; and

''(ii) was not, based on the evidence adduced at trial, an aider, abettor, accomplice, or co-conspirator in the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay, as certified in writing to the convening authority by—

''(I) the military judge of the court-martial that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

''(II) the staff judge advocate of the convening authority; and

''(C) in the case of eligibility of a dependent child under paragraph (1)(B), the dependent child—

''(i) had not reached the age of 16 years at the time of the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

''(ii) had reached the age of 16 years at the time of the misconduct and was not, based on the evidence adduced at trial, an aider,

abettor, accomplice, or co-conspirator in the misconduct that resulted in the termination of retired pay, as certified in writing to the convening authority by—

''(I) the military judge of the court-martial that resulted in the termination of retired pay; or

''(II) the staff judge advocate of the convening authority.

''(3) The amount certified by the Secretary concerned under paragraph (4) with respect to a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A) shall be deemed to be the disposable retired pay of that member or former member for the purposes of this subsection.

''(4) Upon the request of a court or an eligible spouse or former spouse, or an eligible dependent child, of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A) in connection with a civil action for the issuance of a court order in the case of that member or former member, the Secretary concerned shall determine and certify the amount of the monthly retired pay that the member or former member would have been entitled to receive as of the date of the certification—

''(A) if the member or former member's eligibility for retired pay had not been terminated as described in paragraph (2)(A); and

''(B) if, in the case of a member or former member not in receipt of retired pay immediately before that termination of eligibility for retired pay, the member or former member had retired on the effective date of that termination of eligibility.

''(5)(A) Paragraphs (5) through (8) and (10) of subsection (h) shall apply to eligibility of former spouses to payments under this subsection, court orders for the payment of disposable retired pay under this subsection, amounts payable under this subsection, and payments under this subsection in the same manner as such paragraphs apply to such matters under subsection (h).

''(B) If a spouse or former spouse or a dependent child eligible or entitled to receive payments under this subsection is eligible or entitled to receive benefits under subsection (h), the eligibility or entitlement of that spouse or former spouse or dependent child to such benefits shall be determined under subsection (h) instead of this subsection.

''(6)(A) A spouse or former spouse of a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A), while receiving payments in accordance with this subsection, shall be entitled to receive medical and dental care, to use commissary and exchange stores, and to receive any other benefit that a spouse or a former spouse of a retired member of the armed forces is entitled to receive on the basis of being a spouse or former spouse, as the case may be, of a retired member of the armed forces in the same manner as if the member or former member referred to in paragraph (2)(A) was entitled to retired pay.

''(B) A dependent child of a member or former member referred to in paragraph (2)(A) who was a member of the household of the member or former member at the time of the misconduct described in paragraph (2)(A) shall be entitled to receive medical and dental care, to use commissary and exchange stores, and to have other benefits provided to dependents of retired members of the armed forces in the same manner as if the member or former member referred to in paragraph (2)(A) was entitled to retired pay.

''(C) If a spouse or former spouse or a dependent child eligible or entitled to receive a particular benefit under this paragraph is eligible or entitled to receive that benefit under another provision of law, the eligibility or entitlement of that spouse or former spouse or dependent child to such benefit shall be determined under such other provision of law instead of this paragraph.

''(7) In this subsection, the term 'dependent child', with respect to a member or former member of the armed forces referred to in paragraph (2)(A), has the meaning given that term in subsection (h)(11).''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking ''subsection (i)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (j)''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to a spouse or former spouse, or a dependent child of a member or former member of the Armed Forces whose eligibility to receive retired pay is terminated on or after that date as a result of misconduct while a member.

(e) OFFSET.—$57,000,000 of the National Defense Function (050) of unobligated balances from fees collected to defray expenses for the automation of fingerprint identification and criminal justice information services and associated costs of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is hereby cancelled.

SA 1607. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO REMOVE SENIOR EXECUTIVES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR PERFORMANCE OR MISCONDUCT TO INCLUDE CERTAIN OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 713 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter before subparagraph (A), in the first sentence, by striking ''senior executive position'' both places it appears and inserting ''covered position''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''in paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''in paragraph (3) employed in a senior executive position at the Department'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) For purposes of this section, a covered position is—

''(A) a senior executive position; or

''(B) a position listed in section 7401 of this title that is not a senior executive position.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''under subsection (a)(2)'' and inserting ''under subsection (a)(1)(B)'';

(3) in subsection (c), by striking ''senior executive position'' and inserting ''covered position'';

(4) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''The procedures under section 7543(b) of title 5'' and inserting ''Sections 7461(b) and 7462 of this title and sections 7503, 7513, and 7543(b) of title 5''; and

(5) in subsection (g)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) an employee of the Department employed on a full-time basis under a permanent appointment in a position listed in section 7401 of this title (other than interns and residents appointed pursuant to section 7406 of this title) who is not in a senior executive position.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subchapter V of chapter 74 of such title is amended—

(1) in section 7461(b)(1), by striking ''If the'' and inserting ''Except as provided in sections 713 of this title, if the''; and

(2) in section 7462—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''Disciplinary'' and inserting ''Except as provided in section 713 of this title, the Disciplinary''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''In any case'' and inserting ''Except as provided in section 713 of this title, in any case''.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 713 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), in the first sentence, by striking ''of Veterans Affairs''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives'' and inserting ''Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading for section 713 of such title is amended by striking ''**Senior executives: removal based on performance or misconduct**'' and inserting ''**Removal of senior executives and certain other employees based on performance or misconduct**''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 713 and inserting the following new item:

''713. Removal of senior executives and certain other employees based on performance or misconduct.''.

SA 1608. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 686, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

''(e) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED FOR WAIVER OR EXCEPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not exercise the waiver authority under subsection (b), and the exception under subsection (c)(1) shall not apply, unless the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of the Russian Federation is no longer—

''(A) violating the territorial integrity of Ukraine; or

''(B) supporting entities that have illegally seized property of the Government of Ukraine or territory of Ukraine.

''(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.''.

SA 1609. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 540. ELIGIBILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMY FOR TUITION ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EFFECTIVE UPON COMPLETION OF INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING IN THE ARMY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any individual who is enlisted, inducted, or appointed as a member of the Army, including the Army National Guard of the United States and the Army Reserve, after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be eligible for tuition assistance through the Department of Defense for members of the Armed Forces upon completion of initial entry training.

SA 1610. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 540. RECEIPT BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH PRIMARY MARINER DUTIES OF TRAINING THAT COMPLIES WITH NATIONAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2105 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

''(b) MEMBERS WITH PRIMARY MARINER DUTIES.—(1) For purposes of the program under this section, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall each ensure that members of the armed forces with primary mariner duties receive training that complies with national standards and requirements under the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping (STCW).

''(2) The following shall comply with basic training standards under national requirements and the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping:

''(A) The recruit training provided to each member of the armed forces.

''(B) The training provided to each member of the armed forces who is assigned to a vessel.

''(3) Under the program, each member of the armed forces who is assigned to a vessel of at least 100 gross tons (GRT) in a deck or engineering career field shall be provided the following:

''(A) A designated path to applicable credentials under the national requirements and the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping consistent with the responsibilities of the position to which assigned.

''(B) The opportunity, at Government expense, to attend credentialing programs that provide merchant mariner training not offered by the armed forces.

''(4)(A) For purposes of the program, the material specified in subparagraph (B) shall be submitted to the National Maritime Center of the Coast Guard for assessment of the compliance of such material with national requirements and the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping.

''(B) The material specified in this subparagraph is as follows:

''(i) The course material of each unclassified course for members of the armed forces in marine navigation, leadership, and operation and maintenance.

''(ii) The unclassified qualifications for assignment for deck or engineering positions on waterborne vessels.

''(C) The National Maritime Center shall conduct assessments of material for purposes of this paragraph. Such assessments shall evaluate the suitability of material for the service at sea addressed by such material and without regard to the military pay grade of the intended beneficiaries of such material.

''(D) If material submitted to the National Maritime Center pursuant to this paragraphs is determined not to comply as described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary offering such material to members of the armed forces shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the actions to be taken by such Secretary to bring such material into compliance.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Secretary concerned shall establish, for members of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of such Secretary, procedures as follows:

(A) Procedures by which members identify qualification gaps in training and proficiency assessments and complete training or assessments approved by the Coast Guard in addressing such gaps.

(B) Procedures by which members obtain service records of any service at sea.

(C) Procedures by which members may submit service records of service at sea and other military qualifications to the National Maritime Center for evaluation and issuance of a Merchant Marine Credential.

(D) Procedures by which members may obtain a medical certificate for use in applications for Merchant Marine Credentials.

(2) USE OF MILITARY DRUG TEST RESULTS IN MERCHANT MARINE CREDENTIAL APPLICATIONS.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly establish procedures by which the results of appropriate drug tests administered to members of the Armed Forces by the military departments may be used for purposes of applications for Merchant Marine Credentials.

(3) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''Secretary concerned'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 1611. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 221. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR THE MEADS PROGRAM.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the medium extended air defense system.

SA 1612. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following:

SEC. 141. HEI PGU–13/B ROUND 30MILIMETER AMMUNITION.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 101 is hereby increased by $1,096,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for procurement of ammunition, Air Force, for the purpose of the procurement of HEI PGU–13/B Round 30milimeter ammunition.

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for the procurement of ammunition specified in that paragraph is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for procurement of such ammunition.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 is hereby decreased by $1,096,000, with the amount of the decrease to be applied against amounts available for operation and maintenance, Air Force, for Base Support for golf.

SA 1613. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 593. AUTHORIZATION FOR AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO JAMES MEGELLAS FOR ACTS OF VALOR DURING BATTLE OF THE BULGE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President may award the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of title 10, United States Code, to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for the acts of valor described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTION DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor referred to in subsection (a) are the actions of James Megellas on January 28, 1945, in Herresbach, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge, during World War II, when, as a first lieutenant in the 82d Airborne Division, he led a surprise and devastating attack on a much larger advancing enemy force, killing and capturing a large number and causing others to flee, single-handedly destroying

an attacking German Mark V tank with two hand-held grenades, and then leading his men in clearing and seizing Herresbach.

(c) WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.—The award under subsection (a) may be made without regard to the time limitations specified in section 3744(b) of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation established by law or regulation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Army.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. MCCAIN. 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 June 3, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 3, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Challenges and Implications of EPA's Proposed National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ground-Level Ozone and Legislative Hearing on S. 638, S. 751, and S. 640.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 3, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Audit & Appeal Fairness, Integrity, and Reforms in Medicare Act of 2015.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 3, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Implications of the Iran Nuclear Agreement for U.S. Policy in the Middle East.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 3, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Ensuring College Affordability.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. 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 June 3, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Watchdogs Needed: Top Government Investigator Positions Left Unfilled for Years.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 3, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 3, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Aja Kennedy, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Commander Eric Taylor, a Navy fellow in my office, be allowed floor privileges for the duration of Senate debate on H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act through the fiscal year 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jody Bennett, on the staff of the Committee on Armed Services, be granted privileges of the floor at all times during the Senate's consideration of and votes relating to H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 48, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 48) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 48) was agreed to.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE RISE OF ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 92, S. Res. 87.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 87) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 25, 2015, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF JOSEPH ROBINETTE BIDEN, III

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 191.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 191) relative to the death of Joseph Robinette Biden, III.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be 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. 191) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 4; 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. 1735 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Senators should expect at least one rollcall vote at approximately 10:15 tomorrow morning.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:31 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 4, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING VICTIMS OF THE 1984 ANTI-SIKH POGROMS AND MASSACRE, AND HONORED POLITICAL PRISONERS IN INDIA TODAY INCLUDING MR. SURAT SINGH KHALSA

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to honor those killed during the November 1984 anti-Sikh pogroms and massacre. November 2014 marked the 30 year anniversary of the horrific anti-Sikh pogroms, which claimed the lives of thousands of Sikhs throughout India in the first week of November 1984. I ask that this Congress remember those who were killed that tragic week.

I also ask that this Congress honor the struggle of many political prisoners in India today, including Mr. Surat Singh Khalsa, who is currently under house arrest, on a hunger strike and in very poor health. Today, we should reflect on his advocacy for the rights of political prisoners, support his right to free speech and ask for his release.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THOMAS A. KELLEY

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Thomas A. Kelley, an extraordinary constituent of California's 18th Congressional District who has been chosen to receive the STAR Award by AchieveKids on June 20, 2015, in Palo Alto, California.

Tom Kelley is a 1962 graduate of Rice University where he earned both B.A. and B.S. degrees, and a 1967 graduate of the Stanford Business School. He founded Thomas A. Kelley & Associates, an executive search firm in 1969, on Sand Hill Road in Menlo Park, California. The company's mission was to bring together management teams for high technology start-ups. While performing executive searches, Thomas A. Kelley & Associates invested in pre-public client companies and achieved financial success. While managing the ever-growing business, Tom continued to personally conduct searches through the life of the company. In 2002, the company became Thomas A. Kelley Investments, which manages the Kelley Family Trust and performs pro bono consulting for tech entrepreneurs.

In addition to his extraordinary success in business, Tom Kelley gives generously of his time, resources and considerable talents to many non-profit organizations. He was honored as a ''Stanford Associate'' for his volunteer work at the Stanford Business School; served on the Board of the Portola Valley School District; served on the Board of AchieveKids; and co-founded the Portola Valley Theatre Conservancy. Tom is also a member of the Board of Trustees, Inner Circle and a Producer at TheatreWorks of Palo Alto. He has served on the Board of Valley Presbyterian Church, the Board of the Chambers Landing Homeowners Association, and currently serves on the Advisory Board of Glimmerglass Networks. He served his country as an officer in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring Thomas A. Kelley as he receives the STAR Award. Tom and the entire Kelley family are respected, admired and loved in our community for their civic contributions and leadership. It's a privilege to honor him and a blessing to have his friendship and that of his extraordinary family.

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO MARY LOIS NEVINS

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mary Lois Minton Nevins, of Pasadena, California, a well-known and respected community leader who passed away on Monday, May 25, 2015.

Mary Lois Minton was born on December 6, 1924 in Long Island, New York. Her father, Henry Miller Minton, was a lieutenant colonel in the Army Air Corps during World War II and was stationed at the Santa Ana Army Airbase in California; consequently, the Minton family moved to Newport Beach, California. Ms. Minton was a graduate of Westover School and Vassar, where she studied chemistry. In 1946, Mary Lois married Richard Nevins and moved to Pasadena, where they raised their children, Richard, William, and Henry.

As a young mother and wife, Mary Lois, along with her husband, became extremely active in Democratic Party politics, volunteering for the California Young Democrats, the Altadena-Pasadena Young Democrats, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Club and the California Democratic Council, and working on countless local, state and national campaigns.

Ms. Nevins was also incredibly passionate about issues surrounding early childhood education and disadvantaged youth. In 1964, she pursued a teaching credential from Los Angeles State College, and after student teaching in 1965 at Markham Junior High School and Jordan High School in Los Angeles, she joined the Episcopal Home for Children (now known as Hillsides) where she taught at-risk children for nearly two decades. During her career at Hillsides, she founded the Tutor-Friend Volunteer program that brought together Hillsides students with local college and high school students. In 1990, Mary Lois joined the board of Pacific Oaks College, an institution known for its excellent early childhood education programs, where she served as chair, leader and mediator until 1997. A pioneer in promoting the two-generation learning concept, Ms. Nevins was a key leader and generous supporter of the Mothers' Club Family Learning Center in Pasadena, a non-profit that provides high-quality education to the area's needy parents and children. She served as President of the Board from 1988 to 1992.

Preceded in death by her husband, Richard Nevins, a former member of the California State Board of Equalization, Mary Lois is survived by her sons, Richard, William and Henry; her grandchildren, Richard, Sarah, Katharine, Casey, Austin, and Wynn; her siblings, Hatheway Hasler, Helen Farley, and Dwight Minton; and many other family members.

Remembered in her community as a generous, compassionate and strong woman, Mary Lois will be greatly missed. I ask all members to join me in remembering one of Pasadena's most beloved citizens, Mary Lois Nevins.

CONGRATULATING MR. AND MRS. KENNETH AND BETTY KATING

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth and Betty Kating on their 60th wedding anniversary which they will be celebrating on June 11, 2015.

Marriage is a sacred institution that represents true love, commitment, and dedication to family. This is a special time for Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Kating to celebrate and showcase the depth of their love and devotion to one another.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Kating on this momentous occasion.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak to the provisions in the bill related to programs of the National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) that address the monitoring and mapping of our Nation's coastlines. This function is an important function for the safety of navigation, environmental protection, and homeland security of the United States. There is little dispute that important commercial, military, and recreational activities are supported by this effort.

While important across the entire country, I want to address the specific needs of my State of Alaska. I understand that there is a concerted effort by NOAA to improve sea subsurface surveys. I fully support their efforts and applaud them for continuing this important work. The safety of navigation for our waterways is extremely important.

However, there is another dimension of survey that needs some attention also. Most of the shoreline in the Arctic along Alaska's northern and western coasts has not been mapped since 1960, if ever, and confidence in the shoreline depicted on the region's nautical charts is extremely low. Less than 10% of Alaska has contemporary shoreline data and less than 1% is mapped annually. There is also a disturbing lack of consistent elevation data.

The current state of shoreline mapping leaves those who ply Alaskan waters and depend on accurate shoreline mapping for their livelihood unnecessarily vulnerable. Due to Alaska's vast size and sparse population, the cost of acquiring traditional high-resolution topographic data and mapping thousands of miles of coastline is a daunting endeavor. Alaska has more than 44,000 miles of shoreline, which more than doubles the shoreline of the entire lower 48 states. Further, the emerging importance of the Arctic is adding to the need for updated shoreline charts. Increased economic development and shipping transits require that the most accurate data be collected and up to date charts be produced.

As a result, citizens and the State's economy are at risk. In addition to understanding sea-level rise impacts on fish and wildlife habitat, sea-level rise investigations are also important given that three quarters of Alaska's citizens live in coastal regions, which support 80% of the state's economic activity. Economic activity in Alaska's coastal zones includes world-renowned fish and shellfish industries as well as a burgeoning recreation and tourism industry.

Many approaches are available. Some techniques can be a painstaking undertaking due to cost and logistical challenges because of the vast area and distances involved. As a result the data collected within Alaska can be fairly limited in coverage. Another promising technology is the use of satellite remote sensing that can help assist current NOAA efforts. The complementary use of optical and radar satellites can add a new dimension to remote sensing applications. Within the State of Alaska there is an emerging capability using this approach that is cost effective and not dependent on weather conditions. This capability includes the ability to download data and provide the refined products needed to create the needed mapping quickly and cost effectively. I understand that NOAA regularly uses both government and commercial satellite imagery to support nautical charting in Alaska.

Regardless of the approach, I want to encourage NOAA to make a concerted effort to use funding received to reduce the backlog of outdated and uncharted shorelines in Alaska as quickly and cost effectively as possible in addition to continuing the important work of conducting the sea subsurface surveying. The economic and strategic importance of the Pacific Northwest region and the emerging Arctic require that this be done.

GIRLS COUNT ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 1, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as the Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus and a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of S. 802, the "Girls Count Act of 2015."

I support this legislation which authorizes the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International development to: (1) support programs that will contribute improved civil registration and vital statistics systems with a focus on birth registration; and (2) promote programs that build the capacity of developing countries' national and local legal and policy framework to prevent discrimination against girls, and help increase property rights, social security, land tenure, and inheritance rights for women.

In addition, this bill authorizes the Secretary and the U.S. AID Administrator to cooperate with multilateral organizations to promote such programs.

As co-chair of the Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Algeria Caucuses, I have long advocated for the rights for women around the world. In the current Congress, I introduced H.R. 69 and H.R. 57, two bills that promote women's rights.

H.R. 69 is a bill awarding a Congressional Gold Medal to Malala Yousafzai, the Nobel Laureate for Peace, in recognition of her devoted service to education, justice, and equality.

Malala Yousafzai is an inspiration to young people in the United States and children who must struggle to receive an education.

In a speech before the United Nations, she called for a global struggle against literacy, poverty and terrorism.

She closed her remarks by saying "One child, one teacher, one pen, and one book can change the world."

The Taliban remains unrepentant while she remains defiant and said that the day she was shot "weakness, fear and hopelessness died."

While her road to recovery proved to be amazing and complete, she has not been deterred in pursuing her goal of education rights for young girls in her native land and for this, her life continues to be threatened by the Taliban.

H.R. 57 requires that activities carried out by the United States in South Sudan relating to governance, post-conflict reconstruction and development, police and military training, and refugee relief and assistance support the human rights of women and their full political, social, and economic participation.

According to the United States Census Bureau's 2013 international figures, 1 person in 12, or close to 900 million people, is a girl or woman age 10 through 24.

The Census Bureau's data also illustrates that young people are the fastest growing segment of the population in developing countries.

Even though most countries have birth registration laws, four out of ten babies born in 2012 were not registered worldwide.

Moreover, an estimated 36 percent of children under the age of five worldwide (about 230,000,000 children) do not possess a birth certificate.

A nationally recognized proof of birth system is important to determining a child's citizenship, nationality, place of birth, parentage, and age.

Without such a system, a passport, driver's license or other identification card is difficult to obtain.

The lack of such documentation can prevent girls and women from officially participating in and contributing to the formal economic, legal, and political sectors in their country.

The lack of birth registration among girls worldwide is particularly concerning as it can exacerbate the disproportionate vulnerability of women to trafficking, child marriage, and lack of access to health and education services.

A lack of birth registration among women and girls can also aggravate what, in many places, amounts to an already reduced ability to seek employment, participate in civil society, or purchase or inherit land and other assets.

Girls undertake much of the domestic labor needed for poor families to survive: carrying water, harvesting crops, tending livestock, caring for younger children, and doing chores.

Mr. Speaker, to help ensure that women and girls are considered in United States foreign assistance policies and programs, that their needs are addressed in the design, implementation, and evaluation of foreign assistance programs, and that women and girls have the opportunity to succeed, it is important that girls be counted and have access to birth certificates and other official documentation.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in strong support for S. 802.

REMEMBERING DR. PHIL LINEBERGER

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay my respects to Dr. Phil Lineberger. He was a noble, God-fearing man who left us too soon.

Pastor Phil served as pastor of Sugar Land Baptist Church since November 1995 and was the senior pastor until the time of his death. Pastor Phil mentored many people during his forty-five years as a pastor and was even coined "the real Dr. Phil" by members of his congregation for how readily he nurtured others through good and bad times. Pastor Phil touched many people throughout his life and always gave of himself unconditionally in service of others.

I extend my deepest condolences to Phil's wife, Brenda, his three daughters, and ten beautiful grandchildren. Our prayers are with each of you during this unimaginable grief. Your husband, father, and grandfather was

loved by many. I know that your family at Sugar Land Baptist Church is lifting you up in prayers and surrounding you with love. Again, the folks from the Twenty Second Congressional District are very sorry for your loss. We lost Phil too soon, and he will be missed.

PRESS CONFERENCE: BERTIE'S RESPECT FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES ACT

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, our national military cemeteries are hallowed ground.

And I ask my colleagues to agree . . . and support my bill, H.R. 2490, ''Bertie's Respect for National Cemeteries Act.''

On October 15, 1969, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, a man named George Emery Siple shot and killed Bertha Smith, known to everyone as ''Bertie.''

Siple was convicted of the murder . . . and sentenced to life in prison without parole.

Thirty years later, he died in prison.

Because he was a military veteran, he was buried in Indiantown Gap National Cemetery in 1999.

He was buried there despite a federal law passed in 1997.

That law said that veterans convicted of federal or state capital crimes . . . are not permitted to be buried in Veterans Affairs National Cemeteries or Arlington National Cemetery.

For Bertie Smith's family, this is a heart-wrenching situation that has gone on for three decades.

Jackie Katz—Bertie's daughter—has called it ''hell'' and a ''horror'' to live with the fact that George Siple was memorialized and buried with full military honors.

When I first began to look into this issue, it was clear to me that it was as frustrating as it was heartbreaking.

Back in 1997—led by our Pennsylvania Senators—Congress passed a law that said that veterans found guilty of capital crimes could not be buried in our national veterans cemeteries.

At that time, you may remember, the country was still reeling from the Oklahoma City bombing.

And veterans everywhere were justifiably appalled that Timothy McVeigh, a military veteran, could be buried with full military honors.

Now, McVeigh did not receive that burial.

But a major problem we discovered was that the law was not actively enforced for others until 2006.

Since then, the VA has relied on an ''honor system,'' which requires family members to willingly report their relative's criminal record.

In 2013, Congress once again sought to protect our VA National Cemeteries by passing a law to explicitly allow the VA to remove veterans from cemeteries, if they had been convicted of a federal or state capital crime. However, this law does not extend to veterans buried between 1997 and 2013, a time period that includes George Emery Siple.

That's why I've introduced ''Bertie's Respect for National Cemeteries Act.''

What this law will do is:

Require Veterans Affairs to take every reasonable action to ensure that a veteran is eligible to be buried, including searching public criminal records.

It will clarify Congress's original intent by providing Veterans Affairs the explicit authority . . . to remove veterans convicted of capital crimes that were wrongly buried after 1997.

And it will specifically provide for the removal of George Emery Siple from Indiantown Gap National Cemetery.

This bill really only reaffirms what Congress intended in the first place.

And it enjoys the support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

There are precedents for the removal of convicted murderers from veterans cemeteries—from Arlington National Cemetery, and VA cemeteries in Michigan, and Oregon . . . to name just a few.

Additionally, nothing in the bill would withdraw previous military honors, such as Purple Hearts or medals for valor, otherwise earned by the deceased veterans.

The discussion of military veterans who have been convicted of murder often raises the issue of mental health treatment and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

There is no question that PTSD is a real condition affecting many service men and women, and I have always stood for funding the evaluation and treatment of those who may be afflicted.

That said, those who have been convicted of capital murder by our judicial system have been declared guilty of the worst offense possible, and any mitigating factors would have been considered at trial and sentencing. And I don't think it's too much to say that murderers should not be buried next to true American heroes.

And the memories of victims like Bertie Smith should not be disregarded. I ask my colleagues for their support in saying that real, true honor really means something in our National Military Cemeteries.

HONORING GREATER GROVE STREET MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community, Greater Grove Street Missionary Baptist Church. Greater Grove Street M. B. Church has served as a catalyst for the African American growth in Warren County and the State of Mississippi.

Greater Grove Street Missionary Baptist Church was organized in 1908 in the former home of the late Cosby family on the lower West end of Grove Street. The church was known commonly as ''Cato's Church,'' a name noting the leadership and zeal of its principal deacon at the time. Deacon F. Jackson and family donated the Cornerstone.

Rev. Willie Wood was elected as the first pastor of the church and he served until death. The next pastor, Rev. George S. Lewis, served aptly, with deacons: William Fair, E. Sparkmen and W. Wilson serving faithfully under him.

In 1948, Rev. W.C. Porter was elected pastor; and under his leadership, the following officers served: Sing Robin, Lieutenant Bradley, Charlie Hunt, Jessie Ware, Theadore Shaw, Rufus Britten, James Williams, Rufus Price and Tom Neal.

In 1962, the church came to a major crisis. The City of Vicksburg began widening Grove Street. Grove Street M.B. Church laid in the path of the city's improvements. As a result, the church was torn down. The concrete baptismal pool remains on the old lot, and is the solitary reminder that the church ever existed there. In our hour of need, the Pastor, Rev. E. E. Tutt, and the members of Ebenezer M.B. Church proved to be our friends indeed, as they shared their church building with Grove Street M. B. Church over three years as they struggled to rebuild the church.

West of the old site, a new property on Pierce Street, was selected. On April 27, 1965, at a cost of $13,000.00, the congregation moved into its newly built tabernacle. First, the old pews from the old church were shed. At a cost of $600.00, more comfortable pews were purchased from Fisher Funeral Home. In 1972, at a cost of $2,400.00, the members added 534 square feet of floor space to the rear of the church, which consists of the Fellowship Hall and the kitchen. On June 28, 1975, a chapter of their struggle and movement ended with the death of Rev. W.C. Porter, their pastor through their trials.

Rev. Albert Price succeeded Rev. Porter. Under his leadership, the march resumed for the church. They installed a public address system and added brick veneer to the building at a cost of $10,000.00. This brief chapter ended in the death of Rev. Price after only serving eleven months as pastor.

In 1977, God blessed the congregation with the energetic leadership of Rev. John L. Brown. Under his leadership, the members were able to free themselves from the mortgage and all indebtedness. In 1979, a new central air unit was installed. However, there was still work to be done. For example, they purchased a Baldwin organ in 1979 to enhance the song service and installed a central cooling system for $4,056.81; and in 1985, landscaping and drainage work was done which cost $5,350.00.

In this description of the establishment, struggle, and movement of Grove Street M.B. Church, the presence and power of the Holy Spirit motivated them to have a place set aside for the many souls that were added to the church; and He motivated them to actively seek to grow spiritually and to inspire future generations with the spiritual mission. As Dr. John L. Brown continued to lead and direct the church, it was hoped that Grove Street M.B. Church would continue to grow.

Dr. John L. Brown was a native of Utica, MS. He is a graduate of Alcorn A&M College, in Lorman, MS, where he received his B.S. degree in Elementary Education. He did further study toward his M.S. degree in Elementary Education at Jackson State College, Jackson, Mississippi. He received his Ph.D. degree from McKinley Theological Seminary, Jackson, MS, in 1981. Dr. Brown was a teacher and principal in the Hinds County Public School System, Utica, MS, for twenty years.

As a community leader, he served as an adult leader of the 4–H Club, Mixon Junior High School, Utica, MS, for five years. He served as president of the N.A.A.C.P., Utica,

MS branch, for twelve years. He served on the Board of Directors of the Mississippi Baptist State Convention for ten years, and the Community Services Association and the Hinds County Community Action Agency, Jackson, MS for eight years. Dr. Brown honorably served his community as a community voter registration coordinator, advisor, civil rights activists, social worker, and community organizer.

He was a pastor of three other churches: Orange Hill Baptist Church, Bolton, MS; Rock of Ages Baptist Church, Vicksburg, MS; and Mt. Olive Baptist Church, Lorman, MS. He was in the ministry for over 30 years. His loving and devoted wife, Mrs. Lucille Brown, supported Dr. Brown in all of his efforts. Their union was blessed with six children, four girls and two boys.

Under his leadership, the members altered the way services were conducted. Instead of posting the Order of Service on the wall, printed programs were disseminated to the congregation. The practice of roll call (where each member's name was called and one stated the amount of his tithes/offering) was eliminated and the practice of distributing envelopes was implemented. In 1987, land was purchased and donated to the church, which were forty-seven lots (North side of the church) to be used for additional parking. In 1993, two more additional corner lots were purchased. Also, the wooden steeple on the church was replaced with a fiberglass steeple. In 1996, the church van was purchased due to the increased attendance in Bible class. Ceiling fans were also purchased and installed in the sanctuary and fellowship hall.

In January 9, 1999, Pastor Casey D. Fisher was elected pastor of Greater Grove Street a M.B. Church. At the time he began this ministry, the church had a membership of approximately sixty-five souls. Soon after becoming pastor, Rev. Fisher adopted his motto, ''Making this church the best church this side of Heaven,'' and his theme, ''This is the Church where the gospel is preached, love is practiced and people are changed.'' Under his leadership, the church congregation has grown from the initial sixty-five members to over six hundred. Pastor Fisher began his ministry in September of 1998, which he was ordained under the pastorate of Reverend Willie L. Lewis of Jackson, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Greater Grove Street M. B. Church for its rich heritage and dedication to serving others and giving back to the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALMA S. ADAMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 2015 I was absent for recorded votes #268 and #269 due to the passing of my mother.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here: On Roll Call #268 I would have voted No, On Roll Call #269 I would have voted No.

IN RECOGNITION OF CYNTHIA SIMMS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Cynthia Simms who is retiring as the Superintendent of the San Mateo-Foster City School District after a remarkable career in education that spans more than four decades. She has been an educator for 43 years and a superintendent for 27 years, 14 of them in California. Dr. Simms' outstanding leadership, vision and communication skills have benefited thousands of students, parents, teachers and the community as a whole.

Dr. Simms was the Superintendent of the San Mateo-Foster City School District for four years overseeing the largest elementary-middle school district in San Mateo County with 20 schools, 12,000 students and 1,200 employees. She hired 13 of 20 current school principals and three district administrators. Her priority has been to provide the best possible education for each child to prepare her or him for a successful life as a responsible, contributing citizen. She instills a wonderful sense of community by making every staff member feel appreciated through their significant role in accomplishing this mission.

During her tenure, four schools were honored as California Distinguished Schools and eight school programs received J. Russell Kent Awards. Dr. Simms focused the school district on equity for all students by supporting and growing magnet school program choices for parents including STEM, STEAM, spearheading the transition of Horrall Elementary School to LEAD Elementary School, and expanding the Montessori program. She also adopted the Common Core State Standards that are designed to turn students into critical thinkers, effective communicators, collaborators and innovators. Always looking to the child's future, the district formed important partnerships with the San Mateo Union High School District, St. Mary's College and California State University East Bay.

Dr. Simms understands that children cannot thrive academically if they don't feel safe or are unhealthy. This is why she implemented consistent safety protocols across the district that include security fencing, cameras, intrusion alarms and Columbine lock sets. The schools work closely with local police departments on gang resistance training.

All students take music classes and healthy food is served at breakfast and lunch. There even is a growing number of vegetable gardens at the schools. Under Dr. Simms' leadership, the San Mateo-Foster City School District cares for and about the wellbeing of its students on every level.

Dr. Simms is credited with developing extensive communication inside and outside of the schools. There is a weekly letter to all staff, a monthly newsletter to parents, collaboration with city councils and local legislators, and quarterly reports mailed to every resident and business in San Mateo and Foster City. Collaboration, partnership and inclusiveness are core values in Dr. Simms' philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives rise with me to honor Dr. Cynthia Simms, an extraordinary educator who is deeply committed to our community and to the future of our children. She tirelessly strived for excellence, harmony and the success of her students. Her expertise, energy and enthusiasm will be missed as she enters her well-deserved retirement.

CONGRATULATING XANDER MCPHEETERS

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Xander McPheeters of Salem, Indiana.

I want to congratulate Xander on receiving the Hobie's Hero Award. Xander received this award as a result of heroic actions he took to save his father. James McPheeters was clearing brush from his farm near Salem, Indiana when he was suddenly struck by a falling tree. James was knocked off his tractor where he lay unconscious with multiple serious injuries. His son Xander, being the only person to see the accident occur, rushed to help his injured father. Xander proceeded to turn off the key to the runaway tractor and run to his nearest neighbor's home who called 911. The emergency response team arrived and saved James McPheeters life as a result of Xander's decisive actions.

The Hobie's Heroes Award is presented to young people, 18 years or younger, who perform heroic actions in the spirit of self-sacrifice, without consideration of personal gain, for the benefit of another in significant need. Being that Xander was five years old when he performed these lifesaving actions, I know that he is the epitome of what the Hobie's Heroes Award represents.

Xander will be the sixth Hobie's Hero Award recipient and he is the youngest recipient to date. Xander is an inspiration and role model for Hoosiers across Indiana. It is an honor to rise today and highlight Xander's fearlessness, and congratulate him on receiving the Hobie's Hero Award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote yesterday because of the death of a close friend. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Roll Call #270—AYE
Roll Call #271—NO
Roll Call #272—AYE
Roll Call #273—AYE

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note that I was unable to vote

on Monday's legislation due to the weather, which forced my flight to be diverted to Norfolk Virginia.

If the weather had allowed, I would have voted as follows:

On consideration of the Dingell Amendment to H.R. 1335, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, I would have voted ''yea.''

On consideration of the Lowenthal Amendment to H.R. 1335, I would have voted ''no.''

On the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1335, I would have voted ''yea.''

On final passage of H.R. 1335, I would have voted ''no.''

LIEUTENANT PARKER MOSLEY—PARATROOPER

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at 91 years of age, E. Parker Mosley is a local legend. Lieutenant Mosley has served his country, traveled the world and even rubbed elbows with one of history's fiercest generals. Lt. Mosley is a loyal patriot and a man of integrity and action. The Houston community is blessed to have him.

Lt. Mosley was born in 1924 in Macon, Georgia. From ages 12–18, he went to Gordon military school, where his father was a teacher. After graduation, in 1942, he was drafted into the Army. Being an eager and young man, he volunteered to be a paratrooper in WWII. Mosley attended Jump School at Fort Benning in Georgia.

Paratroopers are military parachutists that are used as a surprise advantage to the military because they can be inserted quickly into the battlefield from the air.

This allows the military to be positioned in areas that are not accessible by land. The first U.S. Airborne unit began a test in July 1940 and the first U.S. Army Combat Jump was near Oran, Algeria, in North Africa on November 8, 1942, which was right before Lt. Mosley started Jump School. This aspect of the military was quite new and unfamiliar, but that did not stop tenacious Lt. Mosley from volunteering to be a paratrooper.

Lt. Mosley was then sent to Officer Candidate School (OCS) in Brisbane, Australia, to learn military and leadership skills. Even more impressive and something that many people do not know, Lt. Mosley was first in his class at OCS. This is a high honor and privilege that many do not receive.

Lt. Mosley even had an opportunity to meet and befriend General MacArthur's wife at a Red Cross church service. Coincidentally, he ran into her two years later in Japan and she remembered him.

After Brisbane, Lt. Mosley moved to the Philippines and then Japan where he was assigned master in the parachute school airbase at Yamato. At one point he even held the record number of consecutive jumps; he was always willing to jump. His favorite jumping memory was his last jump at the age of 22. It was over northern Japan and he was allowed to solo jump. There was no one giving him orders; he was all by himself. He said he will never forget the pilot circling as he jumped.

And not only was Lt. Mosley good at his job, he encouraged other troops. He once convinced two soldiers to stay in parachute school who were going to quit.

He asked them if they had told their girlfriends about parachute school yet, and if they had, now they'd have to write their girlfriends back and tell them they quit. The approach worked and they each thanked him the next day.

Lt. Mosley was discharged from the army in 1947. He then went on to Oklahoma University in Norman, Oklahoma, to study geology where he met his future wife, Lorraine.

Lt. Mosley described their first date like this: ''I had an airplane at the time, but no car. I called her and asked her if she wanted to go flying, and I don't think she believed me that I had a plane but no car. We went out for six nights straight then got engaged, just like that.''

Lorraine and Lt. Mosley were married for 63 years before she passed away a couple of years ago.

After college at Oklahoma University, Mosley was hired by Exxon where he worked for 35 years. His work with Exxon eventually brought him to Texas, where he lives today.

He remained in the Reserves after Active Duty and even reached the rank of captain.

Mosley is admired and respected by his peers for his patriotism and wit. One of his friends, Mr. Warnack, said that Mosley has ''one of the quickest minds I've ever ran across.''

Recently, Creekwood Middle School in Kingwood—which has a tradition of honoring our military—honored Lt. Mosley by dedicating a brick to him in their Veterans Honor Garden. The Honor Garden contains more than 200 bricks which all honor local veterans and serve as a place of remembrance for past and present loved ones. It is my hope that all the students learn Lt. Mosley's story. He is one of Texas' finest.

Lt. Mosley represents the best of the Greatest Generation. He's truly a remarkable patriot—always ready and willing to jump out of a plane for his country.

Thank you, Lt. Parker Mosley, for your devotion and service to our American nation.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Concord, New Hampshire in celebration of the city's 250th anniversary. With each passing year, Concord continues to grow and prosper as the capital city of the Granite State. Having grown up and attended school in Concord, I know this historic city has so much to share with us all.

Concord, New Hampshire has a proud and storied history. Prior to its incorporation, the land that today makes up the city's limits was presided over by the Pennacook, a tribe of Abenaki Native Americans. Situated in the Merrimack River valley, the fertile soil proved ideal for growing a wide variety of crops along the river's banks.

Following Concord's incorporation and naming in 1765, the city continued as a popular area to visit and also to establish roots and start a family. The beautiful Merrimack River that winds its way from the rural northern border and through to the southern limits of the city continues to provide an idyllic backdrop and playground for all generations.

Concord's location at the geographic center of the state has enabled the city to serve as a meeting place for lawmakers, dignitaries, and citizens. Our beloved State House is distinguished as the oldest capitol in the country in which both houses of the legislature continue to meet in their original chambers.

One cannot discuss Concord without also mentioning its proud history of craftsmanship, entrepreneurs, and leaders. The fourteenth President of the United States, Franklin Pierce, chose to raise his family in Concord during his time as an elected official, leaving the city with his beautiful historic homestead that continues to bring history to life today for school groups and visitors. The Capital City also became the namesake for the most famous of the prestigious Abbot-Downing Coaches, with the Concord Coach smoothly transporting passengers for decades before the advent of the automobile.

Concord has been called home by numerous notable figures over the years, including Crista McAuliffe, who has inspired generations of students both in the classroom as a teacher and through her legacy as a member of the *Challenger* Space Shuttle crew. Basketball player Matt Bonner honed his athletic skills at Concord High School before launching his professional career in the NBA. And we cannot forget Tara Mounsey, who helped lead the United States Women's Hockey Team to a gold medal in the 1998 Winter Olympics. The successes and achievements of Concord's citizens are a testament to the wonderful community that so many are lucky to call home.

Concord is now in the midst of a 21st century transformation made possible in part through the competitive TIGER grants, as its Main Street is revitalized to improve safety and increase greenspace along this vital economic corridor.

As a native of Concord and a lifelong resident of the Granite State, I am immensely proud of all that Concord, New Hampshire has accomplished over the past 250 years, and I am confident that the city will continue to thrive in the centuries ahead.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CULVER-UNION TOWNSHIP CARNEGIE PUBLIC LIBRARY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Culver-Union Township Carnegie Public Library, located in Culver, Indiana as it celebrates its 100th Anniversary on June 6, 2015.

In the early 1900's, local communities around the country were awarded funds to build libraries using money from the businessman and philanthropist Andrew Carnegie. In 1915, the Carnegie Corporation granted

$10,000 to the town of Culver to build a library on Main Street.

Still needing additional funds, local Culver businessmen helped to raise the money needed to purchase the land for the building site. On December 30, 1915 the library opened, consisting of 17 books that were donated by local members of the Culver community and Zolla Moss was hired as their first librarian.

The lower level of the library was used as a meeting and performance space until the 1950's. Many church congregations met in the lower level of the Carnegie library building at one time or another. During the 1960's, the library's book collection continued to increase in size, leading to the use of the lower level to hold books.

Today, the Culver-Union Township Public Library Carnegie building is still in use as a library, and has undergone an addition and renovation which were completed in 2001 and remains the only Carnegie Library still in existence in Marshall County, Indiana.

The library continues to play a vital role in the education and success of all communities and, with its historic Carnegie building, is a shining example of all that public libraries can accomplish for local communities.

For the past century, the Culver-Union Township Public Library has been an important piece of communal life in Culver. Families, friends, and students gather to conduct research, enjoy literary works, and socialize. There is no question the library holds an important public function in serving the community through literary means, and is enjoyed by many.

I commend the staff, visitors and members of the library for their dedication to serving the people of Culver. They serve the diverse needs of its communities through the sharing of library resources and services in a welcoming atmosphere for all and will continue to function as a public forum for learning.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Culver-Union Township Public Library as they celebrate their 100th Anniversary.

HONORING PLEASANT GREEN MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community, Pleasant Green Missionary Baptist Church. Pleasant Green M. B. Church has served as a catalyst for the African American growth in Warren County.

Pleasant Green Missionary Baptist Church was established in 1867 in a mess hall on Pearl Street. The first church was destroyed by a storm in 1869 and another church was built in 1869 under Rev. Jim Shaw. The church relocated to its present site in 1888 with the construction of a wood-framed structure for worship, which subsequently burned. A new brick structure was constructed under Rev. Dunham and Deacon Ragan, both professional brick masons.

In 1893, the church called Rev. Oscar Williams—a mighty man of God, soul-stirring preacher, revivalist, earnest and tireless worker—as its seventh pastor, who organized the church into working ministries with assistance from Deacons: Jack Lindsey, Johnny Young, George Ely, Saul Moore, Dan Scott, Ed Brackins, and Jim Shaw. The final church structure was completed under Rev. Williams leadership in 1898 and the membership increased to over 800 congregants.

In 1910, under the leadership of Rev. G. W. Alexander, a two-story hall was erected and the usher board was organized with the first ushers being Will Moore, Henry Tucker, and Fink Taylor.

In 1922, under the pastor-ship of Rev. Frank Williams, the pipe organ was installed, concrete steps replaced wooden steps, electric lights replaced gas lights, and a water cooler was added. Also, the two story fellowship hall was replaced with the current structure, a heat furnace was added, and the communion table presently used was obtained.

In 1939, under the shepherding of Rev. L. R. Chandler, a new roof for the church and fellowship hall were completed, the exterior of the church and fellowship hall was restored, a baptismal pool and new hardwood floors were added, and the choir stand were extended.

In 1969, after 29 years of faithful service, Rev. Chandler resigned due to health issues, and Rev. F. L. Barnes was called as pastor and oversaw the installation of air conditioning and carpeted floors.

In March 1982, after the passing of Rev. Barnes, Rev. Alvin G. Walker was called to serve as pastor. Under his leadership, new land was purchased; new doors for the front of the church and basement were installed; usher, finance and communion rooms were constructed, and handrails were added.

In November 2013, after other faithful servants of the gospel ministry had served, Rev. Jefforey Stafford was called as pastor. It is his vision that Pleasant Green ''Exalt Christ Crucified and Coming Again, Embrace Community with Care, and Engage the Culture with Christ-Centered Compassion.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Pleasant Green Missionary Baptist Church for its rich heritage.

COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE PORT OF PALM BEACH

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to rise today to recognize and commemorate the centennial anniversary of the Port of Palm Beach located in Palm Beach County, Florida.

Since its founding in 1915, the Port of Palm Beach has grown and flourished, maintaining a superior standard of work while enriching the surrounding county and community. The Port now stands as the fourth busiest container port in Florida and 18th in the nation. Some two million tons of cargo, valued at greater than $5 billion dollars passes through the Port annually, which further serves to highlight the substantial contribution the Port makes to the state at large.

This heavy load and its many years of service have not dissuaded the Port from expanding its enterprise, however, and just this year the Port celebrated the maiden voyage of a new cruise liner. Now with nearly 3,000 Floridians under its employ, the Port of Palm Beach is an industrial powerhouse, helping to fuel South Florida's development and contributing millions in revenue to Florida's economy. Most remarkable is the Port's record of self-sustenance, as it has been nearly 40 years since the Port last levied any sort of tax on the citizens of Palm Beach County.

Mr. Speaker, the Port of Palm Beach is a cornerstone of the greater Florida community and a model of excellence. I applaud the Port's many years of success and wish it many more years of prosperity and progress.

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF KENT, WASHINGTON

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Kent, Washington as it celebrates its 125th year anniversary. Kent has special significance for me, being the place where I grew up fishing in Mill Creek and playing at Kent Memorial Park. It was there I held my first job at 11 years old, working in the valley farms picking strawberries, raspberries, and beans. I attended Kent-Meridian High School and have fond memories of playing football at French Field, and I even bought my first car in Kent. Starting out with only 793 people in May of 1890, it has grown into a city of 124,000 and is home to an extremely diverse population. Kent is the fourth largest manufacturing and distribution center in the country, making it a hub with connections across the entire nation. Kent has also won national awards for its Airways Brewery, and word of this local treasure has spread far and wide. It also boasts the Seattle Thunderbirds who play at Kent's ShoWare Center and made it to the Western Hockey League playoffs last year.

Not only is it a successful city, hosting over 4,500 businesses and 78,000 jobs, but with its prime location nestled in the Green River Valley, it is also a beautiful location. As you look out you can see Mt. Rainier and both the Cascade and Olympic Mountain ranges—some of the most stunning landscape in the entire country. Kent has truly proven that they are here to stay and I am confident its next 125 years will prove as successful as its first.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST PARISH

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 2015, Archbishop Charles Chaput will celebrate a Mass commemorating the close of the year-long celebration of the 50th Anniversary of St. John the Evangelist Parish. The parish has faithfully attended to the spiritual needs of the community for 50 years, providing a place of prayer, meditation and reflection. Furthermore, the parishioners in the

Lower Makefield, Bucks County church, built bonds of charity throughout the community with their devotion to those most in need. They dutifully collect and distribute food and clothing, school supplies, and visit the sick and homebound, year after year. St. John the Evangelist Parish has extended its mission, reaching out to the needy in nearby Trenton, New Jersey and Philadelphia, as well as supporting church missions worldwide. In so doing, the parishioners have demonstrated their faith through their good works. Congratulations on this anniversary year with all best wishes for the continuation of your community of the faithful far into the future.

TRIBUTE TO TAMELA LYNN LATHERY FLEMMINGS

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of my Aunt, Tamela Lynn Lathery Flemmings, a woman of great faith and an active volunteer in the Connersville community.

Tamela was a loving and devoted wife to her husband of 12 years, Marcus. She was the proud mother of her daughter, Mamie Rae Young, and leaves behind a large family including her husband, mother, brothers, sisters, as well as many, many nieces and nephews.

In addition to spending time with her family, Tamela was known for her faith in the Lord, as a member of the Growing Branches for Christ Church. Her faith led to an active commitment in her community. Through her work to help others recover from their drug and alcohol addictions by way of the Solid Rock Ministries and the House of Ruth, Tamela was able to serve the lives of many. She also regularly volunteered with Walk a Mile in My Shoes and Gentle Christmas.

I know my Aunt Tamela was someone with a loving spirit, who could be counted on for her warm laugh and big smile. She was a straight-shooter, who was candid, loyal and smart. I will always be grateful for her love, friendship and support.

Tamela, you will be missed by those you helped to smile, succeed and empower. May God bless you, your family, and all the people of Connersville who you touched and saved through your work.

IN RECOGNITION OF CYNTHIA SCHUMAN BANKS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Cynthia Schuman Banks, an accomplished artist and designer, a philanthropist and community leader, and one of the most youthful people I know. I am blessed to count Cynthia as one of my closest friends.

Cynthia has extraordinary talent and whatever she touches turns into a treasure. She has painted superb portraits including those of Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, Reverend Jessie Jackson, Dr. Linus Pauling and Vice President Walter Mondale. When former Soviet Union President Mikhail Gorbachev visited San Francisco in the early 1990s, Cynthia was selected to present him with one of her abstract paintings. She remains an avid painter to this day and recently had many of her works displayed at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

Cynthia was born in Oakland, California. She attended Stanford University before she started her career as a fashion designer at Lilli Ann, a San Francisco-based clothing company that her father Adolph Schuman founded in 1934. It was named for Cynthia's mother Lillian and renowned for its good workmanship and high quality fabrics.

Adolph Schuman started the company in two rented rooms with $800 he borrowed. Fifty years later, Lilli Ann reported retail sales of $40 million. Mr. Schuman bought large quantities of French and Italian fabrics from small companies which helped revitalize those countries' war-ravaged textile industries. Cynthia significantly contributed to the legacy of Lilli Ann. She designed the most successful suit in the company's history.

In 1965, she changed her professional focus from fashion design to interior design and founded Benatar and Cole Interiors. She has transformed many prestigious homes in the Bay Area with her unique and exquisite touch.

In 1991, Cynthia met Dan Banks and they married the next year. For the last 23 years, Cynthia and Dan have made family their priority. They are the proud parents of Darrell Benatar, Denise Benatar, Pamela Banks Joyce and Tom Banks and grandparents Trevor, Parker, always-remembered Emily, Isabel, Maya, Colin, Sandra, Michael and Taylor. To say that Cynthia is a people person would be the understatement of the century—she loves people and loves bringing them together. Dinner parties at the Schuman Banks are must-attends for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives rise with me to honor a remarkable woman who lives life with joie de vivre and my most favorite friend Cynthia Schuman Banks on the occasion of her birthday. She continues to enrich our lives every day.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,152,841,401,259.20. We've added $7,525,964,352,346.12 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING MARY FORTUNE WILLIAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a self-motivated leader and innovator of the community. Ms. Mary Fortune Williams, MBA, works as an Accountant for the State of Mississippi. She earned her Bachelor of Science degree in Marketing from Jackson State University and her Master of Business Administration degree from Mississippi College. She also earned a Certificate of Accounting from Mississippi College.

Ms. Williams is a single parent of one daughter. After becoming divorced when her daughter was a toddler, she was determined that her child would not become another negative statistic attributed to single parent households. She strives to instill in her daughter one of the greatest fundamentals of life: Never let negative circumstances define who you are or what you can become.

Ms. Williams is actively involved in her daughter's educational and character development. She works diligently in her church and her community. She is part of the Youth Leadership Team at Greater Fairview Missionary Baptist Church, serves as an Assistant Leader of Girl Scout Troop 5576, serves on the PTSA Board of Murrah High School, and serves on the planning committee for the American Cancer Society's Relay for Life of Jackson, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Mary Fortune Williams for giving back to the community in which she was born and reared.

RECOGNIZING OSCAR HOPKINS, SR.

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and accomplishments of Oscar Hopkins, Sr.:

Whereas, Oscar Hopkins, Sr., a native of Sumter, South Carolina, was born in 1929. He worked as a farmhand before he left home to seek a better life for his family and establish his business as a barber in Springfield Gardens, New York; and

Whereas, after moving to New York in 1951, Oscar Hopkins was drafted into the military, serving in the 7th Infantry Division, 31st Regiment, Company C as an ammunition bearer for 50-caliber machine guns during the Korean War. After completing his tour of duty and returning to the United States three years later, Oscar was united in holy matrimony to Novell Henry. Having made a lifetime commitment to each other, two boys and one girl were added to this union; and

Whereas, deciding to go into business, Oscar took advantage of his veterans benefits by signing up for barbering courses working as an apprentice before obtaining his Master Barbering License and opening his own shop in 1966. The past several years Mr. Hopkins has been an exemplary member of the Southeastern Queens community; and

Whereas, for four generations Hopkins Barber Shop has served over 500,000 people since opening its doors, serving as a forum for community residents to have healthy open dialogues regarding current affairs, politics, faith and sports. In addition to serving its community well, the barber shop has trained several dozen of men of color to become barbers. Having achieved the status of Mayor of Springfield Gardens, today we gather to salute this exceptional person; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That I, GREGORY W. MEEKS, Member of the 114th Congress, representing the Fifth Congressional District of New York, congratulate you, for your service to your country, and your dedication to the Southeast Queens Community. On behalf of the 723,000 residents of the Fifth Congressional District, I thank you, Oscar Hopkins, Sr., for your outstanding and ongoing contribution to our community's well-being. I hereby proclaim today, May 15, 2015, "Oscar Hopkins, Sr. Day".

ANGELICA GARCIA WOMEN'S BUSINESS STAR AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Angelica Garcia who was recently awarded the Women's Business Enterprise National Council's Women's Business Star at its Salute to Women's Business Enterprise Gala.

Angelica is an entrepreneur and a mother from the Katy-area. She was awarded by the Women's Business Enterprise Alliance for her entrepreneurial leadership and perseverance. Angelica established AIM Global Logistics, LLC using only $50,000 in savings and a $500 credit card. Today her business brings in over 20 million dollars a year by offering superior services in the transportation industry. She is an exceptional leader in the Houston business community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Angelica Garcia for receiving the Women's Business Enterprise National Council's Women's Business Star Award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Numbers 264 through 267, I was not present due to airplane equipment problems. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on Roll Call Vote No. 264, "no" on Roll Call Vote No. 265, "no" on Roll Call Vote No. 266, and "aye" on Roll Call Vote No. 267.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE 2015 SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTEES FROM THE 21ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2015 Service Academy appointees from the 21st Congressional District of Texas.

The following individuals have accepted academy appointments:

McKinlee Marie Boss, Smithson Valley High School, United States Military Academy; William Ellis Cooper, Jack C. Hays High School, United States Air Force Academy; Shelby Lee Feldman, Comfort High School, United States Air Force Academy; Nicky Sophia Manitzas, Liberal Arts and Science Academy of Austin, Greystone Preparatory School at Schreiner University, United States Military Academy; Elisa Elena Nelson, Winston Churchill High School, United States Air Force Academy Preparatory School, United States Air Force Academy; Rollins Law Olmsted, Our Lady of the Hills Catholic High School, Greystone Preparatory School at Schreiner University, United States Military Academy; Scott Allen Pofahl, Bandera High School, Greystone Preparatory School at Schreiner University, United States Military Academy; Travis S. Pospisil, Boerne-Samuel V. Champion High School, United States Naval Academy; Nicholas Cole Smisek, Winston Churchill High School, United States Air Force Academy; Aaron Raoul Solorzano, Alamo Heights High School, United States Military Academy; and Eric James Yandura, Claudia Taylor "Lady Bird" Johnson High School, United States Air Force Academy.

Again, congratulations to these outstanding students. I know they will serve our country well and I trust success will follow them in all their endeavors.

HONORING COACH DAVEY "THE WIZ" WHITNEY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of a man who touched the lives of many throughout the states of Texas, Kentucky, and Mississippi. He recently passed away on May 10, 2015 in his home.

Davey Whitney was born in the small town of Midway, Kentucky on January 8, 1930. He later moved to Lexington, Kentucky where he discovered his passion for basketball and joined his high school team as the point guard. There he led his team into tournaments for two consecutive years. He went on to graduate from Kentucky State University in 1952.

A seasoned basketball player, Whitney became the head coach of Texas Southern University. Subsequently he served as the head coach of Alcorn State University, which is located in Lorman, Mississippi, from 1969 to 1989 and later from 1996 to 2003. Under his leadership, they made national history in 1980 for being the first historically black college or university to win a game in the NCAA Men's Division I Basketball Championship. Rising in the midst of such a groundbreaking achievement, Whitney became nationally known as "The Wiz".

A teacher, mentor, and sometimes revered as a father to the Alcorn Braves, Whitney was inducted into the Mississippi Sports Hall of Fame in 1991. He was also inducted into the College Basketball Hall of Fame in 2010. Alcorn State University dedicated the Davey Whitney Complex basketball gym in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in celebrating the life and legacy of Coach Davey Whitney. His uncompromising commitment to diligence has paved the way for the entire Black community. Although he is no longer with us, Davey Whitney, "The Wiz" will forever be etched in the hearts of Mississippians.

HONORING MR. MICHAEL FINLEY LANGE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Mr. Michael Finley Lange, a prominent actor, teacher, filmmaker, and playwright. Mr. Lange earned a reputation throughout the years as a progressive force in the theater arts. With his passing on May 20, 2015, we look to recognize his extraordinary life's work and all those he inspired as an actor and teacher of theatre arts.

Mr. Lange was born in Oakland on January 2, 1948. His father was a thespian who inspired him to pursue the dramatic Arts. Mr. Lange graduated from Oakland Technical High School in 1967. He attended UC Berkeley where he obtained his undergraduate degree in Political Science and later completed his graduate studies in Public Health at California State University East Bay. He later taught for more than a decade at California State University San Jose to Hospitality, Recreation, and Health Science majors.

Mr. Lange had a passion for theatre. From 1974 to 2006, Mr. Lange managed the Alice Arts Center (now the Molonga Casquelord Centre for the Arts). He also managed the Henry J. Kaiser building in Downtown Oakland.

Mr. Lange directed stage productions in the Bay Area for more than 25 years. He produced The Meeting, a fictional meeting between the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King and Honorable Malcolm X. He was also an exceptional playwright. He wrote "Prophet Nat", a musical docudrama based on the life of slave-prophet Nat Turner. He also directed two award winning plays: Ceremonies in Dark Old Men and The Old Settler.

Since the early 1990's, Mr. Lange was known for his portrayals of Malcolm X. Mr. Lange was able to captivate and capture audiences with his performances, bringing the passion and presence of Malcolm X to life, while also presenting the crowd with pressing questions regarding racial discrimination still prevalent in today's society.

Throughout his prolific career, Mr. Lange received numerous accolades, which includes being honored by the San Francisco Black Film Festival.

I have known Michael since my college days at Mills College—he constantly encouraged me. His smile, words of wisdom, and his friendship will be deeply missed.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding individual, Mr. Michael Finley Lange. Mr. Lange's contributions have truly impacted so many lives throughout the Bay Area. I join all of Mr. Lange's loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed.

IN HONOR OF EMMA BASS

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's been more than a century since the famous Blues singer Sam "Lightnin'" Hopkins was born in Centerville, but there has been one lady catching lightning on paper since 1980.

For more than three decades if news happened in the Leon county seat, we all could count on Emma Bass to keep us fully informed.

In her town of less than a thousand residents, Emma started The Centerville News with a local loan and a big dream.

Thanks to Emma's hard work, The Centerville News is a necessary part of Centerville life. Centerville natives who have moved away from home subscribe to keep up on local happenings. All thanks to Emma's hard work and perseverance.

My friendship with Emma started when I was lucky enough to be elected to represent Centerville in the Texas House of Representatives. That friendship continues today and I'm better for it.

Count me as part of Emma's fan club.

I greatly admire and respect her integrity, intelligence and humor.

Everyone knew that if you wanted to get the story out and get it right, you better be talking to Emma Bass.

In an era of newspaper cutbacks, it's that hometown feel that makes what she created so special. When you read a story in The Centerville News and close your eyes just for a moment, you are there.

While it may take time for the new team to fill Emma's shoes, The Centerville News she founded and nurtured is staying local and Emma's contributions to her community continue on through her work on the Centerville Chamber of Commerce board.

Emma Bass is a Centerville icon and her voice will be missed on the pages of The Centerville News. But my friend Emma's retirement from news is well deserved. May it be as long, happy and fulfilling as this wonderful lady deserves.

Thank you, Emma Bass, for sharing so much with all of us for all these years.

HONORING THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOROUGH OF SHOEMAKERSVILLE

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today and congratulate my constituents residing in the Borough of Shoemakersville on the occasion of the 250th Anniversary of its founding.

Shoemakersville, located in Berks County, Pennsylvania, was founded by Henry and Carl Shoemaker in 1765. Henry and Carl were sons of German immigrant, Jacob Shoemaker.

When Henry and Carl arrived in the area that was to become Shoemakersville they found a dense forest land. It was Henry who built the first stone house at the site. This house stands to this day at the corner of Main & Miller Streets.

The area flourished, becoming an important hub on the Schuylkill Canal. The Canal allowed for the transportation of vital anthracite coal that fueled the industrial boom in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania during the middle of the Nineteenth Century.

With steady growth, the residents of the region decided to formally incorporate as the Borough of Shoemakersville on September 12, 1921.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartfelt congratulations to the residents of Shoemakersville on this momentous anniversary celebration.

The story of Shoemakersville is the story of growth and prosperity fueled by hard work and the determination to overcome adversity that is the very essence of the American story.

On behalf of the House and my colleagues, I congratulate the people of the Borough of Shoemakersville on the occasion of the 250th Anniversary of its founding. God bless them and may they continue to know freedom and prosperity.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 04, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 9

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 15, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to recognize the authority of States to regulate oil and gas operations and promote American energy security, development, and job creation, S. 454, to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, S. 784, to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish microlabs to improve regional engagement with national laboratories, S. 1033, to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to replace the current requirement for a biennial energy policy plan with a Quadrennial Energy Review, S. 1054, to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small-and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, S. 1068, to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system from cyber security threats, S. 1181, to expand the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program to include commercial trucks and United States flagged vessels, to return unspent funds and loan proceeds to the United States Treasury to reduce the national debt, S. 1187, to improve management of the National Laboratories, enhance technology commercialization, facilitate public-private partnerships, S. 1216, to amend the Natural Gas Act to modify a provision relating to civil penalties, S. 1218, to establish an interagency coordination committee or subcommittee with the leadership of the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, focused on the nexus between energy and water production, use, and efficiency, S. 1221, to amend the Federal Power Act to require periodic reports on electricity reliability and reliability impact statements for rules affecting the reliable operation of the bulk-power system, S. 1223, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to improve the loan guarantee program for innovative technologies, S. 1229, to require the Secretary of Energy to submit a plan to implement recommendations to improve interactions between the Department of Energy and National Laboratories, S. 1230, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program under which the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall enter into memoranda of understanding with States providing for State oversight of oil and gas productions activities, S. 1241, to provide for the modernization, security, and resiliency of the electric grid, to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs for research, development, demonstration, and information-sharing for cybersecurity for the energy sector, S. 1256, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy storage research program, loan program, and technical assistance and grant program, S. 1258, to require the Secretary

of Energy to establish a distributed energy loan program and technical assistance and grant program, S. 1259, to establish a grant program to allow National Laboratories to provide vouchers to small business concerns to improve commercialization of technologies developed at National Laboratories and the technology-driven economic impact of commercialization in the regions in which National Laboratories are located, S. 1263, to provide for the establishment of a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Fund to assist United States businesses with exporting clean energy technology products and services, S. 1274, to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to reauthorize Federal agencies to enter into long-term contracts for the acquisition of energy, S. 1275, to establish a Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program in the Department of Energy to provide financial assistance to promote energy efficiency and onsite renewable technologies in manufacturing and industrial facilities, S. 1277, to improve energy savings by the Department of Defense, S. 1293, to establish the Department of Energy as the lead agency for coordinating all requirements under Federal law with respect to eligible clean coal and advanced coal technology generating projects, S. 1306, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to use existing funding available to further projects that would improve energy efficiency and reduce emissions, S. 1310, to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing new oil or natural gas production leases in the Gulf of Mexico under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to a person that does not renegotiate its existing leases in order to require royalty payments if oil and natural gas prices are greater than or equal to specified price thresholds, S. 1311, to amend the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to modify certain penalties to deter oil spills, S. 1312, to modernize Federal policies regarding the supply and distribution of energy in the United States, S. 1338, to amend the Federal Power Act to provide licensing procedures for certain types of projects, S. 1340, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to improve coal leasing, S. 1346, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an e-prize competition pilot program to provide up to 4 financial awards to eligible entities that develop and verifiably demonstrate technology that reduces the cost of electricity or space heat in a high-cost region, S. 1363, to require the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress a report assessing the capability of the Department of Energy to authorize, host, and oversee privately funded fusion and fission reactor prototypes and related demonstration facilities at sites owned by the Department of Energy, S. 1398, to extend, improve, and consolidate energy research and development programs, S. 1405, to require a coordinated response to coal fuel supply emergencies that could impact electric power system adequacy or reliability, S. 1407, to promote the development of renewable energy on public land, S. 1408, to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Energy, S. 1420, 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, S. 1422, 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, S. 1428, to amend the USEC Privatization Act to require the Secretary of Energy to issue a long-term Federal excess uranium inventory management plan, S. 1432, to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study on the technology, potential lifecycle energy savings, and economic impact of recycled carbon fiber, S. 1434, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish an energy storage portfolio standard, S. 1449, 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, and H.R. 35, to increase the understanding of the health effects of low doses of ionizing radiation.

SD–366

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, ''Fiscal Year 2016 Department of Defense Appropriations.''

SD–192

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Transportation Security Administration, focusing on first-hand and government watchdog accounts of agency challenges.

SD–342

JUNE 10

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine passenger rail safety, focusing on accident prevention and on-going efforts to implement train control technology.

SR–253

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine health information exchange, focusing on a path towards improving the quality and value of health care for patients.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the Federal regulatory system to improve accountability, transparency and integrity.

SD–226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, ''Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016''.

SD–192

1:30 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Luis Felipe Restrepo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

SD–226

2 p.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine the escalating threat of ISIL in Central Asia.

RHOB–2175

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 248, to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine addressing the need for victim services in Indian County.

SD–628

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine S. 145, to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown, S. 146, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, S. 319, to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Mount Denali, S. 329, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 403, to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, S. 521, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of President Station in Baltimore, Maryland, S. 610, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of P.S. 103 in West Baltimore, Maryland and for other purposes, S. 782, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a bison management plan for Grand Canyon National Park, S. 873, to designate the wilderness within the Lake Clark National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska as the Jay S. Hammond Wilderness Area, and S. 1483, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the James K. Polk Home in Columbia, Tennessee, as a unit of the National Park System.

SD–366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management

To hold hearings to examine wasteful spending in the Federal government, focusing on an outside perspective.

SD–342

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the proliferation of unwanted calls.

SD–562

JUNE 11

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine accounts of current and former federal agency whistleblowers.

SD–342

JUNE 16

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jonathan Elkind, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (International Affairs), and Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management).

SD–366

JULY 9

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the back-end of the nuclear fuel cycle and related legislation, including S. 854, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.

SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3635–S3729

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1487–1501, and S. Res. 190–191. **Pages S3678–79**

Measures Passed:

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 48, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War. **Page S3728**

Responding to Anti-Semitism in Europe: Senate agreed to 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. **Page S3728**

Relative to the Death of Joseph Robinette Biden, III: Senate agreed to S. Res. 191, relative to the death of Joseph Robinette Biden, III. **Pages S3728–29**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of H.R. 1735, 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, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S3642–67**

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3642**

McCain Amendment No. 1456 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels. **Page S3657**

Reed Amendment No. 1521 (to Amendment No. 1463), to limit the availability of amounts authorized to be appropriated for overseas contingency operations pending relief from the spending limits under the Budget Control Act of 2011. **Page S3657**

Portman Amendment No. 1522 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide additional amounts for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation for Stryker Lethality Upgrades, and to provide an offset. **Pages S3657–59**

Reed (for Bennet) Amendment No. 1540 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require the Comptroller General of the United States to brief and submit a report to Congress on the administration and oversight by the Department of Veterans Affairs of contracts for the design and construction of major medical facility projects. **Page S3661**

Cornyn Amendment No. 1486 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security. **Pages S3659–61**

Reed (for Shaheen) Amendment No. 1494 (to Amendment No. 1463), to revise the definition of spouse for purposes of veterans benefits in recognition of new State definitions of spouse. **Page S3667**

Tillis Amendment No. 1506 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide for the stationing of C–130 H aircraft avionics previously modified by the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) in support of daily training and contingency requirements for Airborne and Special Operations Forces. **Pages S3666–67**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 4, 2015, that there be 30 minutes equally divided in the usual form on the following amendments, and that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on or in relation to the amendments in the order listed: Portman Amendment No. 1522 (to Amendment No. 1463) (listed above), and Reed (for Bennet) Amendment No. 1540 (to Amendment No. 1463) (listed above); and that there be no second-degree amendments in order to any of these amendments prior to the votes. **Pages S3666, S3729**

Messages from the House: **Page S3675**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S3675**

Executive Communications: Pages S3675–77

Petitions and Memorials: Pages S3677–78

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S3679–80

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S3680–83

Additional Statements: Page S3675

Amendments Submitted: Pages S3683–S3728

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S3728

Privileges of the Floor: Page S3728

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:31 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 4, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3729.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

EPA'S PROPOSED NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD FOR GROUND-LEVEL OZONE

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine challenges and implications of EPA's proposed national ambient air quality standard for ground-level ozone, including S. 638, to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to exceptional event demonstrations, S. 751, to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and S. 640, to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the review and revision of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone, after receiving testimony from Senators Thune and Flake; Representative Olson; Kanathur Srikanth, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations; Michael McKee, Uintah County Commission Chairman, Vernal, Utah; Gary Moore, Boone County Judge/Executive, Burlington, Kentucky, on behalf of the National Association of Regional Councils; Larry Greene, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, Sacramento, California; and Gregory B. Diette, American Thoracic Society, Baltimore, Maryland.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "Audit and Appeal Fairness, Integrity, and Reforms in Medicare Act of 2015".

IMPLICATIONS OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine implications of the Iran nuclear agreement for United States policy in the Middle East, after receiving testimony from James F. Jeffrey, The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, and Martin Indyk, Brookings Institution, both of Washington, D.C.

GOVERNMENT INVESTIGATOR POSITIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine top government investigator positions left unfilled for years, after receiving testimony from Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General, Department of Justice; and Danielle Brian, Project on Government Oversight, and Daniel Z. Epstein, Cause of Action, both of Washington, D.C.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on ensuring college affordability, after receiving testimony from Judith Scott-Clayton, Columbia University Teachers College, New York, New York; Elizabeth Akers, Brookings Institution, and Michael Mitchell, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, both of Washington, D.C.; F. King Alexander, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge; and James Kennedy, Indiana University, Bloomington.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1292, to amend the Small Business Act to treat certain qualified disaster areas as HUBZones and to extend the period for HUBZone treatment for certain base closure areas;

S. 1470, to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance to small business concerns for disaster recovery, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nomination of Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

PENDING HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 297, to revive and expand the Intermediate Care Technician Pilot Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 425, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration

programs and to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under such programs, S. 471, to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 684, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and other pending calendar business, after receiving testimony from Thomas Lynch, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health Clinical Operations, Veterans Health Administration; Adrian M. Atizado, Disabled American Veterans, and Thomas J. Snee, Fleet Reserve Association, both of Washington, D.C.; Fred Benjamin, Medicalodges, Inc., Coffeyville, Kansas; and Victor Medina, El Paso, Texas.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 22 public bills, H.R. 2623–2644; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 292–297 were introduced. **Pages H3877–79**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3879–80**

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 H3763**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:08 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H3770**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend William Rice, Calvary Baptist Church, Clearwater, Florida. **Page H3770**

Commodity End-User Relief Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 288, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, and to help keep consumer costs low, by a yea-and-nay vote of 243 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 274. **Pages H3773–81**

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016: The House passed H.R. 2578, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 297. Consideration began yesterday, June 2. **Pages H3781–H3817**

Rejected the Brownley (CA) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 184 yeas to 240 nays, Roll No. 296. **Pages H3815–16**

Agreed to:

Bonamici amendment (No. 9 printed in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2015) that was debated on June 2nd that prohibits funds from being used by the Department of Justice to prevent a State from implementing its own State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of industrial hemp, as defined in section 7606 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (by a recorded vote of 282 ayes to 146 noes, Roll No. 280); **Pages H3784–85**

Rohrabacher amendment that was debated on June 2nd that prohibits the use of funds by various states to prevent any of them from implementing their own laws that authorize the use, distribution, possessions, or cultivation of medical marijuana (by a recorded vote of 242 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 283); **Pages H3786–87**

Grayson amendment that was debated on June 2nd that prohibits the use of funds to compel a person to testify about information or sources that the person states in a motion to quash the subpoena that he has obtained as a journalist or reporter and that he regards as confidential (by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 182 noes, Roll No. 284); **Pages H3787–88**

Perry amendment that was debated on June 2nd that prohibits the use of funds to take any action to prevent a State from implementing any law that makes it lawful to possess, distribute, or use cannabidiol oil (by a recorded vote of 297 ayes to 130 noes, Roll No. 286); **Pages H3788–89**

Garrett amendment that was debated on June 2nd that prohibits the use of funds to enforce the Fair Housing Act in a manner that relies upon an allegation of liability under section 100.500 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations (by a recorded vote of 232 ayes to 196 noes, Roll No. 287); **Pages H3789–90**

Gosar amendment that prohibits the use of funds to carry out the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosive Special Advisory entitled ''Test, Examination and Classification of 7N6 5.45x39 Ammunition'', dated April 7, 2014; **Page H3794**

Issa amendment that prohibits the use of funds to operate or disseminate a cell-site simulator or IMSI catcher in the United States except pursuant to a court order that identifies an individual, account, address, or personal device; **Pages H3795–96**

Duncan (SC) amendment that prohibits the use of funds to prosecute or hold liable any person or corporation for a violation of section 2(a) of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; **Pages H3797–98**

King (IA) amendment that prohibits the use of funds to negotiate or finalize a trade agreement that includes provisions relating to visas issued under the Immigration and Nationality Act; also provides that the limitation described in the amendment shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff (agreed by unanimous consent to withdraw the earlier request for a recorded vote to the end that the amendment stand adopted in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon); **Pages H3803–04**

Luetkemeyer amendment that prohibits the use of funds to carry out the program known as Operation Choke Point; **Pages H3805–07**

Massie amendment that prohibits the use of funds in contravention of section 7606 (Legitimacy of Industrial Hemp Research) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 by the Department of Justice or the Drug Enforcement Administration (by a recorded vote of 289 ayes to 132 noes, Roll No. 288); **Pages H3790–91, H3809–10**

Massie amendment that prohibits the use of funds to treat ammunition as armor piercing for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, except for ammunition designed and intended for use in a handgun (by a recorded vote of 250 ayes to 171 noes, Roll No. 289); **Pages H3791–93, H3810**

Massie amendment that prohibits the use of funds by the National Institute of Standards and Technology to consult with the National Security Agency or the CIA to alter cryptographic or computer standards, except to improve information security (by a recorded vote of 383 ayes to 43 noes, Roll No. 290); **Pages H3793–94, H3811**

Flores amendment that prohibits the use of funds to implement Executive Order 13547, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes, including the National Ocean Policy developed under such Executive Order (by a recorded vote of 236 ayes to 190 noes, Roll No. 291); **Pages H3796–97, H3811–12**

King (IA) amendment (No. 3 printed in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2015) that prohibits funds from being used with respect to the case State of Texas v. United States of America (No. B–14–254 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas and No. 15–40238 in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit) (by a recorded vote of 222 ayes to 204 noes, Roll No. 293); **Pages H3801–02, H3813**

King (IA) amendment that prohibits the use of State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance in contravention of the Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 198 noes, Roll No. 294); and **Pages H3804–05, H3813–14**

Denham amendment that prohibits the use of funds for NOAA to implement in the California Central Valley Recovery Domain any existing recovery plan for salmon and steelhead populations listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1978 as threatened species or endangered species if that recovery plan does not address predation by non-native species (by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 295). **Pages H3807–08, H3814–15**

Rejected:

Pittenger amendment that was debated on June 2nd that sought to increase funding, by offset, for salaries and expenses of the FBI by $25,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes to 263 noes, Roll No. 275); **Pages H3781–82**

Nadler amendment that was debated on June 2nd that sought to strike section 527 of the bill, which prohibits use of funds to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the U.S., its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who is not a U.S. citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the U.S. and is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense (by a recorded vote of 170 ayes to 256 noes, Roll No. 276); **Page H3782**

Farr amendment that was debated on June 2nd that sought to strike section 540 from the bill, which prohibits use of funds to facilitate, permit, license, or promote exports to the Cuban military or intelligence service or to any officer of the Cuban military or intelligence service, or an immediate family member thereof (by a recorded vote of 153 ayes to 273 noes, Roll No. 277); **Pages H3782–83**

Blackburn amendment (No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2015) that was debated on June 2nd that sought to reduce amounts made available by 1 percent, except those amounts made available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and certain accounts of the Department of Justice (by a recorded vote of 168 ayes to 257 noes, Roll No. 278); **Pages H3783–84**

Foster amendment that was debated on June 2nd that sought to prohibit the use of funds to fund any Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) program (by a recorded vote of 195 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 279); **Page H3784**

Ellison amendment that was debated on June 2nd that sought to prohibit the use of funds by the Department of Justice in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; or to repeal the guidance provided in the memorandum issued by the Attorney General on March 31, 2015 (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 281); **Pages H3785–86**

Grayson amendment that was debated on June 2nd that sought to prohibit the use of funds to negotiate or enter into a trade agreement whose negotiating texts are confidential (by a recorded vote of 27 ayes to 399 noes with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 282); **Page H3786**

McClintock amendment that was debated on June 2nd that sought to prohibit the use of funds by various states to prevent any of them from implementing their own laws that authorize the use, distribution, possessions, or cultivation of marijuana on non-Federal lands within their respective jurisdictions (by a recorded vote of 206 ayes to 222 noes, Roll. No. 285); and **Page H3788**

Sanford amendment that sought to reduce funding in the bill by 2.48 percent across-the-board (by a recorded vote of 134 ayes to 290 noes, Roll No. 292). **Pages H3799–H3801, H3812**

Withdrawn:

Flores amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds for further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547; and **Pages H3796–99**

Jeffries amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds for the monitoring or review of electronic communications between and inmate and attorney or attorney's agents who are traditionally covered by attorney client privilege except in specified instances. **Pages H3808–09**

Point of Order sustained against:

Lamborn amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds to collect information about individuals attending gun shows, by means of an automatic license plate reader, or to retain any information so collected. **Page H3798**

H. Res. 287, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2577) and (H.R. 2578) was agreed to yesterday, June 2nd.

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016: The House began consideration of H.R. 2577, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, June 4. **Pages H3817–77**

Agreed to:

Dent amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for the purpose of installing inward facing cameras in locomotives, by $9,000,000; **Pages H3830–32**

Bustos amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, by $500,000; **Page H3832**

Meehan amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Federal Railroad Administration Safety and Operations, by $3,500,000; **Page H3832**

Burgess amendment that increases funding, by offset, for National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Operations and Research by $4,000,000; **Pages H3832–33**

LoBiondo amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Facilities and Equipment, Airport and Airway Trust Fund, by $3,000,000; **Page H3838**

Bridenstine amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Federal Aviation Administration Operations Airport and Airway Trust Fund for commercial space transportation activities, by $250,000; **Pages H3841–44**

Gosar amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation Office of Inspector General Salaries and Expenses, by $500,000; **Pages H3846–47**

Titus amendment that redirects $1,000,000 in funding within the Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation; **Page H3848**

Langevin amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Technical Assistance and Training, by $2,000,000; **Page H3852**

Capps amendment that adds a new proviso that not less than $1,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the finalization and implementation of rules required under section 60102(n) of title 49, United States Code, and section 8(b)(3) of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainity, and Job Creation Act of 2011; **Page H3856**

Nadler amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Community Planning and Development, Housing Opportunities for persons with AIDS, by $3,000,000; **Pages H3865–66**

Grayson amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Housing for the Elderly, by $2,500,000; **Pages H3868–69**

Stivers amendment that redirects $28,375,000 in funding within the Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity account; **Pages H3869–70**

Grayson amendment that increases funding for the Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity by $150,000; **Pages H3870–75**

Grayson amendment that prohibits the use of funds to enter into contracts with entities who have been convicted of fraud; **Page H3876**

Fitzpatrick amendment that prohibits the use of funds in contravention of section 121.584 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and **Page H3876**

Grayson amendment that prohibits the use of funds to make incentive payments pursuant to 48 CFR 16.4 to contractors for contracts that are behind schedule under the terms of the contract as prescribed by 48 CFR 52.211 or over the contract amount indicated in Standard Form 33, box 20. **Pages H3876–77**

Rejected:

Dold amendment that sought to remove language in the bill which allows the Secretary to increase the Federal share of costs above 80 percent for projects in rural areas; **Pages H3835–36**

Dold amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, by $290,000,000; **Pages H3839–40**

Dold amendment that sought to increases funding, by offset, for Capital Investment Grants, by $200,000,000; **Pages H3840–41**

Grothman amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Capital Investment Grants by $230,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; and **Pages H3852–53**

Grothman amendment that sought to reduce funding for the Public and Indian Housing Programs by $614,000,000 and to apply the savings to the spending reduction account. **Pages H3863–65**

Withdrawn:

Lynch amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding, by offset, for Federal Railroad Administration Safety and Operations, by $25,000,000; **Page H3840**

Mica amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have struck the proviso that the Secretary, in order to ensure safety throughout the rail system, may waive the requirements of section 601(e)(1) of title VI of Public Law 110–432; and **Pages H3853–54**

Al Green (TX) amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding for Renewals of Expiring Section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts under Public and Indian Housing Programs by $75,000,000. **Page H3860**

Point of Order sustained against:

Waters amendment that sought to increase funding for National Infrastructure Investments (TIGER Grants) by $1,150,000,000; **Pages H3833–34**

Waters amendment that sought to increase funding for National Infrastructure Investments (TIGER Grants) by $400,000,000; **Pages H3834–35**

Corrine Brown (FL) amendment that sought to increase funding for Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation by $861,500,000; **Pages H3850–51**

Connolly amendment that sought to increase funding for the Grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority by $50,000,000; **Pages H3854–56**

Norton amendment that sought to increase the funding for the Public and Indian Housing Programs Tenant-Based Rental Assistance by $512,000,000; **Pages H3860–61**

Nadler amendment that sought to make various increases in the Public and Indian Housing Programs Tenant-Based Rental Assistance; and **Pages H3861–63**

Al Green (TX) amendment that sought to increase funding for the Community Planning and Development-HOME Investment Partnerships by $293,000,000 and strike the last two provisos in the Community Planning and Development-HOME Investment Partnerships Program. **Pages H3866–68**

Proceedings Postponed:

McClintock amendment that seeks to zero out the funding for Payments to Air Carriers and apply the savings of $155,000,000 to the spending reduction account; **Pages H3836–37**

Walberg amendment that seeks to strike section 102 from the bill which allows the Secretary or his designee to engage in activities with States and State legislators to consider proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities; **Pages H3837–38**

Esty amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for the Federal Railroad Administration, by $3,000,000; **Pages H3838–39**

Cartwright amendment that seeks to strike section 134 of the bill, which prohibits the use of funds to develop, issue, or implement any regulation that increase level of minimum financial responsibility for transporting passengers or property as in effect on January 1, 2014; **Pages H3844–46**

Garrett amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for the Federal Railroad Administration by $16,930,000; **Pages H3847–48**

Brooks (AL) amendment that seeks to strike the paragraph providing funding for Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation; **Pages H3848–50**

Brooks (AL) amendment that seeks to strike the paragraph providing funding for Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation; **Pages H3851–52**

Capps amendment that seeks to increase funding in the Pipeline Safety Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund by $27,604,000; and **Pages H3856–60**

Stivers amendment that seeks to prohibit the use of funds for the Private Enforcement Initiative of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program under section 561(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987. **Pages H3875–76**

H. Res. 287, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2577) and (H.R. 2578) was agreed to yesterday, June 2nd.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, June 4. **Page H3877**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and twenty-one recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3780–81, H3781, H3782, H3782–83, H3783–84, H3784, H3784–85, H3785–86, H3786, H3786–87, H3787–88, H3788, H3788–89, H3789–90, H3809–10, H3810, H3811, H3811–12, H3812, H3813, H3813–14, H3814, H3816 and H3816–17. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 12:27 a.m. on Thursday, June 4, 2015.

Committee Meetings

REVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Review of Agricultural Subsidies in Foreign Countries''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a markup on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 2016. The State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 2016, was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE: OVERSIGHT HEARING

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Congressional Budget Office: Oversight Hearing''. Testimony was heard from Keith Hall, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

COMPULSORY UNIONIZATION THROUGH GRIEVANCE FEES: THE NLRB'S ASSAULT ON RIGHT-TO-WORK

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Compulsory Unionization through Grievance Fees: The NLRB's Assault on Right-to-Work''. Testimony was heard from Pete Ricketts, Governor, State of Nebraska; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 2576, the ''TSCA Modernization Act of 2015''; and H.R. 2583, the ''Federal Communications Commission Process Reform Act of 2015''. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 2576 and H.R. 2583.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power began a hearing entitled ''Discussion Draft on Accountability and Department of Energy Perspectives on Title IV: Energy Efficiency''. Testimony was heard from Kathleen Hogan, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy; J. Arnold Quinn, Director, Office of Energy Policy and Innovation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Larry R. Parkinson, Director, Office of Enforcement, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

EXAMINING THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK'S REAUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN EXPORT FINANCING

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Export-Import Bank's Reauthorization Request and the Government's Role in Export Financing''. Testimony was heard from Fred P. Hochberg, Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank of the United States; Michael T. McCarthy, Deputy Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Export-Import Bank of the United States; and public witnesses.

U.S. POLICY TOWARDS ISIL AFTER TERROR GROUP SEIZES RAMADI AND PALMYRA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Policy Towards ISIL After Terror Group Seizes Ramadi and Palmyra''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE FUTURE OF U.S.-ZIMBABWE RELATIONS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''The Future of U.S.-Zimbabwe Relations''. Testimony was heard from Shannon Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

TERRORISM GONE VIRAL: THE ATTACK IN GARLAND, TEXAS AND BEYOND

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Terrorism Gone Viral: The Attack in Garland, Texas and Beyond''. Testimony was heard from John J. Mulligan, Deputy Director, National Counterterrorism Center; Francis X. Taylor, Under Secretary, Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security; and Michael B. Steinbach, Assistant Director, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

HOUSE OFFICER PRIORITIES FOR 2016 AND BEYOND

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''House Officer Priorities for 2016 and Beyond''. Testimony was heard from Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House; Paul D. Irving, House Sergeant at Arms; and Ed Cassidy, Chief Administrative Officer.

RETURNING RESILIENCE TO OUR OVERGROWN, FIRE-PRONE NATIONAL FORESTS ACT OF 2015

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing on a discussion draft entitled the ''Returning Resilience to our Overgrown, Fire-prone National Forests Act of 2015''. Testimony was heard from Tom Tidwell, Chief, U.S. Forest Service; and public witnesses.

ENSURING AGENCY COMPLIANCE WITH THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Ensuring Agency Compliance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)''. Testimony was heard from Joyce A. Barr, Chief FOIA Officer, Department of State; Mary Howard, Director, Privacy, Governmental Liaison, and Disclosure, Internal Revenue Service; Melanie Anne Pustay, Director, Office of Information Policy, Department of Justice; Karen Neuman, Chief FOIA Officer, Department of Homeland Security; and Brodi Fontenot, Chief FOIA Officer, Department of Treasury.

THE ROAD AHEAD: SMALL BUSINESSES AND THE NEED FOR A LONG-TERM SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Road Ahead: Small Businesses and the Need for a Long-Term Surface Transportation Reauthorization''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ASSESSING VA'S ABILITY TO PROMPTLY PAY NON-VA PROVIDERS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Assessing VA's Ability to Promptly Pay Non-VA Providers''. Testimony was heard from Gene Migliaccio, Deputy Chief Business Officer for Purchased Care, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

PROTECTING THE SAFETY NET FROM WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing entitled ''Protecting the Safety Net from Waste, Fraud, and Abuse''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Sam Johnson of Texas; Brady of Texas; Reichert; Becerra; Reed; Renacci; and DeLauro; Patrick P. O'Carroll, Jr., Inspector General, Social Security Administration; Dan Bertoni, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, Government Accountability Office; Curt Eysink, Executive Director, Louisiana Workforce Commission; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

EMPLOYMENT EFFECTS OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the employment effects of the Affordable Care Act, after receiving testimony from Casey B. Mulligan, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois; Joseph P. Sergio, The Sergio Corporation, South Bend, Indiana; Barbara L. Carroll, North Carolina State University, Raleigh; and Paul N. Van de Water, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: business meeting to consider the nomination of Jeffrey Michael

Prieto, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Export-Import Bank of the United States, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider the nomination of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy, to hold hearings to examine security assistance in Africa, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management, to hold hearings to examine practical solutions to improve the federal regulatory process, 1:15 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1137, to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and the nominations of Dale A. Drozd, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, Lawrence Joseph Vilardo, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, LaShann Moutique DeArcy Hall, and Ann Donnelly, both to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, John W. Huber, of Utah, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of four years, Eileen Maura Decker, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of California for the term of four years, and Eric Steven Miller, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts, to hold hearings to examine the process that led to the Affordable Care Act subsidy rule, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Examining H.R. 2017, the Common Sense Nutrition Disclosure Act of 2015'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled ''Discussion Draft on Accountability and Department of Energy Perspectives on Title IV: Energy Efficiency'' (continued), 10:15, 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''EPA Regulatory Overreach: Impacts on American Competitiveness'', 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled ''Sizing Up Small Business: SBA's Failure to Implement Congressional Direction'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, markup on Intelligence Authorization Act, 9 a.m., HVC–304. This markup will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 1735, National Defense Authorization Act, and vote on or in relation to Portman Amendment No. 1522 (to Amendment No. 1463), and Reed (for Bennet) Amendment No. 1540 (to Amendment No. 1463) at approximately 10:15 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, June 4

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Continue consideration of H.R. 2577—Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Alma S., N.C., E830
Barletta, Lou, Pa., E829
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E835
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E833
Dent, Charles W., Pa., E835
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E827
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E832
Green, Gene, Tex., E830
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E832
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E828
Kuster, Ann M., N.H., E831
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E834
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E827
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E827
Meeks, Gregory W., N.Y., E833
Messer, Luke, Ind., E833
Olson, Pete, Tex., E828, E834
Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E834
Poe, Ted, Tex., E831
Reichert, David G., Wash., E832
Roe, David P., Tenn., E830
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E827
Smith, Lamar, Tex., E834
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E830, E833
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E829, E832, E833, E834
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E831
Young, Don, Alaska, E827
Young, Todd C., Ind., E830

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.